RBB received
3/9/05

720

From: "Charles Rettiger" <crettiger@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 3:43 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 19, 2005

12/10/04
69FR71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Charles Rettiger
700 Washington St W Apt 507
Gainesville, GA 30501-3584
USA
crettiger@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EEC649.647 : 24 : 13895)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 3:42 PM
From: "Charles Rettiger" <crettiger@hotmail.com>

Created By: crettiger@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2027	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 3:42 PM
Mime.822	3244	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

721

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Eve Venema" <accordioneve@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 3:43 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Eve Venema
2637 Golfridge Dr SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
USA
accordioneve@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EEC649.64E : 6 : 13902)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 3:42 PM
From: "Eve Venema" <accordioneve@hotmail.com>

Created By: accordioneve@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2013	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 3:42 PM
Mime.822	3224	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

722

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Tavis Schmidt" <tavisschmidt@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 4:04 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Tavis Schmidt
711 W Santa Fe Ave
Flagstaff, AZ 86001-5324
USA
tavisschmidt@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EECB4D.8DB : 9 : 14555)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 4:03 PM
From: "Tavis Schmidt" <tavisschmidt@hotmail.com>

Created By: tavisschmidt@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2016	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 4:03 PM
Mime.822	3227	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "chris spahn" <bud0011@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

723

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

chris spahn
312B Ford Hall
Oneonta, NY 13820-1765
USA
bud0011@aol.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EEFC17.CA2 : 22 : 19618)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 7:32 PM
From: "chris spahn" <bud0011@aol.com>

Created By: bud0011@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1999	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 7:32 PM
Mime.822	3212	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RO B received
3/9/05

From: "Juliana Radloff" <jewlzzzz1@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 8:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

724

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Juliana Radloff
1111 Virginia Ave Apt C3
Harrisonburg, VA 22802-2540
USA
jewlzzzz1@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EF0327.EAA : 17 : 20138)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 8:02 PM
From: "Juliana Radloff" <jewlzzzz1@yahoo.com>

Created By: jewlzzzz1@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2022	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 8:02 PM
Mime.822	3251	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "Julie Bond" <juliekaybond@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 8:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

725

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Julie Bond
375 Liguori Rd
Edgerton, WI 53534-9331
USA
juliekaybond@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EF07D9.015 : 5 : 20501)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 8:22 PM
From: "Julie Bond" <juliekaybond@yahoo.com>

Created By: juliekaybond@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2006	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 8:22 PM
Mime.822	3213	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

226

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Suzanne Sievers-Bartlett" <ssievers@loyno.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 9:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Sievers-Bartlett
206 Metairie Heights Ave
Metairie, LA 70001
USA
ssievers@loyno.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EF137E.32B : 20 : 21291)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 9:12 PM
From: "Suzanne Sievers-Bartlett" <ssievers@loyno.edu>

Created By: ssievers@loyno.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2021	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 9:12 PM
Mime.822	3242	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Jennifer Doob" <jkdoophi@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 10:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

727

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Doob
867 Warfield Ave
Piedmont, CA 94610-2118
USA
jkdoophi@aol.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EF23FB.87A : 4 : 22650)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 10:22 PM
From: "Jennifer Doob" <jkdoophi@aol.com>

Created By: jkdoophi@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2005	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 10:22 PM
Mime.822	3206	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

728

From: "Barbara Singer" <barbsinger6260@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 11:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Barbara Singer
8731 W Summerdale Ave
Chicago, IL 60656
USA
barbsinger6260@aol.com

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EF2D59.A93 : 16 : 23187)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 11:02 PM
From: "Barbara Singer" <barbsinger6260@aol.com>

Created By: barbsinger6260@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2011	Wednesday, January 19, 2005 11:02 PM
Mime.822	3220	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(729)

12/10/05
69 FR 71854

From: "David Barish" <barishdavid@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 9:46 AM
Subject: North Anna Nuclear Power Plant

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

To Whom It May Concern:

Although I was not able to attend the hearing in Louisa this, I would like to register my objections to the proposed North Anna Nuclear Power plant. There are so many reasons to oppose this plant. I would think that the recent train crash and subsequent chlorine spill in South Carolina would make some people stop and think about putting a nuclear power plant in North Anna. What if that train was carrying nuclear waste? The people in Graniteville have been able to return to their homes (after only about a week) and only about 9 were killed. Had that been nuclear waste being transported the area would be uninhabitable for decades or centuries.

What procussions are being taken regarding the potential risk of attacks against the power plant? Where is the waste to be stored? What about the environmental degradation of the lake? And what about the fact that nuclear power plants don't ever seem to pay for themselves (and are either kept afloat by gauging consumers or by massive tax payer subsidies).

I strongly think that it is a bad idea to build a nuclear power plant in North Anna.

Sincerely,

David Barish

Albemarle County, VA

Mail Envelope Properties (41EFC43D.59B : 3 : 38299)

Subject: North Anna Nuclear Power Plant
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 9:44 AM
From: "David Barish" <barishdavid@hotmail.com>

Created By: barishdavid@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
TEXT.htm	1376	
Mime.822	2376	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RPB received
3/9/05

(730)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Beverly Jennings" <bevjenn@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 9:52 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Beverly Jennings
602 Chestnut St Apt 3
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3646
USA
bevjenn@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
ADD J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EFC5B1.675 : 21 : 38517)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 9:52 AM
From: "Beverly Jennings" <bevjenn@hotmail.com>

Created By: bevjenn@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2018	Thursday, January 20, 2005 9:52 AM
Mime.822	3231	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RPB received
3/9/05

From: "shirley napps" <shirley.napps.adv85@alum.dartmouth.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 10:22 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

(731)

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

shirley napps
PO Box 4493
Charlottesville, VA 22905-4493
USA
shirley.napps.adv85@alum.dartmouth.org

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EFCCA8.9C7 : 21 : 39367)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 10:22 AM
From: "shirley napps" <shirley.napps.adv85@alum.dartmouth.org>

Created By: shirley.napps.adv85@alum.dartmouth.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2029	Thursday, January 20, 2005 10:22 AM
Mime.822	3280	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RAB received
3/9/05

From: "Dawn Winalski" <dwinalski@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 11:32 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

732

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Dawn Winalski
1118 F St NE Unit 1
Washington, DC 20002-5328
USA
dwinalski@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = Adm-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

SISP Review Complete
Template = Adm-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EFDD29.1CF : 2 : 41423)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 11:32 AM
From: "Dawn Winalski" <dwinalski@yahoo.com>

Created By: dwinalski@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2013	Thursday, January 20, 2005 11:32 AM
Mime.822	3238	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Dina Sorensen" <sorensen@vmdo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 11:53 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

733

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Dina Sorensen
116 Second Street
Charlottesville, VA 22903
USA
sorensen@vmdo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41EFE1DD.400 : 13 : 41984)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 11:52 AM
From: "Dina Sorensen" <sorensen@vmdo.com>

Created By: sorensen@vmdo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2009	Thursday, January 20, 2005 11:52 AM
Mime.822	3230	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Angela Burnett Penn" <aroundangie@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 2:14 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

734

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Angela Burnett Penn
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02454
USA
aroundangie@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F002F5.2B4 : 2 : 45748)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 2:13 PM
From: "Angela Burnett Penn" <aroundangie@hotmail.com>

Created By: aroundangie@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2015	Thursday, January 20, 2005 2:13 PM
Mime.822	3242	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Linda York" <lindayork5@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 8:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

735

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Linda York
13029 15th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125-4023
USA
lindayork5@msn.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F056FB.1DB : 2 : 53723)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 8:12 PM
From: "Linda York" <lindayork5@msn.com>

Created By: lindayork5@msn.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2004	Thursday, January 20, 2005 8:12 PM
Mime.822	3197	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Anne Maziak" <Catwoman44@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 4:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

736

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Anne Maziak
892 Eastover Dr
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-2528
USA
Catwoman44@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F01C54.E6A : 0 : 48746)

Subject:	Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date:	Thu, Jan 20, 2005 4:02 PM
From:	"Anne Maziak" <Catwoman44@hotmail.com>
Created By:	Catwoman44@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2016	Thursday, January 20, 2005 4:02 PM
Mime.822	3243	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received 3/9/05

From: "Ana Yong Soler" <ays@elp.rr.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 8:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

737

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Ana Yong Soler
private
El Paso, TX 79925
USA
ays@elp.rr.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F056FB.1DC : 3 : 53724)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 8:12 PM
From: "Ana Yong Soler" <ays@elp.rr.com>

Created By: ays@elp.rr.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1989	Thursday, January 20, 2005 8:12 PM
Mime.822	3208	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Mha Atma S Khalsa" <ean@sbcglobal.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 11:42 PM
Subject: PLEASE: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

738

January 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

As a very concerned American I urge the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. You must examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Mha Atma S Khalsa
1536 S Crest Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90035
USA
ean@sbcglobal.net

E-RIDS = AON-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = AON-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F0882B.05B : 14 : 57435)

Subject: PLEASE: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 20, 2005 11:42 PM
From: "Mha Atma S Khalsa" <ean@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: ean@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2013	Thursday, January 20, 2005 11:42 PM
Mime.822	3233	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Kris McCradic" <krismccradic@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 1:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

739

January 21, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Kris McCradic
2642 Melbourne St
Salt Lake City, UT 84106
USA
krismccradic@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F14605.4A0 : 16 : 9376)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 1:12 PM
From: "Kris McCradic" <krismccradic@hotmail.com>

Created By: krismccradic@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2015	Friday, January 21, 2005 1:12 PM
Mime.822	3226	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Kathleen Grant" <saunaprinsessa@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 2:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

740

January 21, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Grant
Radiaattoritie 19B
Harjunpää, 28260
Finland
saunaprinsessa@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F15D6C.F8F : 15 : 12175)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 2:52 PM
From: "Kathleen Grant" <saunaprinsessa@yahoo.com>

Created By: saunaprinsessa@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2020	Friday, January 21, 2005 2:52 PM
Mime.822	3255	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

741

From: <JMCAUSEYJ@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 3:50 PM
Subject: proposed expansion of the North Anna Nuclear Plant in Louisa Cty, Va

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

As a resident of the great Commonwealth of Virginia I am writing to protest any expansion of nuclear power in my state. The proposed expansion of the North Anna Nuclear Plant in Louisa County, VA is a terrible idea. Two reasons: the world still has not found a safe, effective way to deal with the huge quantities of deadly radioactive waste that are produced by nuclear energy (Yucca Mountain even if it were to be approved is breachable by virtue of its physical characteristics (seismic and salty) and too small to hold all the waste we have produced and continue to produce); and nuclear power plants are ideal terrorist targets making us all that much more vulnerable at a time in our history when we need to secure the safety of our people.

Sincerely,

Patricia Raynor
12512 Thunder Chase Dr.
Reston, VA 20191

E-RIDS= Apn-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template - Apn-013

As a resident of the great Commonwealth of Virginia I am writing to protest any expansion of nuclear power in my state. The proposed expansion of the North Anna Nuclear Plant in Louisa County, VA is a terrible idea. Two reasons: the world still has not found a safe, effective way to deal with the huge quantities of deadly radioactive waste that are produced by nuclear energy (Yucca Mountain even if it were to be approved is breachable by virtue of its physical characteristics (seismic and salty) and too small to hold all the waste we have produced and continue to produce); and nuclear power plants are ideal terrorist targets making us all that much more vulnerable at a time in our history when we need to secure the safety of our people.
Sincerely, Patricia Raynor 12512 Thunder Chase Dr. Reston, VA 20191
hometown.aol.com/jmcauseyj/myhomepage/profile.html
href="http://hometown.aol.com/jmcauseyj/myhomepage/profile.html">

Mail Envelope Properties (41F16B09.599 : 11 : 13721)

Subject: proposed expansion of the North Anna Nuclear Plant in Louisa Cty, Va
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 3:49 PM
From: <JMCAUSEYJ@aol.com>

Created By: JMCAUSEYJ@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	833	Friday, January 21, 2005 3:49 PM
TEXT.htm	1523	
Mime.822	3600	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Diana Sette" <dsette@drew.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 4:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

742

January 21, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Diana Sette
2296 Forest Glen Dr
Warrington, PA 18976-1588
USA
dsette@drew.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F16DD2.70C : 7 : 14092)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 4:02 PM
From: "Diana Sette" <dsette@drew.edu>

Created By: dsette@drew.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2007	Friday, January 21, 2005 4:02 PM
Mime.822	3220	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

743

From: "Brian Hebeisen" <peru_boy@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 5:32 PM
Subject: No permit for Lake Anna Early Site

January 21, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I am against any new nuclear plants. We can easily meet our energy needs with energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. We don't need more nuclear waste and more nuclear time bombs.

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Brian Hebeisen
170 Worcester St
Watertown, MA 02472
USA
peru_boy@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F182FD.F8C : 8 : 16268)

Subject: No permit for Lake Anna Early Site
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 5:32 PM
From: "Brian Hebeisen" <peru_boy@hotmail.com>

Created By: peru_boy@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2198	Friday, January 21, 2005 5:32 PM
Mime.822	3419	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(744)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Marione M. Cobb" <marionemcobb@twinoaks.org>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 8:50 PM
Subject: New Reactors at North Anna Plant Too Dangerous

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulator Commission
Washington, D.CC. 20555-0001

cc.to: Nils J Diaz, Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Thomas E. Capps, CEO, Dominion Resources

Dear sir or madam:

I am dismayed to read that the NRC concluded the draft of its Environmental Impact Statement by saying that " environmental impacts would not prevent issuing an Early Site Permit for North Anna". I believe this to be unconscionable and unrealistic: I am a resident of Louisa County who lives 10 miles as the crow flies from the North Anna plant, and it is clear to me that nuclear reactors present an unacceptable risk for the public. There have been many documented near-catastrophies in addition to the disaster at Chernobyl and the near meltdown at Three Mile Island.

The highly radioactive spent fuel from the projected two new reactors at North Anna would most likely be stored on the site; where else would this high level nuclear waste go since the Yucca Mountain repository, if ever built, has a capacity limited to the waste from nuclear plants existing through 2012? Therefore the North Anna cask storage site, located less than 100 miles from our nationl's capitol, would be a prime target for terrorists, continuing to place those of us who live in this area at highest risk.

If transported by rail or truck across the United States, there is the ever-present possibility of an accident (-the January 6 train derailment in Graniteville, South Carolina, from which eight persons died of chlorine gas, is a graphic reminder of the peril of transporting toxic materials). Such an accident would leave a legacy of cancers and other debilitating diseases in affected communities. A rail accident is an even greater risk because nuclear waste shiipping containers are not required to undergo full phyusical safety testing for collisions, and the ability of the containers to withstand a high impact rail collision (especially one involving fire)is therefore not fully known.

Please SPARE OUR LIVES and spend OUR (taxpayer) money on safe energy alternatives.

Yours truly,

(Ms.) Marione M. Cobb
138 Twin Oaks Road
Louisa, Virginia, 23093

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F1B147.A3D : 20 : 19005)

Subject: New Reactors at North Anna Plant Too Dangerous
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 21, 2005 8:49 PM
From: "Marione M. Cobb" <marionemcobb@twinoaks.org>

Created By: marionemcobb@twinoaks.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2393	Friday, January 21, 2005 8:49 PM
Mime.822	3232	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Linda Prostko" <lprostko@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 22, 2005 8:52 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

745

January 22, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Linda Prostko
PO Box 141621
Grand Rapids, MI 49514-1621
USA
lprostko@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F25A9F.526 : 5 : 29990)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Sat, Jan 22, 2005 8:52 AM
From: "Linda Prostko" <lprostko@hotmail.com>

Created By: lprostko@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2010	Saturday, January 22, 2005 8:52 AM
Mime.822	3213	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Tom Boughan" <jongaeyu@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 4:02 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

746

January 23, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Tom Boughan
PO Box 67
Cowan, TN 37318
USA
jongaeyu@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F36827.E23 : 23 : 40483)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 4:02 AM
From: "Tom Boughan" <jongaeyu@hotmail.com>

Created By: jongaeyu@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1992	Sunday, January 23, 2005 4:02 AM
Mime.822	3215	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Claire Watson" <ce99watson@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 4:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

747

January 23, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Claire Watson
246 Peppertree Way
Pittsburg, CA 94565-7060
USA
ce99watson@aol.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F36827.E24 : 24 : 40484)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 4:02 AM
From: "Claire Watson" <ce99watson@aol.com>

Created By: ce99watson@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2010	Sunday, January 23, 2005 4:02 AM
Mime.822	3215	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "Betty J. Van Wicklen" <g10121@care2.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 6:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

748

January 23, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Betty J. Van Wicklen
41 Lakeshore Dr Apt 2B
Watervliet, NY 12189-2915
USA
g10121@care2.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add. J. Ashing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SNSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F42D06.B21 : 20 : 47905)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 6:02 PM
From: "Betty J. Van Wicklen" <g10121@care2.com>

Created By: g10121@care2.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2020	Sunday, January 23, 2005 6:02 PM
Mime.822	3237	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

749

From: Cindy Patterson <hmskvgm@mac.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 8:55 PM
Subject: No more nuclear plants

Cynthia Patterson
3000 Sassafras Tree Ct
Dumfries, Va. 22026

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

NRC, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Admin. Services
Office of Admin.
Mailstop T_6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear NRC,

Do not expand your nuclear plant in Louisa County, Va. outside Charlottesville. We have renewable and clean forms of energy, such as wind and solar power. Prevent another Chernobyl and be a leader in corporate development in renewable energy. Be the first on your block to do the right thing for America and the future of our children.

Thank you,

Cynthia Patterson

CC: <larrypatterson@mac.com>, <kalin@mac.com>

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F45579.170 : 10 : 49520)

Subject: No more nuclear plants
Creation Date: Sun, Jan 23, 2005 8:55 PM
From: Cindy Patterson <hmskvgm@mac.com>

Created By: hmskvgm@mac.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

mac.com
kalin CC
larrypatterson CC

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov
	mac.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	612	Sunday, January 23, 2005 8:55 PM
Mime.822	1769	

Options
Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "K. Patterson" <kalin@mac.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jan 24, 2005 12:32 PM
Subject: No More nuclear plants

750

Kalin Patterson
3000 Sassafras Tree Ct
Dumfries, Va. 22026

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

NRC, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Admin. Services
Office of Admin.
Mailstop T_6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear NRC,

Do not expand your nuclear plant in Louisa County, Va. outside Charlottesville. We have renewable and clean forms of energy, such as wind and solar power. Prevent another Chernobyl and be a leader in corporate development in renewable energy. Be the first on your block to do the right thing for America and the future of our children.

Thank you,

Kalin Patterson

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F53143.38E : 11 : 910)

Subject: No More nuclear plants
Creation Date: Mon, Jan 24, 2005 12:32 PM
From: "K. Patterson" <kalin@mac.com>

Created By: kalin@mac.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	608	Monday, January 24, 2005 12:32 PM
Mime.822	1747	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

751

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Erin Christiansen" <ecsunshine@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jan 24, 2005 2:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 24, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Erin Christiansen
535 Slayton Ave
Grand Haven, MI 49417-1866
USA
ecsunshine@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F551F5.5E4 : 5 : 5604)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Mon, Jan 24, 2005 2:52 PM
From: "Erin Christiansen" <ecsunshine@hotmail.com>

Created By: ecsunshine@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2017	Monday, January 24, 2005 2:52 PM
Mime.822	3238	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

752

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "john covey" <johncovey@sbcglobal.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jan 24, 2005 10:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 24, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

john covey
167 Lee Road 103
Marianna, AR 72360-7898
USA
johncovey@sbcglobal.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F5BDBC.189 : 3 : 16777)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Mon, Jan 24, 2005 10:32 PM
From: "john covey" <johncovey@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: johncovey@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2009	Monday, January 24, 2005 10:32 PM
Mime.822	3212	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

753

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Ed Harris" <edharris60@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 25, 2005 5:12 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 25, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Ed Harris
8175 Imber St
Orlando, FL 32825-8282
USA
edharris60@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add. J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F61B7A.64D : 19 : 22093)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Jan 25, 2005 5:12 AM
From: "Ed Harris" <edharris60@yahoo.com>

Created By: edharris60@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2001	Tuesday, January 25, 2005 5:12 AM
Mime.822	3202	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

754

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Linda Alberda" <lkalberda@adelphia.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 25, 2005 1:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 25, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Linda Alberda
6304 Longspur Rd
Highland Heights, OH 44143-3721
USA
lkalberda@adelphia.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F690C7.D01 : 23 : 36097)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Jan 25, 2005 1:32 PM
From: "Linda Alberda" <lkalberda@adelphia.net>

Created By: lkalberda@adelphia.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2019	Tuesday, January 25, 2005 1:32 PM
Mime.822	3232	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

755

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Kirk Clayton" <kirkclayton@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 25, 2005 2:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 25, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Kirk Clayton
6941 Hummock Pond
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
USA
kirkclayton@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F69C74.3C0 : 0 : 37824)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Tue, Jan 25, 2005 2:22 PM
From: "Kirk Clayton" <kirkclayton@hotmail.com>

Created By: kirkclayton@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2011	Tuesday, January 25, 2005 2:22 PM
Mime.822	3242	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RPB received
3/9/05

From: "Jim Oxyer" <kylthrfaerie@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 26, 2005 5:42 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

756

January 26, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Jim Oxyer
1210 S Brook St Apt 1
Louisville, KY 40203-2789
USA
kylthrfaerie@hotmail.com

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41F77402.969 : 8 : 55657)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 26, 2005 5:42 AM
From: "Jim Oxyer" <kylthrfaerie@hotmail.com>

Created By: kylthrfaerie@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2016	Wednesday, January 26, 2005 5:42 AM
Mime.822	3243	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

757

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <Johnjoy2you@cs.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 26, 2005 11:15 PM
Subject: Licensing of New Nuclear Power at North Anna

I am writing to express my deep concern about the possibility of two new nuclear reactors being at the existing North Anna nuclear power plant in central Virginia. I think that this is not the answer to our energy concerns, and ask that you do not grant a site permit for the purpose of increasing the nuclear reactors at North Anna.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

John Votta
Richmond, VA

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F86AE9.7EB : 23 : 18411)

Subject: Licensing of New Nuclear Power at North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Jan 26, 2005 11:15 PM
From: <Johnjoy2you@cs.com>

Created By: Johnjoy2you@cs.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	410	Wednesday, January 26, 2005 11:15 PM
Mime.822	1225	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

758

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Sydney Funsinn" <Sydneyk55@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 27, 2005 7:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 27, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Sydney Funsinn
11340 Lakeside Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125-5945
USA
Sydneyk55@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F9811E.47B : 11 : 50299)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 27, 2005 7:02 PM
From: "Sydney Funsinn" <Sydneyk55@aol.com>

Created By: Sydneyk55@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2011	Thursday, January 27, 2005 7:02 PM
Mime.822	3216	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

759

From: "KELLE PEEPLEZ" <ORANGEPZ@HOTMAIL.COM>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 27, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

January 27, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

KELLE PEEPLEZ
PO Box 1649
Perris, CA 92572-1649
USA
ORANGEPZ@HOTMAIL.COM

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41F9881B.6A4 : 14 : 50852)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Jan 27, 2005 7:32 PM
From: "KELLE PEEPLEZ" <ORANGEPZ@HOTMAIL.COM>

Created By: ORANGEPZ@HOTMAIL.COM

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2002	Thursday, January 27, 2005 7:32 PM
Mime.822	3211	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Daisy Semling and Ken Fujishiro" <kfujishiro@worldnet.att.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 28, 2005 4:54 PM
Subject: Proposed additions to Dominion Power's North Anna Nuclear Generating Station

760

The Sierra Club is opposed to Dominion Power's efforts to build two new nuclear generators on the shore of Lake Anna.

It is my considered opinion that the Sierra Club is "barking up the wrong tree". The cost (both environmentally and economically) of operating an environmentally clean nuclear generator is considerably less than that required for fossil fuel plants, which generate smog, acid rain, and other pollutants. Both the fossil fuel and nuclear power plants will have potential environmentally negative aspects. However, weighing all the alternatives available with current off the shelf technology, I would opt to champion the cause of nuclear power generation over fossil fuels from an economical and environmental points of view.

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

My vote is for Dominion Power's plan to expand nuclear power generation.

K. Kenneth Fujishiro, AICP, FSAME, BSCE
19375 Cypress Ridge Terrace #821
Lansdowne, VA 20176-5189

CC: <glen.besa@sierraclub.org>, <abhayathiele@yahoo.com>

SISP Review Complete
Template = Adm-013

E-RIDS = Adm-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41FAB496.530 : 10 : 17712)

Subject: Proposed additions to Dominion Power's North Anna Nuclear Generating Station
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 28, 2005 4:53 PM
From: "Daisy Semling and Ken Fujishiro" <kfujishiro@worldnet.att.net>

Created By: kfujishiro@worldnet.att.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

yahoo.com
abhayathiele CC

sierraclub.org
glen.besa CC

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov
	yahoo.com
	sierraclub.org

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	922	Friday, January 28, 2005 4:53 PM
Mime.822	2071	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

761

From: "Julie Boswell" <miloboz@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 28, 2005 6:03 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 28, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Julie Boswell
1319 W 106th St
Cleveland, OH 44102-1511
USA
miloboz@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41FAC4C9.AF9 : 16 : 19193)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Fri, Jan 28, 2005 6:03 PM
From: "Julie Boswell" <miloboz@aol.com>

Created By: miloboz@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2004	Friday, January 28, 2005 6:03 PM
Mime.822	3197	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Carolynn Pakeltis" <carolynnpakeltis@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 29, 2005 4:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

(762)

January 29, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Carolynn Pakeltis
6970 Ohio St
Mentor, OH 44060-8400
USA
carolynnpakeltis@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41FC034F.D0E : 8 : 36110)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Sat, Jan 29, 2005 4:42 PM
From: "Carolynn Pakeltis" <carolynnpakeltis@hotmail.com>

Created By: carolynnpakeltis@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2015	Saturday, January 29, 2005 4:42 PM
Mime.822	3248	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Dianne Miller" <dianne88@cox.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 29, 2005 5:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

(763)

January 29, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Dianne Miller
1440 Puterbaugh St
San Diego, CA 92103-3710
USA
dianne88@cox.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

Mail Envelope Properties (41FC13AF.F5D : 24 : 36701)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Sat, Jan 29, 2005 5:52 PM
From: "Dianne Miller" <dianne88@cox.net>

Created By: dianne88@cox.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2008	Saturday, January 29, 2005 5:52 PM
Mime.822	3227	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

764

From: "Brian Butcher" <tonycherry23@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jan 31, 2005 12:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 31, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Brian Butcher
3226 Kimber Ct
San Jose, CA 95124-2380
USA
tonycherry23@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWJ)

Mail Envelope Properties (41FE6951.0B1 : 7 : 4273)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Mon, Jan 31, 2005 12:22 PM
From: "Brian Butcher" <tonycherry23@aol.com>

Created By: tonycherry23@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2007	Monday, January 31, 2005 12:22 PM
Mime.822	3234	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received 3/9/05

765

From: "Michael Neil" <mneil@du.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jan 31, 2005 12:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 31, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Michael Neil
2551 S High St
Denver, CO 80210-5145
USA
mneil@du.edu

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (41FE6E06.39E : 6 : 5022)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Mon, Jan 31, 2005 12:42 PM
From: "Michael Neil" <mneil@du.edu>

Created By: mneil@du.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1996	Monday, January 31, 2005 12:42 PM
Mime.822	3187	

Options
Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Connie Boitano" <Conboitano@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 1, 2005 7:22 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

(766)

February 01, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Connie Boitano
8037 21st Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117
USA
Conboitano@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (41FF748D.D0B : 24 : 27915)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 1, 2005 7:22 AM
From: "Connie Boitano" <Conboitano@yahoo.com>

Created By: Conboitano@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2005	Tuesday, February 1, 2005 7:22 AM
Mime.822	3207	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Micheal Aleman" <zetabreeze@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 2, 2005 5:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

767

February 02, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urge the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Micheal Aleman
1222 N Main Ave Ste 660
San Antonio, TX 78212-5713
USA
zetabreeze@aol.com

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Templat: ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42015050.39B : 19 : 25499)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 2, 2005 5:12 PM
From: "Micheal Aleman" <zetabreeze@aol.com>

Created By: zetabreeze@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2018	Wednesday, February 2, 2005 5:12 PM
Mime.822	3222	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "pete lafoillette" <plafollette@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 3, 2005 7:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

768

February 03, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

pete lafoillette
915 W Micheltorena St
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
USA
plafollette@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4202C047.DEF : 23 : 3567)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 3, 2005 7:22 PM
From: "pete lafoillette" <plafollette@yahoo.com>

Created By: plafollette@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2019	Thursday, February 3, 2005 7:22 PM
Mime.822	3251	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

769

From: "Kimberley Sharp" <GreenJasimen@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 4, 2005 10:12 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

February 04, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Kimberley Sharp
1704 Sheridan Dr
Baytown, TX 77520-5424
USA
GreenJasimen@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williams (ARW1)

SISB Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420390CF.C65 : 9 : 23653)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 4, 2005 10:12 AM
From: "Kimberley Sharp" <GreenJasimen@yahoo.com>

Created By: GreenJasimen@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2013	Friday, February 4, 2005 10:12 AM
Mime.822	3227	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

770

From: "Jeffri Frontz" <jhf@infinet.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Feb 5, 2005 6:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 05, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeffri Frontz
310 Walhalla Rd
Columbus, OH 43202-1444
USA
jhf@infinet.com

E-RIDS: Adm-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42055C3A.9C8 : 8 : 55752)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Sat, Feb 5, 2005 6:52 PM
From: "Jeffri Frontz" <jhf@infinet.com>

Created By: jhf@infinet.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2004	Saturday, February 5, 2005 6:52 PM
Mime.822	3194	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "Caryn Corriere" <corrierecl@excite.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 6, 2005 7:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

771

February 06, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Caryn Corriere
620 Locust St
Hammond, IN 46324-1517
USA
corrierecl@excite.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4206B019.996 : 21 : 2454)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 6, 2005 7:02 PM
From: "Caryn Corriere" <corrierecl@excite.com>

Created By: corrierecl@excite.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2008	Sunday, February 6, 2005 7:02 PM
Mime.822	3236	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Wendy McFadden" <wendyfromwonderland@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 6, 2005 8:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

772

February 06, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant.

Further, Lake Anna may not be able to physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will impact the lake ecosystems and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected. This could kill many of the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Wendy McFadden
910 Wylie
Missoual, MT 59802
USA
wendyfromwonderland@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4206C77E.CA4 : 3 : 3236)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 6, 2005 8:42 PM
From: "Wendy McFadden" <wendyfromwonderland@yahoo.com>

Created By: wendyfromwonderland@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1561	Sunday, February 6, 2005 8:42 PM
Mime.822	2753	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "Leslie Tawnamaia" <hopenjoy@pivot.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2005 1:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

773

February 07, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing lifeforms that inhabit it.

As you know, currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Leslie Tawnamaia
PO Box 471
Plainfield, VT 05667-0471
USA
hopenjoy@pivot.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (4207B8F2.62E : 4 : 22062)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2005 1:52 PM
From: "Leslie Tawnamaia" <hopenjoy@pivot.net>

Created By: hopenjoy@pivot.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1911	Monday, February 7, 2005 1:52 PM
Mime.822	3112	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

(774)

From: "Ben Malloy" <kayman668@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 8, 2005 5:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 08, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Ben Malloy
PO Box 325
Cleveland, MN 56017
USA
kayman668@aol.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420942AD.91C : 14 : 63772)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 8, 2005 5:52 PM
From: "Ben Malloy" <kayman668@aol.com>

Created By: kayman668@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1994	Tuesday, February 8, 2005 5:52 PM
Mime.822	3182	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Anna von Gehr" <avongehr@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 10:42 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

775

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Anna von Gehr
4304 W Franklin St
Richmond, VA 23221-1112
USA
avongehr@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420A2F5C.AC8 : 22 : 19144)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 10:42 AM
From: "Anna von Gehr" <avongehr@hotmail.com>

Created By: avongehr@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2012	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 10:42 AM
Mime.822	3212	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

776

From: "Claudia Duffy" <cduffy@ehc.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 11:52 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Claudia Duffy
PO Box FF
Emory, VA 24327-0972
USA
cduffy@ehc.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AR01)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420A3FC7.58F : 6 : 21903)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 11:52 AM
From: "Claudia Duffy" <cduffy@ehc.edu>

Created By: cduffy@ehc.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1994	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 11:52 AM
Mime.822	3206	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "William Zachary Fields" <wzf3v@neon.mail.virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 12:38 PM
Subject: public comment on Dominion Power's request to build newreactors at North Anna

777

To Whom it May Concern,
Please consider this email my official public comment regarding Dominion Power's request to build two new reactors at the North Anna power station in central Virginia. I am completely opposed to the construction of any new nuclear facilities. We have enough trouble disposing of the waste we're already creating without making the problem worse by building new facilities.
If Dominion wishes to produce more energy, it should do so by building wind farms in places like Highland County. If we want to leave our children a world worth inhabiting, then we must invest in renewable energy now. Thank you for your attention to this letter.
Zack Fields
school address:
474 Lambeth#1
Charlottesville VA 22904
home address:
9304 Woodcrest Rd
Richmond VA 23229

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420A4A6D.EAE : 16 : 24238)

Subject:	public comment on Dominion Power's request to build newreactors at North Anna
Creation Date:	Wed, Feb 9, 2005 12:37 PM
From:	"William Zachary Fields" <wzf3v@neon.mail.virginia.edu>
Created By:	wzf3v@neon.mail.virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	795	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 12:37 PM
Mime.822	1809	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Emily and Jeremy Peters" <jerandem@cox.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 12:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

778

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Emily and Jeremy Peters
6141 Saddleridge Cir
Roanoke, VA 24018-4621
USA
jerandem@cox.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420A4B6F.F73 : 13 : 24435)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 12:42 PM
From: "Emily and Jeremy Peters" <jerandem@cox.net>

Created By: jerandem@cox.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2019	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 12:42 PM
Mime.822	3255	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "susannah wood" <susannahwood@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 1:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

779

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

susannah wood
919 Anderson St
Charlottesville, VA 22903-4409
USA
susannahwood@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushington (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-03

Mail Envelope Properties (420A572D.705 : 1 : 26373)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 1:32 PM
From: "susannah wood" <susannahwood@hotmail.com>

Created By: susannahwood@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2020	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 1:32 PM
Mime.822	3234	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

780

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Bob Peckman" <bob@peckmanjazz.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 1:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

We have built a few nuclear power plants and run them to come down the learning curve. In all this time, we have not figured out what to do with the waste. Even worse, we have some making plans to poison future generations. We have no right to build another one until we can handle our waste!

There are other forms of energy that deserve our attention.

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Bob Peckman
8131 Webster Dr
Roanoke, VA 24019-2333

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420A599A.866 : 4 : 26726)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 1:42 PM
From: "Bob Peckman" <bob@peckmanjazz.com>

Created By: bob@peckmanjazz.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2362	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 1:42 PM
Mime.822	3581	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "linda boswell" <linda_boswell@ccpsnet.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 1:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

781

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

linda boswell
4801 E Gurney Ct
Richmond, VA 23237-3346
USA
linda_boswell@ccpsnet.net

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AFW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420A599A.867 : 5 : 26727)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 1:42 PM
From: "linda boswell" <linda_boswell@ccpsnet.net>

Created By: linda_boswell@ccpsnet.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2015	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 1:42 PM
Mime.822	3227	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Jeffrey Grossman" <jg2t@virginia.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 3:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

782

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urge the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Grossman
142-B Bollingwood Rd., Charlottesville, VA 22903
Charlottesville, VA 22903
USA
jg2t@virginia.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWJ)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420A75B1.B65 : 17 : 31589)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 3:42 PM
From: "Jeffrey Grossman" <jg2t@virginia.edu>

Created By: jg2t@virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2043	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 3:42 PM
Mime.822	3245	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

783

From: <floristcyn@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 5:09 PM
Subject: no nukes

Please, no new nukes, further expansion of current levels, or anything other than a turn to earth friendly and people friendly energy!!

Cynthia Lewis
Charlottesville, VA

" The cross made the difference for me"

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420A8A25.665 : 8 : 34405)

Subject: no nukes
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 5:11 PM
From: <floristcyn@earthlink.net>

Created By: floristcyn@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	213	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 5:11 PM
TEXT.htm	954	
Mime.822	2638	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "Carol Curran" <cnrcurran@adelphia.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

(784)

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Carol Curran
3325 Braemar Ct
Keswick, VA 22947-9137
USA
cnrcurran@adelphia.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420AAB8A.F66 : 1 : 12134)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 7:32 PM
From: "Carol Curran" <cnrcurran@adelphia.net>

Created By: cnrcurran@adelphia.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2009	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 7:32 PM
Mime.822	3217	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Dottie Hampton" <Dottie7dmh@cox.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 9:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

785

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Dottie Hampton
3856 Clearwood Ct
Virginia Beach, VA 23453-2132
USA
Dottie7dmh@cox.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Austing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420AC567.440 : 18 : 13376)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2005 9:22 PM
From: "Dottie Hampton" <Dottie7dmh@cox.net>

Created By: Dottie7dmh@cox.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2016	Wednesday, February 9, 2005 9:22 PM
Mime.822	3238	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Coleen Zahnke" <coleenkirsty@optidynamic.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

786

February 09, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Coleen Zahnke
Rt.2 Box 221
Big Stone Gap, VA 24219
USA
coleenkirsty@optidynamic.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420B2313.791 : 13 : 18321)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 4:02 AM
From: "Coleen Zahnke" <coleenkirsty@optidynamic.com>

Created By: coleenkirsty@optidynamic.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2014	Thursday, February 10, 2005 4:02 AM
Mime.822	3235	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Elizabeth Gilchrist" <foundation@now.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 8:32 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

787

February 10, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Gilchrist
2911 Marshall St
Falls Church, VA 22042-1916
USA
foundation@now.org

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420B6264.482 : 1 : 21634)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 8:32 AM
From: "Elizabeth Gilchrist" <foundation@now.org>

Created By: foundation@now.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2018	Thursday, February 10, 2005 8:32 AM
Mime.822	3235	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Anne Johnston" <mijo0967@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 8:52 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

788

February 10, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Anne Johnston
1400 Radcliff Ave
Lynchburg, VA 24502-5117
USA
mijo0967@msn.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

Mail Envelope Properties (420B6709.646 : 3 : 22086)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 8:52 AM
From: "Anne Johnston" <mijo0967@msn.com>

Created By: mijo0967@msn.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2008	Thursday, February 10, 2005 8:52 AM
Mime.822	3227	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

789

From: "Charlotte Shnaider" <charsing@webtv.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 9:29 AM
Subject: expanding plant

I think it is a big mistake to invest in nuclear power when we have no way to dispose of the waste and it's so dangerous. I sincerely hope those who make these decisions will think of the future of our planet and not just give in to those who will make a profit.
Charlotte Shnaider

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420B6FBA.B24 : 24 : 23332)

Subject: expanding plant
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 9:28 AM
From: "Charlotte Shnaider" <charsing@webtv.net>

Created By: charsing@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	285	Thursday, February 10, 2005 9:28 AM
Mime.822	1145	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

790

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Melanie Jackson" <njeri@comcast.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 10:42 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

February 10, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Melanie Jackson
1208 Taylor Ave
Richmond, VA 23225-4643
USA
njeri@comcast.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420B80D2.5C8 : 23 : 26056)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 10:42 AM
From: "Melanie Jackson" <njeri@comcast.net>

Created By: njeri@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2008	Thursday, February 10, 2005 10:42 AM
Mime.822	3215	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(791)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <Dennis_Bried@dom.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 12:36 PM
Subject: North Anna ESP

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to SUPPORT granting an Early Site Permit to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. This is a wise decision for a company that has proven over time to be a safe and effective nuclear operator. The economic considerations to the community are considerable and as a resident who lives within 20 miles of the plant I feel comfortable about the addition of two units at the site.

Sincerely,

Dennis A Bried
739 Canterbury Dr.
Ruther Glen, VA 22546

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420B9B8D.295 : 3 : 37525)

Subject: North Anna ESP
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 12:35 PM
From: <Dennis_Bried@dom.com>

Created By: Dennis_Bried@dom.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	756	Thursday, February 10, 2005 12:35 PM
TEXT.htm	1264	
Mime.822	3349	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

792

From: "Joanna Salidis" <Joanna@salidis.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 2:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 10, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Joanna Salidis
129 Goodman St
Charlottesville, VA 22902-5719
USA
Joanna@salidis.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420BB6CB.218 : 24 : 41496)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 2:32 PM
From: "Joanna Salidis" <Joanna@salidis.com>

Created By: Joanna@salidis.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2014	Thursday, February 10, 2005 2:32 PM
Mime.822	3215	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(793)

From: "Clare McBrien" <cmcbrien@richmonddiocese.org>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 5:39 PM
Subject: North Anna Nuclear Plant

I wish to state that no more nuclear plants should be built until we find a way to solve the tremendous waste problem it leave us and generations far beyond us. Our country needs to be looking at save, sensible and sustainable energy sources. Nuclear at this time is certainly none of these. My hope is you will hear what thinking, sensible people are saying and abandon this project. Clare McBrien

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

Mail Envelope Properties (420BE2AA.903 : 16 : 47363)

Subject: North Anna Nuclear Plant
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 10, 2005 5:39 PM
From: "Clare McBrien" <cmcbrien@richmonddiocese.org>

Created By: cmcbrien@richmonddiocese.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	404	Thursday, February 10, 2005 5:39 PM
TEXT.htm	666	
Mime.822	2453	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

From: "Della Cleve" <katzchen@davidbowie.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 4:03 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

(794)

February 11, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Della Cleve
3321 Parkwood Ave
Richmond, VA 23221-3422
USA
katzchen@davidbowie.com

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420C74E1.BE4 : 20 : 56292)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 4:03 AM
From: "Della Cleve" <katzchen@davidbowie.com>

Created By: katzchen@davidbowie.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2012	Friday, February 11, 2005 4:03 AM
Mime.822	3217	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Julie Huff" <weezerkitty@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 6:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

795

February 11, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Julie Huff
9001 River Valley Ln
Spotsylvania, VA 22553-3588
USA
weezerkitty@yahoo.com

E-RIDS: Apr-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWJ)

SISP Review Complete
Template: Apr-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420C90B8.268 : 9 : 62056)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 6:02 AM
From: "Julie Huff" <weezerkitty@yahoo.com>

Created By: weezerkitty@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2016	Friday, February 11, 2005 6:02 AM
Mime.822	3221	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Frank Worshek" <frank_worshek@lcv.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 11:42 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

796

February 11, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Frank Worshek
9477 Arlington Blvd Apt 203
Fairfax, VA 22031-2477
USA
frank_worshek@lcv.org

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420CE076.6C8 : 21 : 5832)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 11:42 AM
From: "Frank Worshek" <frank_worshek@lcv.org>

Created By: frank_worshek@lcv.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2021	Friday, February 11, 2005 11:42 AM
Mime.822	3252	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

797

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: david johnston <blackecho47@netzero.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 2:50 PM
Subject: nuclear power not safe

dear chief:

there is no safe way to store or dispose of nuclear waste.
wind and solar energy need to be developed.

clean, safe energy is available. we need to use it

thank you.

best regards,

dave johnston

david johnston
322 n. 2nd st., #1204
hbg., pa 17101
717 236 3604

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Quking (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARD1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420D0C91.D49 : 7 : 11593)

Subject: nuclear power not safe
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 11, 2005 2:49 PM
From: david johnston <blackecho47@netzero.com>

Created By: blackecho47@netzero.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	286	Friday, February 11, 2005 2:49 PM
Mime.822	1211	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

798

From: Peggy Augustus <keswickstables@webtv.net>
To: <Northanna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 3:36 PM
Subject: North Anna

Please DO NOT put any more nuclear reactors in Virginia. We neither want nor need them. We already have pollution - we don't need a bigger possibility of radiation.

Peggy Augustus

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420E4ECC.6CA : 24 : 30410)

Subject: North Anna
Creation Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 1:45 PM
From: Peggy Augustus <keswickstables@webtv.net>

Created By: keswickstables@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	185	Saturday, February 12, 2005 1:45 PM
Mime.822	1335	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Sally Bastian" <sbastian5@netzero.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 4:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

799

February 12, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Sally Bastian
441 Hidden Ridge Rd
Charlottesville, VA 22902-7244
USA
sbastian5@netzero.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AFW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420E7130.DB2 : 17 : 32178)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 4:12 PM
From: "Sally Bastian" <sbastian5@netzero.net>

Created By: sbastian5@netzero.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2021	Saturday, February 12, 2005 4:12 PM
Mime.822	3232	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: Paul Fleisher <pfleishe@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 7:43 PM
Subject: No additional nuclear generation at North Anna

800

No additional permits for nuclear power generation should be issued for the North Anna site until a permanent location for the disposal of high level nuclear waste generated by the current and future generating plants has been approved and constructed.

Paul Fleisher
2781 Beowulf Ct.
Richmond VA 23231
804.795.5326
pfleishe@earthlink.net
www.paulfleisher.com

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (420EA2A8.514 : 7 : 34068)

Subject: No additional nuclear generation at North Anna
Creation Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 7:44 PM
From: Paul Fleisher <pfleishe@earthlink.net>

Created By: pfleishe@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	367	Saturday, February 12, 2005 7:44 PM
Paul Fleisher.vcf	197	
Mime.822	2294	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(801)

From: "Rosemarie Sawdon" <sawdon@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 10:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 12, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Sawdon
PO Box 125
Blacksburg, VA 24063-0125
USA
sawdon@msn.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420ECEEA.B2B : 16 : 35627)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Sat, Feb 12, 2005 10:52 PM
From: "Rosemarie Sawdon" <sawdon@msn.com>

Created By: sawdon@msn.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2003	Saturday, February 12, 2005 10:52 PM
Mime.822	3200	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RIDB received
3/9/05

(802)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <Bachdiana393@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 13, 2005 1:27 PM
Subject: (no subject)

I am writing this to show my opposition for grantiong an Early Site Permit to Dominion Resourses for the construction of two new reactors. There is far too much risk to the enviornment in this proposal, Lake Anna is already at risk, and the construction of this magnitude would only make the situation worse. Furthermore, security of the surrounding cities is another main concern for those of us living in areas that would be affected adversly by the plant. Then there is the issue of waste managment, there is a finite area that can be used for nuclear waste, I feel that other options must be looked at first. Should we not forget Three mile Island, of worse Chernobyl. So I urge you to think long, and hard about the consequenses this construction could have on the enviornment, as well as the people.

Sincerely,

Diana Bach
3330 Parkwood Ave
Richmone Va, 23221

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420F9BD9.58E : 21 : 42382)

Subject: (no subject)
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 13, 2005 1:26 PM
From: <Bachdiana393@aol.com>

Created By: Bachdiana393@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	913	Sunday, February 13, 2005 1:26 PM
TEXT.htm	1201	
Mime.822	3261	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(803)

From: "Todd Chenore" <hempogt@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 13, 2005 4:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

February 13, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Todd Chenore
81 Grove Street
#424 Melville Grove
Liverpool, L7 7AD
United Kingdom
hempogt@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420FC759.C21 : 4 : 44065)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 13, 2005 4:32 PM
From: "Todd Chenore" <hempogt@hotmail.com>

Created By: hempogt@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2033	Sunday, February 13, 2005 4:32 PM
Mime.822	3257	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "JUlie BOnd" <juliekaybond@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 13, 2005 5:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

(864)

February 13, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

JUlie BOnd
375 Liguori Rd
Edgerton, WI 53534-9331
USA
juliekaybond@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (420FCE71.D4E : 5 : 44366)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 13, 2005 5:02 PM
From: "JUlie BOnd" <juliekaybond@yahoo.com>

Created By: juliekaybond@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2007	Sunday, February 13, 2005 5:02 PM
Mime.822	3232	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05
(805)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Adrienne Hall Bodie" <bodie@rockbridge.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 14, 2005 7:31 PM
Subject: ESP for new N Anna reactors

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to OPPOSE granting an Early Site Permit (ESP) to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. The draft Environmental Impact Statement states that construction activities permissible under the ESP may stir up heavy metals and other contaminants in the lake sediment. Other effects on the lake, such as temperature increases and reduced water levels, have not beent fully analyzed.

Even more important, questions about the adequacy of current security regulations and performance remain unanswered, not to mention the issues of waste generation and its safe, permanent isolation. This is NOT the "clean," "renewable" energy the president touts it to be. It is highly dangerous, not the least to Washington, DC, which is in its radiation radius, should anything go wrong -- and things can and have gone wrong!

Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP.

Sincerely,

Charles & Adrienne Hall Bodie
Solevento Farm
1002 Still House Drive
Lexington VA 24450

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AHW1)

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to OPPOSE granting an Early Site Permit (ESP) to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. The draft Environmental Impact Statement states that construction activities permissible under the ESP may stir up heavy metals and other contaminants in the lake sediment. Other effects on the lake, such as temperature increases and reduced water levels, have not beent fully analyzed. Even more important, questions about the adequacy of current security regulations and performance remain unanswered, not to mention the issues of waste generation and its safe, permanent isolation. This is NOT the "clean," "renewable" energy the president touts it to be. It is highly dangerous, not the least to Washington, DC, which is in its radiation radius, should anything go wrong -- and things can and have gone wrong!

Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP.

Sincerely,

Charles & Adrienne Hall Bodie
Solevento Farm
1002 Still House Drive
Lexington VA 24450

Mail Envelope Properties (421142EA.9A1 : 7 : 10657)

Subject: ESP for new N Anna reactors
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 14, 2005 7:31 PM
From: "Adrienne Hall Bodie" <bodie@rockbridge.net>

Created By: bodie@rockbridge.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1313	Monday, February 14, 2005 7:31 PM
TEXT.htm	1880	
Mime.822	4773	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

806

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: Remmers Kenneth D CRBE <RemmersKD@nswccd.navy.mil>
To: "'northanna_esp@nrc.gov'" <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 9:05 AM
Subject: FW: Comments on Draft EIS for North Anna ESP Site NUREG 1811

<<ESP at NANPP.doc>> <<O2 Saturation.bmp>>

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Remmers Kenneth D CRBE
> Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2005 8:59 AM
> To: Remmers Kenneth D CRBE
> Subject: Comments on Draft EIS for North Anna ESP Site NUREG 1811
>
> Comments on the DRAFT Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the North Anna Early Site Permit (ESP) are included in the following two dated February 8, 2005:
>
>
>
> Submitted by: Kenneth Remmers, President, Waterside Property Owners Association of Lake Anna
> 2301 Waterside Dr., Bumpass VA. 23024
>

CC: "'jxc9@nrc.gov'" <jxc9@nrc.gov>, "'arw1@nrc.gov'" <arw1@nrc.gov>

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

February 8, 2005

Comments on the EIS for the ESP of NAPS

1. Flow rates are confusing in the report. Some liters/ second, meters^3 / second, ft^3 / second, and gallons / minute are used. I suggest that the same units be used throughout the ESP report. I will try to use gallons/ minute in my discussion. Liters/second X 15.85 = gallons/ minute Feet cubed / second X 448.83 = gallons/ minute

2. ESP uses 242-foot level as the minimum lake level before shutdown for unit 3. Unit 3 should use the 244-foot level not 242 as is currently used by units 1 and 2 until NRC has studied the proposed 242 level.

3. **Can Dike 3 handle the increased discharge of the third plant or will the Waste Heat Treatment Facility (WHTF) (Warm side) level increase?**
   Plants 1 & 2 each draws 952,873 gal/min in a once pass through cooling with a temperature increase of 14 degrees F. Plant 3 is proposed at 20% more discharge rate at 1,140,000 gal/min with no discussion as why the increased amount, thereby increasing the heat load and output pass through temperature to 18-degree F. **Are the proposed Units 3 and 4 larger than Units 1 and 2?** The total draw from the once pass through cooling for three plants is 3 Million gal/min or **4.38 Billion gal/day.** Section 5.3 states that one inch of lake level translates to 14m^3/sec (500 cfs) or 224,417 gal/min. This is not clear. If we use 13,000 acres of lake and calculate the number of gallons per inch of Lake Height, we get the following:

   13,000 acres X 43,560 ft^2/acre X 1/12 ft height X 7.48052 gal/ft^3 = **353,005,738** gallons/inch of lake height

   Dividing this into the daily pass through for cooling of **4.38 Billion gallons**, we get an equivalent of **12.4 inches of Lake Height each day passing through the WHTF.** This is compared to an equivalent of 7.7 inches of Lake Height passing through the WHTF each day with the existing two plants operating. For comparison, in low water levels, discharge from the damn is 20 cfs or 8,976 gallons/minute, which equates to 12.9 Million gallons per day. With 4.38 Billion gallons/day passing from the WHTF and only 12.9 Million gallons discharging, there will be serious mixing of the WHTF water in the lower and middle lake. **Can dike 3 handle 4.38 Billion gallons/day discharge into the main lake? What is the expected rise in water height of the WHTF from the current height when Units 1, 2, and 3 are operating?** If it is expected to be a foot or more, residents' docks may be under water.

4. **What can the maximum expected temperature of the WHTF be?**

   ESP indicates the maximum temperature increase will be from 14 to 18 degrees F across the once passing cooling or an increase of 4 degrees F. There is no discussion as to the expected temperatures in the WHTF (Warm Side). Section 5.4.2.4 of the ESP indicates that on the cool side at the intake, Thurman Island, and Burrus Point,

95degrees F would be reached 6 days out of one year in 42. At this time the WHTF would be 113 degrees F. At the intake location, 90 degrees F would be exceeded 8 days per year during June to September. The WHTF would be 108 degrees F. Section 3.2.2.1 states that based on the PPE, the maximum discharge temperature will be 127 degrees F. This would equate to an input temperature at the intake of 119 degrees F. This seems inconsistent with the maximum of 95 degrees stated above. If we look at the history of water temperatures collected for the DEQ by LACA over the last four years, we can see actual temperatures at a depth of 0.3 meters for the power plant intake and an average of three points in the WHTF. The intake is LACA Site 4 and the averages of three points in the WHTF are from Rock Creek Site 30, Millpond Creek Site 31 and Elk Creek Site 32. Table 1 shows these temperatures measured four time a year. The first thing to point out in the table is during a non-drought year of 2003 in August the WHTF reached 96.8 degrees F. The delta from intake to exhaust was about 12.4 degrees. This agrees closely with the predicted 14 degrees F. If the third plant were added, this temperature would rise to 100.8 degrees F. Occurrence of mid 90 degree F water temperature in the WHTF occurs in three out of the last four years with the fourth year just below 90 degrees F with only two units operating. WHTF temperatures of 100 degrees F or more will make the WHTF unsuitable for recreation, swimming and aquatic life. **In table 5.12 of the ESP, Hydrological alterations as presented will have an impact level of MODERATE and not SMALL as represented by ESP.** Since this report documents that Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permits would be required the fact that no treatment of the water is required for plants 1 and 2. **Has VPDES been contacted about the possibility of adding of biocides, antiscalants, and dispersants into the water?**

5. **What will happen to the Dissolved Oxygen (DO) in the WHTF at temperature 100 degrees F or higher?**
   The ESP addresses aquatic life in the cool side only at Burrus Point and Thurman Island. No mention was made as to the aquatic life in the WHTF. DEQ measurements by LACA show that the WHTF DO is about 1 PPM below saturation for the temperatures measured when using the more accurate electronic meters currently employed versus the Winkler method previously used. For temperatures at or above 100 degrees F, the DO of the WHTF will be in the 5 PPM where fish cannot survive. **Table 5-21 of the ESP, for the Aquatic Ecosystems should have an impact level of MODERATE and not SMALL as represented by the ESP.** (Table 2 handout of Oxygen Saturation (ppm) by weight). Section 7.3 of the EIS, Water Use and Quality states that "The intake of water from and the discharge of water to Lake Anna from the new units would be regulated by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) just as the existing NAPS units 1 and 2 are". **Has VDEQ been contacted with respect to the additions of units 3 and 4 about the increased water temperature of the Lake and the lower Dissolved Oxygen levels? Will VDEQ set a maximum temperature for water re-entering the reservoir form the WHTF at Dike 3 as part of their discharge permit?**

6. **What happens to temperatures and lake levels with the third plant operating?**

   ESP Section 5.3.2 states that the 20-cfs (8,977-gallons/min) discharge will go from 5.8% to 11.8% of the time. Therefore residence of the cool side can expect the time that the lake will be 2 foot or more down will be twice the time as currently seen. This low level will occur every two years versus every four years currently.

Temperatures will be increased as outlined above in the WHTF and for the Cool side as well. They will be hotter earlier in the year and stay hotter longer due to the fact that the third plant is adding more waste heat. Currently when one plant is shut down for maintenance less heat is introduced to the WHTF by ½, but when three plants are operating only one is shut down, now 2/3 versus ½ of the heat continues to go into the WHTF. No discussion in the ESP is presented as to how many units will be expected to operate at any time. **Will the EIS discuss the maintenance plan for the overall NAPS and to what percentage of the time will all or some of the plants be running compared to existing units 1 and 2's history?**

7. **What solution will work with the ESP and not effect current Environmental System?**

   Several possible solutions are proposed. Obviously the decommisioning either one or both existing units 1 and 2 will keep the "status quo". Next, a Dry Cooling tower can be built for each Unit 3 and 4 or a larger one for both units 3 and 4. Since there is a penalty for dry cooling of 8.5 to 11%, it would only be used when the WHTF reaches a temperature of 96 degrees F or some other prescribed conditions. Otherwise the once pass through cooling would be used. Another option would be to shut down one of the three units when the WHTF reaches a temperature of 96 degrees F or other prescribed conditions. Any of the above solutions would be generally be acceptable to residents of the lake. A forth option would be to shut down one of the units using the once pass through cooling when the discharge temperature at dike 3 reaches a pre-described temperature. A fifth option would be to introduce supplemental cooling water other than from the reservoir. **Has NRC or Dominion looked into the possibility of using water from the New James River Pipeline that is currently under construction for supplemental water for cooling?**

8. **Can you answer the informal questions about the comparative cost for a dry cooling tower for unit 3 versus the once pass through cooling proposed? Have any studies been done on sprayers in the WHTF? What about the cost versus cooling, evaporation, and aeration for these sprayers?**

Table 1 DEQ Data taken by LACA Water Quality CY 01 Through CY04

Date	Plant intake (deg F)	WHTF (deg F)	Delta increase (deg F)
3/15/01	~51.8	57	~5.2
5/30/01	69.8	80.6	10.8
8/22/01	81.1	93.2	12.1
12/5/01	57.2	water too low	---
4/23/02	~62.6	83.1	~20.5
6/26/02	~80.6	94.1	~13.5
8/21/02	~84.2	91.4	~7.2
10/16/02	~68	73.4	5.4
4/28/03	60.8	71.6	10.8
6/16/03	77	83.3	6.3
8/19/03	84.4	96.8	12.4
10/20/03	65.8	77	11.2
4/20/04	62.6	73.4	10.8
7/23/04	77	87.8	10.8
8/18/04	79.7	89.6	9.9
10/18/04	68.2	76.6	8.4

Data from: https://www.deq.state.va.us/webapp/wqm_station.get_parm2,

Enclosure : Oxygen Saturation Versus Temperature

Submitted by: Kenneth Remmers, President Waterside Property Owners Association
2301 Waterside Dr.
Bumpass, VA 23024



① MEASURED LEVELS FOR DEQ BY LACF with QUANTA METERS, 2004 (WHTF)

Mail Envelope Properties (42120192.563 : 5 : 25955)

Subject: FW: Comments on Draft EIS for North Anna ESP Site NUREG 1811
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 9:03 AM
From: Remmers Kenneth D CRBE <RemmersKD@nswccd.navy.mil>

Created By: RemmersKD@nswccd.navy.mil

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ARW1 CC (Alicia Williamson)
JXC9 CC (Jack Cushing)
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	628	Tuesday, February 15, 2005 9:03 AM
ESP at NANPP.doc	93696	
O2 Saturation.bmp	2798614	
Mime.822	3960447	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(807)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: Jim Nelson <james4765@verizon.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 4:29 PM
Subject: My feelings on the North Anna power plant expansion.

I would hope that there is no attempt to start up the construction of nuclear power plants in this country. They are among the most dangerous pieces of industrial equipment on the planet, with environmental consequences lasting for thousands of years.

I am also concerned about the costs of cleanup of these power plants if the companies that own them go bankrupt - which will happen eventually. This will mean that taxpayer money will be used to clean up the irresponsibility of another industry. Don't you think one Superfund was enough?

The NRC is in an unusual position, in that it has a detailed understanding of the costs involved with nuclear power plants, including the decommissioning and hazardous waste disposal. Should we really resume imposing these costs on ourselves and future generations?

Thanks for your time,

James Nelson
3120 Stuart Ave. Apt. A
Richmond, VA 23221

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421269D3.D47 : 9 : 44359)

Subject: My feelings on the North Anna power plant expansion.
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 4:29 PM
From: Jim Nelson <james4765@verizon.net>

Created By: james4765@verizon.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	902	Tuesday, February 15, 2005 4:29 PM
Mime.822	2088	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Samuel Robert Kroiz" <srk7f@neon.mail.virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 7:20 PM
Subject: Comments on draft NUREG-1811 (Early Site Permit for North Anna,VA)

808

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

To whom it may concern: I am writing to oppose granting an early site permit to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. The issues addressed in the EIS concerning lake water levels and temperature, and problems with stirring up contamination during construction are drastically underanalyzed. I find it even more disgusting that the huge issue of storing and safeguarding all the new waste that will be produced is completely ignored. For generations we have been creating this extremely hazardous waste, expecting that the next generation will be able to figure out what to do with it. There is still no viable solution to this waste problem, and it would be grossly irresponsible for the NRC to grant ANY approval for ANY permit (no matter how early) in the process of building new plants at North Anna; plants that would produce more waste for our children and their children to deal with. Until waste and other important issues are fully addressed, the NRC SHOULD NOT grant an ESP. Sincerely, Samuel Kroiz, 413 Brandon Ave. Apt #6, Charlottesville, VA 22903

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421291C5.812 : 22 : 47122)

Subject:	Comments on draft NUREG-1811 (Early Site Permit for North Anna,VA)
Creation Date:	Tue, Feb 15, 2005 7:20 PM
From:	"Samuel Robert Kroiz" <srk7f@neon.mail.virginia.edu>
Created By:	srk7f@neon.mail.virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1136	Tuesday, February 15, 2005 7:20 PM
Mime.822	2138	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(809)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Josh Swartzbaugh" <susejosh@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 11:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

February 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Josh Swartzbaugh
1025 Meadowsweet Dr
Clayton, OH 45315
USA
susejosh@yahoo.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4212CF39.79E : 2 : 51102)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 11:42 PM
From: "Josh Swartzbaugh" <susejosh@yahoo.com>

Created By: susejosh@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2008	Tuesday, February 15, 2005 11:42 PM
Mime.822	3219	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(810)

From: "Beth Davies" <aec@windbits.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 16, 2005 8:42 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

February 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Beth Davies
PO Box E
Saint Charles, VA 24282-0166
USA
aec@windbits.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42134DBA.5FE : 24 : 62974)

Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 16, 2005 8:42 AM
From: "Beth Davies" <aec@windbits.net>

Created By: aec@windbits.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2001	Wednesday, February 16, 2005 8:42 AM
Mime.822	3198	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(811)

From: Lenore Bassett <lenorebee@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 16, 2005 10:57 AM
Subject: nuclear energy plant

Nuclear energy is NOT the way to go! It threatens society with its danger and there is no way to dispose of its waste, endangering our entire planet.

It is time to use other non-fossil fuel energy alternatives, such as wind, solar power and others. If money were allocated to this research before, we would already be able to benefit from better methods of producing energy.

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

NO NUCLEAR!

Lenore Bassett

206 Tinker Mountain Drive
Daleville, Virginia 24083
(540)591-9008

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Mail - now with 250MB free storage. Learn more.
http://info.mail.yahoo.com/mail_250

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (42136D50.CB1 : 10 : 3249)

Subject: nuclear energy plant
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 16, 2005 10:56 AM
From: Lenore Bassett <lenorebee@yahoo.com>

Created By: lenorebee@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	658	Wednesday, February 16, 2005 10:56 AM
Mime.822	1742	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(812)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <Ashok_Bankley@dom.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 8:20 AM
Subject: ESP COMMENT

Please replace my previous comment dated February 16, 2005 with the following:

In practical terms, nuclear energy is the best possible answer to the environmental and economic hardships that the people of the world are already experiencing. Nuclear energy has been demonstrated as the cleanest form of energy in several parts of the world. It has come out on top after the challenges of the seventies and eighties with an enviable safety record. The environmental and other activists have no real bases to oppose nuclear energy. The United States of America is falling behind in pursuing the nuclear energy option and needs to catch up with countries such as Japan, France, China, India, and Korea. The electric power generation from nuclear energy must be revived with the approval of early site permit (ESP) at North Anna followed by the issuance of combined license for construction and operation (COL). The one-step licensing and economic viability of the safest, the cleanest and the most modern nuclear technology must be demonstrated. It is heartening to know that Dominion is at the forefront of this move. Just as the spiraling costs of fossil energy are a reality, the supply and demand projections show that the real shortage of electricity without nuclear power is waiting to happen in the coming decade or two. The time to support nuclear energy, and the government and the industry to act is overdue. The time to build advanced nuclear reactors is now. The ESP and COL application are just two tiny but monumental steps in the pursuit of nuclear energy option here in the United States and should not be thwarted by what amounts to a baseless anti-nuclear propaganda. More importantly, nuclear energy must be harnessed by building many more modern nuclear plants for the current and coming generation to enjoy cleaner environment, economic prosperity, and less dependence on foreign oil.

Thank you.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4219E025.F87 : 24 : 53127)

Subject: ESP COMMENT
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 8:20 AM
From: <Ashok_Bankley@dom.com>

Created By: Ashok_Bankley@dom.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1917	Monday, February 21, 2005 8:20 AM
Mime.822	2909	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Katie Boyle" <ktb5t@virginia.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 9:52 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

(813)

February 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Katie Boyle
105 DeAyllon Court
Poquoson, VA 23662
USA
ktb5t@virginia.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A-Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4214AFAD.651 : 21 : 34385)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 9:52 AM
From: "Katie Boyle" <ktb5t@virginia.edu>

Created By: ktb5t@virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2003	Thursday, February 17, 2005 9:52 AM
Mime.822	3198	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(814)

From: "Marion McDonald" <emnemsfds@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 12:23 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Marion McDonald
5000 Cartersville Rd
Powhatan, VA 23139-3911
USA
emnemsfds@aol.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4214D2CC.DF9 : 2 : 40441)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 12:22 PM
From: "Marion McDonald" <emnemsfds@aol.com>

Created By: emnemsfds@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2013	Thursday, February 17, 2005 12:22 PM
Mime.822	3214	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

(815)

From: <Emnemsfds@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 1:24 PM
Subject: ESP for Dominion Resources, Inc

My oppositon to the granting of an ESP to Dominion Resources, Inc. for the purpose of permitting 2 new reactors at North Anna is expressed below:

February 17, 2005

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Re: ESP for North Anna nuclear reactors

In 1982, I spoke at a public hearing before the Atomic Safety & Licensing Board concerning the licensing of the Waterford 3 nuclear reactor in Louisiana.

Nothing has changed. The facts are still the same: nuclear is a flawed technology.

It is flawed because the first step of the fuel cycle, extraction of uranium ore from the earth, involves a deadly exploitation of uninformed and unprotected miners. I was teaching on the Navajo Reservation in 1972 when the unemployment rate was 65%. By 1979, attractive salaries offered by the uranium mines in the 85-mile Grants Mineral Belt led many Native American miners to sign on and ultimately supply more than half of the uranium used in this country. These miners were given no information about and no protection against the radon and radium to which they were exposed. Lung cancer, previously unknown among the Navajos, was predicted by the United Mine Workers Union to be the probable cause of death for 80-90% of the uranium miners. Only a flawed technology could exact this kind of human cost.

Mill tailings, alone, have contributed to an untold number of deaths. Remember the 100 million gallons of uranium tailing solution along with 1000 tons of solid material that flooded the Navajo's life-sustaining Rio Puerco River due to a broken dam. The Churchrock, NM reactor responsible for this situation was shut down barely 3 months. The deadly consequences to the people continue.

Nuclear technology is flawed because we are no closer now than we were 40 years ago to finding a safe and permanent mode of nuclear waste disposal—radioactive waste that has accumulated by the thousands of tons that will remain dangerously toxic for hundreds of thousand of years. Yet we read that "the search for a definitive method of disposal...drags on" and the temporary storage methods now in use or being suggested for use generate multiple questions concerning duration, stability, adequacy and guardianship of the stored material.

Every additional nuclear reactor exacerbates the plight of the uranium miners and the people who live in the mining areas, and condemns generations to come to the despicable task of maintaining and guarding tons and tons of radioactive waste generated by a flawed technology, the use of which technology these future generations will never be able to comprehend. Only a flawed technology could exact this kind of commitment from generations yet to be born.

As the late E. F. Schumacher said: " No degree of prosperity could justify the accumulation of large amounts of highly toxic substances which nobody knows how to make 'safe' and which remain an incalculable danger to the whole of creation for historical or even geological ages. To do such a thing is a transgression infinitely more serious than any crime ever perpetrated by humans. The

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWJ)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

idea that a civilization could sustain itself on the basis of such a transgression is an ethical, spiritual, and metaphysical monstrosity. It means conducting the economic affairs of humans as if people really did not matter at all".

Additional nuclear reactors are not needed; renewable energy sources can accomplish as much and more than nuclear generated energy has or ever will. And with none of the lethal consequences of the flawed nuclear technology.

Respectfully,
Sr. Marion M. McDonald, sfcc

Mail Envelope Properties (4214E171.645 : 1 : 42565)

Subject: ESP for Dominion Resources, Inc
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 1:24 PM
From: <Emnemsfds@aol.com>

Created By: Emnemsfds@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3610	Thursday, February 17, 2005 1:24 PM
TEXT.htm	6518	
Mime.822	12066	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

(816)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "sidney sitzer" <sitzer@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 1:46 PM
Subject: Objection to the North Anna Nuclear Power Plant

To those making this important decision:

In view of the fact that the CIA is positivey predicting a major terrorist attack in the near future, it is positively foolhardy to put four nuclear reactors together at North Anna about 50 miles from Washington DC, creating a target for a stupendous terrorist attack. This is a private facility that anyone with an AK47 could go into and shoot up the place. What kind of security and evacuation plan is on the books for this? Can Wasington DC be evacuated without a tremendous loss of lives in the event of a radiation leak or an explosion? Look at what happened in Chernobyl. Long Island, NY has closed down the Shoreham facility. We should be able to learn from the leak at Three Mile Island. Our govt in the past showed courage in limiting and putting a moratorium on new nuclear facilities from 1997 till now. Why all of a sudden is there new interest in creating this danger? The same problem of disposing of the spent fuel rods still exists today as it did in 1997. There is no new technology for this. In fact, more and more states do not want radioactive material shipped accross state lines. (Yucca Mtn. does not want it).

These impending nuclear reactors will change the temperature of the lake where the outflow goes and use a tremendous amount of water from an area in Central Virginia where there is a lack of water already. The population is growing in Chrlottesville and Richmond and these are becomming high density areas.

The additon of two new nuclear reactors makes no sense at all, and creates an accident waiting to happen. More study needs to go into alternative energy sources such as wind power. There is a lot of wind on the mountains that can be harnassed. We need to learn from the example that California is setting with wind farms on the mountains with giant propellers. Natural gas is plentiful in the coal mines of West Virginia. Methane gas from landfills and decomposing cow manure can be harnassed for energy to run the electric generators.

We need to study all the options before putting our area into a check mate situation.

Thank you.

Shelly and Sid Sitzer
665 Fairgrove Court
Earlysville, VA 22936

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4214E695.8DE : 16 : 43230)

Subject: Objection to the North Anna Nuclear Power Plant
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 1:45 PM
From: "sidney sitzer" <sitzer@hotmail.com>

Created By: sitzer@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2229	Thursday, February 17, 2005 1:45 PM
Mime.822	3279	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(817)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Lindsay Anne Hawks" <lah2q@tetra.mail.virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 4:06 PM
Subject: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in ADAMENT OPPOSITION to the granting of the Early Site Permit to Dominion for the building of two new reactors at North Anna's nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. The negative impacts of the construction process and future facility on the lake are not fully understood, and have the potential to be devistating. These possible negative impacts will not only affect the biota of the lake and its ecosystems, but also the human community who call Lake Anna and Mineral home. The impacts also have the potential to affect a much greater area in the case of facility performance failure/problems and waste generation and disposal. The issue of security also has profound implications. Because of these main reasons, and because there are still many other questions that remain unanswered, I have to pledge my opposition to the granting of the ESP on behalf of community stability.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Hawks
413 Brandon Ave. Apt #6
Charlottesville, VA 22903

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4215073B.BF0 : 23 : 48112)

Subject: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 4:05 PM
From: "Lindsay Anne Hawks" <lah2q@tetra.mail.virginia.edu>

Created By: lah2q@tetra.mail.virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1011	Thursday, February 17, 2005 4:05 PM
Mime.822	1978	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(818)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <lawrence.salomone@srs.gov>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 5:38 PM
Subject: Comments - Report No.NUREG-1811,draft

On behalf of the Westinghouse Savannah River Company, the M&O contractor at the Savannah River Site since 1989, we appreciate the opportunity to review Report No. NUREG-1811, draft. Attached are the electronic version of the cover letter and comments with additional relevant information and supporting data regarding Report No. NUREG-1811, draft, entitled, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site."

Please note that a hard copy of the attachments have also been sent to Mike Lesar, Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch.

Sincerely,
Lawrence A. Salomone
Site Chief Geotechnical Engineer
Westinghouse Savannah River Company
Savannah River Site
Building 730-4B, Room 3125
Aiken, SC 29808
(803) 952-6854

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

SAVANNAH RIVER SITE
Aiken, SC 29808 • www.srs.gov

February 15, 2005

WSR-2005-00047

RSM Track #: 10667

Mr. M. Lesar
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop T6-D59
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Mr. Lesar:

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR AN EARLY SITE PERMIT (ESP) AT THE NORTH ANNA ESP SITE, REPORT NO. NUREG-1811

On behalf of Westinghouse Savannah River Company, the M&O contractor at the Savannah River Site since 1989, we appreciate the opportunity to review the report entitled, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site, Report No. NUREG-1811." As you know, this draft EIS includes the NRC staff's analysis of environmental impacts for constructing and operating two nuclear units at the North Anna ESP site or at alternate sites (Savannah River Site, Portsmouth Site and Surry Site). We have focused our comments on those sections in the report that discuss the SRS. General and detailed comments are provided. The detailed comments are those changes in the report that result from the general comments.

There are four general comments. They can be summarized as follows:

The assessment in the report did not credit the extensive environmental and geotechnical database that exists at the SRS;
Construction and operation impacts for some environmental impacts were overstated as "small to moderate" because the author(s) assumed that the detailed routing of the transmission line right-of-ways are not known at this time. Power from the SRS will be transmitted using existing right-of-ways on and off the site and; therefore, the environmental impacts would be "small."
Transportation impacts were overstated in community characteristics as "small to moderate" because the assessment did not credit the site as having an infrastructure on and off the site that has already accommodated a workforce of 25,000. This maximum workforce of 25,000 employees is approximately 40% below the projected workforce required for the facility. The environmental impact would be "small."
The assessment in the report did not credit the relatively isolated location of the SRS and the low nearby density when discussing generic environmental impacts (air quality, nonradiological and radiological health impacts and environmental impacts from postulated accidents) that are dependent on nearby population density and distribution.

Attached are the general and detailed comments with the additional relevant information and supporting data for the changes.

If there are any questions or comments, please contact Lawrence A. Salomone, Site Chief Geotechnical Engineer, at (803) 952-6854.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Pedde
President

LS:dme
Enc.

Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site (NUREG-1811, draft)

By

Westinghouse Savannah River Company

Aiken, SC 29808

GENERAL COMMENTS

A review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site, NUREG-1811 shows that several factors within its scope did not adequately consider available information that if properly credited would demonstrate that all environmental impacts associated with the Savannah River Site are either small or beneficial. The information in question may be summarized as follows:

- The very high level of environmental assessment and characterization of SRS was not accurately credited. SRS has been described as one of the most characterized sites in the Department of Energy (DOE) Complex. In 1951 a baseline environmental study was undertaken as part of initial site startup. In 1970, SRS was named the first National Environmental Research Park. The Savannah River Site (SRS) was characterized in detail as part of a rigorous site selection process and NEPA analysis for a previously proposed mission (Accelerator Production of Tritium). More recently, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has published an Environmental Impact Statement for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at the SRS. SRS publishes extensive environmental reports annually, and has extensive monitoring, research, restoration, and remediation information available from numerous SRS organizations (SGCP, SRNL, Site Geotechnical Engineering, SR Forest Service, Environmental Monitoring Section, and SREL) as well as many regional colleges and universities (Clemson, USC, USC-A, SC State, College of Charleston, UGA, GA Tech., Emory and Augusta State).

- Construction and operation impacts for transmission lines were overestimated and would be SMALL. Although transmission lines on the Savannah River Site may need to be upgraded, the transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, and any construction impacts would be minimal. Offsite, 500-kV transmission lines and switchyards already exist at Plant Vogtle (adjacent to the site and directly across the Savannah River). The 500-kV transmission lines at Plant Vogtle connect to the regional grid so that no additional right-of-ways would be needed. Construction, if any, would merely add additional capacity to the existing lines and a switchyard at the SRS depending on the power being transmitted. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.

- Transportation impacts were overestimated and would be SMALL. The assessment did not credit the fact that the existing infrastructure on and in the vicinity of the site is designed and constructed to accommodate a much larger workforce than will exist at the site during the construction and operation phase of the proposed nuclear plant. The assessment does not credit the fact that, even with the 38% increase, the site workforce would still be ~40% below its 1993 peak of ~25,000 employees.

- The assessment did not credit the relatively isolated location of SRS and the low nearby population density relative to the other candidate sites when discussing generic environmental impacts to all sites. The generic environmental impacts listed in the report (air quality, nonradiological and radiological health impacts and environmental impacts from postulated accidents) are dependent on the nearby population density and distribution, and should, therefore, be different for each site.

Detailed comments reflecting the aforementioned general comments are provided in the pages that follow.

DETAILED COMMENTS

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
1	8-63	8.7.1	30	Change the transmission system impacts to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • Although transmission lines on the Savannah River Site may need to be upgraded from 115-kV to 230-kV or 500-kV, the transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, and any construction impacts would be minimal. Offsite, 500-kV transmission lines and switchyards already exist at Plant Vogtle (adjacent to the site and directly across the Savannah River). The 500-kV transmission lines at Plant Vogtle connect to the regional grid so that no additional right-of-ways would be needed. Construction, if any, would merely add additional capacity to the existing lines and a switchyard at the SRS depending on the power being transmitted. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
2	8-63	8.7.1	37	Change the transmission system impacts to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • Although transmission lines on the Savannah River Site may need to be upgraded from 115-kV to 230-kV or 500-kV, the transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, and any construction impacts would be minimal. Offsite, 500-kV transmission lines and switchyards already exist at Plant Vogtle (adjacent to the site and directly across the Savannah River). The 500-kV transmission lines at Plant Vogtle connect to the regional grid so that no additional right-of-ways would be needed. Construction, if any, would merely add additional capacity to the existing lines and a switchyard at the SRS depending on the power being transmitted. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
3	8-67	8.7.3	6	Change the impact of construction on terrestrial resources (including threatened and endangered species) to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
4	8-67	8.7.3	11	Change the impact of operation on threatened and endangered species to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
5	8-73	8.7.5.3	13	Change the transportation impacts of the construction workforce to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). The assessment currently concludes that the transportation impacts of the construction workforce would be SMALL to MODERATE because the construction workforce would add 38% to the current Savannah River Site workforce, thereby adversely impacting transportation. The assessment does not credit the fact that, even with the 38% increase, the site workforce would still be ~40% below its 1993 peak of ~25,000 employees. Also, the current assessment does not credit the fact that the area transportation infrastructure is designed and constructed to handle this larger workforce.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
6	8-81	Table 8-6	6	Change the Transmission corridors impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
7	8-81	Table 8-6	12	Change the Terrestrial ecosystems impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
8	8-81	Table 8-6	14	Change the T&E Species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
9	8-81	Table 8-6	18	Change the Community Characteristics impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). All of the impacts discussed in section 8.7.5.3 were determined to be SMALL or beneficial except for the transportation impact of the construction workforce which was determined to be "SMALL to MODERATE". This transportation impact should be changed to "SMALL" for reasons discussed in the comment on section 8.7.5.3.
10	8-82	Table 8-7	14	Change the T&E Species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; operation impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
11	9-1	9.0	26	Delete the statement, "The alternative sites have not undergone a comparable level of detailed study." The statement is not appropriately crediting the very high level of environmental assessments and characterizations that exist for the SRS. In the case of the Savannah River Site, the environmental impacts have been well characterized and are indeed SMALL. • The very high level of environmental assessment and characterization of SRS was not accurately credited. SRS has been described as one of the most characterized sites in the Department of Energy (DOE) Complex. In 1951 a baseline environmental study was undertaken as part of initial site startup. In 1970, SRS was named the first National Environmental Research Park. The Savannah River Site (SRS) was characterized in detail as part of a rigorous site selection process and NEPA analysis for a previously proposed mission (Accelerator Production of Tritium). More recently, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has published an Environmental Impact Statement for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at the SRS. SRS publishes extensive environmental reports annually, and has extensive monitoring, research, restoration, and remediation information available from numerous SRS organizations (SGCP, SRNL, Site Geotechnical Engineering, SR Forest Service, Environmental Monitoring Section, and SREL) as well as many regional colleges and universities (Clemson, USC, USC-A, SC State, College of Charleston, UGA, GA Tech., Emory andAugusta State). Also for SRS, offsite impacts would be limited to currently existing transmission right of ways, and the impacts are expected to be small.
12	9-3	Table 9-1	7	Change the Transmission corridors impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
13	9-3	Table 9-1	12	Change the Terrestrial ecosystems impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
14	9-3	Table 9-1	14	Change the Threatened and endangered species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; construction impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
15	9-3	Table 9-1	19	Change the Community Characteristics impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). All of the impacts discussed in section 8.7.5.3 were determined to be SMALL or beneficial except for the transportation impact of the construction workforce which was determined to be "SMALL to MODERATE". This transportation impact should be changed to "SMALL" for reasons discussed in the comment on section 8.7.5.3.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
16	9-4	Table 9-2	16	Change the Threatened and endangered species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE"). • The current rating of SMALL to MODERATE is based on the assumption that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed and that the impacts are indeterminate until the new routes are specified. Onsite, any new transmission lines would use existing right-of-ways, which would require some upgrade and would therefore have some minimal impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; operation impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
17	9-4	9.1	28-32	The statements of generic impacts quoted below cannot be supported without further analyses - the results of which may show a clear preference for one or another of the proposed sites. Each of these impacts is dependent upon the nearby population density and distribution, and should therefore be different for each site. The Savannah River Site, with its large controlled access area, relatively isolated location, and low nearby population density may have a distinct advantage. **Quote from document: "Some environmental impacts considered for the North Anna ESP site or for the alternative sites are generic to all sites and therefore do not influence the comparison of impacts between North Anna ESP site and the alternative sites. The generic environmental impacts common to all sites are air quality, nonradiological and radiological health impacts, and environmental impacts from postulated accidents."**
18	9-6	9.2.1	19-25	Delete the current paragraph and replace with: "The adverse impacts of construction at the Savannah Rive Site alternative are SMALL for all impact categories. Beneficial impacts ranging from SMALL to MODERATE were noted in the community characteristics category, primarily as a result of beneficial economic impacts in Barnwell County." The current paragraph is based on two observations, which are invalid in light of further information. First, the staff concludes that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed, necessitating new construction and possible adverse impacts. In fact, the SRS site selection process would ensure that the location of any new facility would be accessible to existing rights-of-ways, and any upgrades would have negligible impact. Second, the staff concludes that the construction work-force would substantially increase the SRS workforce thereby moderately impacting transportation. In fact, the SRS workforce, including the construction work force, would be significantly less than recent SRS staffing levels and would be easily accommodated by existing transportation infrastructure.

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
19	9-7	9.2.2	11-16	Delete the current paragraph and replace with: "The adverse impacts of operations at the Savannah Rive Site alternative ESP site are SMALL for all impact categories. Beneficial impacts ranging from SMALL to MODERATE were noted in the community characteristics category, primarily as a result of beneficial economic impacts in Barnwell County." • The current paragraph is based on the observation that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed, necessitating new construction and adversely impacting operations and maintenance. In fact, the SRS site selection process would ensure that the location of any new facility would be accessible to existing right-of-ways, and any upgrades would have negligible impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; operation impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.
20	9-7	9.2.2	25-26	Delete "and the Savannah River Site has significant unknown impacts associated with the transmission line rights-of-way (could be anywhere from SMALL to MODERATE)." • This phrase is based on the observation that new transmission right-of-ways may be needed, necessitating new construction and adversely impacting operations and maintenance. In fact, the SRS site selection process would ensure that the location of any new facility would be accessible to existing right-of-ways, and any upgrades would have negligible impact. Offsite, existing 500-kV transmission right-of-ways would be used as is, or would require an upgrade in capacity only; operation impacts would be minimal. Assuming the power from the SRS may be transmitted to a location 60 miles to the west is not realistic because right-of-way and permits may be excessive and time consuming to obtain. This assumption creates unnecessary conservatism in the environmental impacts presented in the report for the SRS.

Mail Envelope Properties (42151CEA.6DD : 20 : 50909)

Subject: Comments - Report No.NUREG-1811,draft
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 5:38 PM
From: <lawrence.salomone@srs.gov>

Created By: lawrence.salomone@srs.gov

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	774	Thursday, February 17, 2005 5:38 PM
TEXT.htm	1333	
EnergyNRCcoverltrWSR-2005-00047.pdf	171433	
EnergyNorthAnnaEISComments.doc	48128	
Mime.822	304441	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

(819)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Jenny Heberlein" <jlheberl@hacc.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 18, 2005 9:32 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

February 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Having lived through the TMI accident as a child and knowing many people who now have cancer in our area I urge you to not alloy any new nuclear power plants.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Jenny Heberlein
1315 Maple Ave
Lancaster, PA 17603-4613
USA
jlheberl@hacc.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4215FC6D.6D2 : 18 : 1746)

Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 18, 2005 9:32 AM
From: "Jenny Heberlein" <jlheberl@hacc.edu>

Created By: jlheberl@hacc.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2170	Friday, February 18, 2005 9:32 AM
Mime.822	3409	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(820)

12/10/04
69FR71854

From: Michael Stuart <stuartmj@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 18, 2005 1:56 PM
Subject: My Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Statement

My name is Michael Stuart. I live in Hanover County, and I am within the 10 mile EPZ of North Anna Power Station.

I attended the public meeting the night of Feb 18, and stayed until 11:45 PM. I was very disappointed that even though I had registered to speak over a month ago, I did not get the opportunity to do so, even though speakers who live much farther away were afforded this opportunity, often with comments that were not relevant to the EIS. It wasn't until after the meeting that I found out that I had to "sign-in" again the night of the meeting to speak.

First, I would like to note that the Draft EIS is very thorough, addressing issues in details I would not have imagined, but I believe that one very important issue has been overlooked, and I would ask that you include and address the following item, which I believe is relevant to the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Nowhere that I can find in this huge document does it explore the environmental impact of NOT building new nuclear capacity. The need for future energy supplies, by even the most conservative estimates does not show that we will need less energy in the future. Since the alternative, viable forms of base-load energy generation are far more detrimental to the environment, failing to build new nuclear generation would have serious negative environmental consequences. Therefore, the environmental impacts of failing to build a non-carbon emitting energy source should be considered as part of the Final EIS.

Michael Stuart
18281 Shiloh Church Road
Beaverdam, Virginia 23015-1231
(H) 804-449-6176; (D) 804-241-6170

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (42163A67.7D3 : 17 : 10195)

Subject: My Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 18, 2005 1:56 PM
From: Michael Stuart <stuartmj@yahoo.com>

Created By: stuartmj@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1618	Friday, February 18, 2005 1:56 PM
TEXT.htm	1687	
Mime.822	4662	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05
(821)

From: <Tomcr9@aol.com>
To: <northanna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 18, 2005 4:27 PM
Subject: (no subject)

I am against the construction of nuclear power plants at Lake Anna. I feel that these plants are a risk to people and the environment. Thank you very much. Allison Crowell

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (42165D98.8CA : 10 : 14538)

Subject: (no subject)
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 18, 2005 4:26 PM
From: <Tomcr9@aol.com>

Created By: Tomcr9@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	180	Friday, February 18, 2005 4:26 PM
TEXT.htm	631	
Mime.822	1949	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

(822)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "B Hyson" <bhyson@copper.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 20, 2005 2:53 PM
Subject: new reactors

To the Lake Anna Facility:

As a mother of two teenage children and a resident of southern Albemarle County, I oppose the expansion of the nuclear facility at Lake Anna. The Lake Anna facility affects not just Louisa County, but all of us. Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, there is always a lurking possibility that it could happen again. Humans make errors and so do their machines, look at the disasters of our space program. Shortly after the 9/11 attacks there was fear that nuclear power plants could become targets for terrorists. This could still happen.

Nuclear waste is another problem. I do not want nuclear waste passing through my town, and yet, I fear this is already happening across America to unsuspecting citizens. In Utah, where nuclear energy supporters wish to send the waste, there is a strong opposition, and I would be opposed as well if it were designated for Virginia. Nuclear waste is not safe nor is it clean, the standing argument for expansion of nuclear energy.

I do not believe that nuclear power is good for our communities or our environment, and I strongly oppose it. If we care about the safety of our communities and the health of our environment, we should not be expanding nuclear energy.

Sincerely,

Brenda Hyson

Scottsville, Virginia

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWW1)

SUSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4218EAC5.A05 : 22 : 43525)

Subject: new reactors
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 20, 2005 2:53 PM
From: "B Hyson" <bhyson@copper.net>

Created By: bhyson@copper.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1292	Sunday, February 20, 2005 2:53 PM
TEXT.htm	3642	
Mime.822	6649	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RPB received
3/9/05

(823)

From: Jim Adams <demeters@louisa.net>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 20, 2005 8:26 PM
Subject: EIS notes to be attached to the EIS

Sometime i get it right the first time; sometimes i find and correct my information so it is right the second time .... sigh .... Anyway, scrap the Feb 18th version and please include this, the Feb 20th version. Thank you

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Jim Adams
3115 Yanceyville Road
Louisa, VA, 23093
540-967-9909

February 20, 2005

*EIS statements, by Jim Adams

* In the EIS meeting at the Louisa County Middle School, the NRC gave the North Anna Nuclear Plant site a clean bill of health and said it met all the criteria they were instructed to deal with. And that's where the biggest problems are. The White House recently changed the criteria so a nuclear plant EIS does NOT include dealing with nuclear garbage and does NOT include any security questions.

1) *Nuclear Garbage*: Let's not be euphemistic about this: the stuff left over after the usable energy has been taken out of it is still highly concentrated, highly radioactive, highly toxic nuclear garbage. There is nothing we can do with it but store it here at home or store it in a nuclear landfill such as Yucca Mountain If Yucca Mountain opens, it will not even hold all the nuclear garbage we have stored around the United States.

One estimate is that about 950 metric tons of high-level spent-fuel nuclear garbage are stored at the North Anna Nuclear Plant (+ another several hundred tons of low level nuclear garbage) and that it is currently producing another 40 tons of high-level spent-fuel nuclear garbage a year. Three things are immediately apparent: a) with luck, Yucca Mountain will hold most, but not all of the North Anna stored nuclear garbage and without that luck, the nuclear garbage will stay stored on site; b) two new reactors will double the North Anna Nuclear Garbage yearly output to 80 tons a year, and c) in a hundred years or less, the four reactors will wear out anyway and each reactor will become nuclear garbage.

Nuclear garbage is not quite like household garbage. It is nuclear garbage: lethal, terror prone and longer lived and dangerous for more than 25 times all of human history! If the first nuclear power plant had been built and turned out its first 20 tons of nuclear garbage in the year Jesus was born, we would only have to guard that toxic garbage for 8,000+ more years. If it wasn't guarded/monitored, you wouldn't want your family to come anywhere near it, nor would you want anyone you knew to live downstream from it.

This garbage is hot both in temperature and radioactivity ... and

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Austing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

corrosive. The garbage destroys the best containers we can put around it.The current dry cask containers at North Anna each hold 14.5 metric tons of nuclear garbage and are licensed by the NRC for only 100 of those 10,000+ years.

2) Nuclear Security: During the meeting, we found out there are ground guards and ground based security, but no air security. All this radioactive trash is a tempting target for a dirty terrorist bomb, especially since we are only 75 wind miles from the heart of DC. When the winds come from south-southwest (as they often do), Washington DC is directly downwind from the North Anna Nuclear Plant.

After September 11th, the rules changed for security in our country. Terrorists do suicide missions. Airplanes filled with fuel, flying at 500 - 600 mph become suicide bombs. And North Anna has no protection against these.

These are some of the real-world environmental impacts, and a number of us call on the NRC to consider these impacts as serious, and deserving of serious consideration. For those of us who live in the 30 mile radius and/or in the wind-shadow of the North Anna Nuclear Plant, it is only our lives, our health and our well-being that are at stake. This may not be important to corporate and political America, but it is important to us.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission: scrap your 1st Draft EIS and redo it with nuclear garbage and nuclear security included. I think you will then reject, not approve the application for new North Anna nuclear power plants

Thank you for listening,

Jim Adams
3115 Yanceyville Road
Louisa, VA 23093

Sometime i get it right the first time; sometimes i find and correct my information so it is right the second time .... sigh .... Anyway, scrap the Feb 18th version and please include this, the Feb 20th version. Thank you

Jim Adams
3115 Yanceyville Road
Louisa, VA, 23093
540-967-9909

February 20, 2005

EIS statements, by Jim Adams

In the EIS meeting at the Louisa County Middle School, the NRC gave the North Anna Nuclear Plant site a clean bill of health and said it met all the criteria they were instructed to deal with. And that's where the biggest problems are. The White House recently changed the criteria so a nuclear plant EIS does NOT include dealing with nuclear garbage and does NOT include any security questions.

1) **Nuclear Garbage**: Let's not be euphemistic about this: the stuff left over after the usable energy has been taken out of it is still highly concentrated, highly radioactive, highly toxic nuclear garbage. There is nothing we can do with it but store it here at home or store it in a nuclear landfill such as Yucca Mountain If Yucca Mountain opens, it will not even hold all the nuclear garbage we have stored around the United States.

One estimate is that about 950 metric tons of high-level spent-fuel nuclear garbage are stored at the North Anna Nuclear Plant (+ another several hundred tons of low level nuclear garbage) and that it is currently producing another 40 tons of high-level spent-fuel nuclear garbage a year. Three things are immediately apparent: a) with luck, Yucca Mountain will hold most, but not all of the North Anna stored nuclear garbage and without that luck, the nuclear garbage will stay stored on site; b) two new reactors will double the North Anna Nuclear Garbage yearly output to 80 tons a year, and c) in a hundred years or less, the four reactors will wear out anyway and each reactor will become nuclear garbage.

Nuclear garbage is not quite like household garbage. It is nuclear garbage: lethal, terror prone and longer lived and dangerous for more than 25 times all of human history! If the first nuclear power plant had been built and turned out its first 20 tons of nuclear garbage in the year Jesus was born, we would only have to guard that toxic garbage for 8,000+ more years. If it wasn't guarded/monitored, you wouldn't want your family to come anywhere near it, nor would you want anyone you knew to live downstream from it.

This garbage is hot both in temperature and radioactivity ... and corrosive. The garbage destroys the best containers we can put around it.The current dry cask containers at North Anna each hold 14.5 metric tons of nuclear garbage and are licensed by the NRC for only 100 of those 10,000+ years.

2) Nuclear Security: During the meeting, we found out there are ground guards and ground based security, but no air security. All this radioactive trash is a tempting target for a dirty terrorist bomb, especially since we are only 75 wind miles from the heart of DC. When the winds come from south-southwest (as they often do), Washington DC is directly downwind from the North Anna Nuclear Plant.

After September 11th, the rules changed for security in our country. Terrorists do suicide missions. Airplanes filled with fuel, flying at 500 – 600 mph become suicide bombs. And North Anna has no protection against these.

These are some of the real-world environmental impacts, and a number of us call on the NRC to consider these impacts as serious, and deserving of serious consideration. For those of us who live in the 30 mile radius and/or in the wind-shadow of the North Anna Nuclear Plant, it is only our lives, our health and our well-being that are at stake. This may not be important to corporate and political America, but it is important to us.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission: scrap your 1st Draft EIS and redo it with nuclear garbage and nuclear security included. I think you will then reject, not approve the application for new North Anna nuclear power plants

Thank you for listening,

Jim Adams
3115 Yanceyville Road
Louisa, VA 23093

Mail Envelope Properties (421938AB.5B3 : 12 : 46515)

Subject: EIS notes to be attached to the EIS
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 20, 2005 8:28 PM
From: Jim Adams <demeters@louisa.net>

Created By: demeters@louisa.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4299	Sunday, February 20, 2005 8:28 PM
TEXT.htm	5547	
Mime.822	11185	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(824)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "John Kesich" <kesich@npacc.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Feb 20, 2005 10:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 20, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

John Kesich
RR 2 Box 168A
Millerton, PA 16936
USA
kesich@npacc.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42195644.994 : 5 : 47508)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Sun, Feb 20, 2005 10:32 PM
From: "John Kesich" <kesich@npacc.net>

Created By: kesich@npacc.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1997	Sunday, February 20, 2005 10:32 PM
Mime.822	3188	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

825

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: Herbert Tucker <tucker@virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 1:55 PM
Subject: site plan approval

Dear NRC

I am one of the patient if at times flabbergastedly fascinated people who spent close to four hours in the Louisa middle school auditorium last Thursday hearing the pros and cons of, not just the site plan, but the entire stepped approval process as it now and then swings open to public oversight and comment.

I attended as an opponent of the continued operation -- much less the fresh construction -- of nuclear facilities in my extended back yard. I left without having my mind fundamentally changed. But I learned a lot, about what the NRC does, and doesn't, do in such a matter; and I learned even more, I thought, about the embattled state of mind that seems to be shared by engineers, spokespeople, and proponents of nuclear power generation, whether in government, in the development industry, or in the local power business. At the level of psychology, I would submit, there is a substantial overlap between the orientation of pro- and anti-nuclear groups. The latter are filled with people who, like me, work regularly on behalf of causes unpopular with the general public and very often opposed to accepted majority views. In this they turn out -- and to me this was a genuine surprise -- to have a lot in common with the advocates of nuclear power, in their self-conception as a misunderstood elite, advancing their cause from a vantage of superior information and expertise against what can seem a superstitious Luddite mass of faithless intransigents. Between groups thus internally constituted there can be little but a standoff, it seems; and that's certainly what your transcript from Louisa will record.

Can this common psychological orientation possibly provide common grounds for mutual understanding? If I can even dimly grasp an engineer's exasperation at my old-fashioned moralist's conviction that I know better, can the engineer not reciprocate, get outside her professional shell, and see where I am coming from? If so, I would hope the process of mutual understanding might reach into the otherwise armor-cased place in the engineering brain where doubts are stored for safe-keeping. Not doubts about an engineer's capacity to design a theoretically safe reactor: I'll grant that for present purposes of argument. Not doubts even about a manager's capacity to run a reactor 24/7, with a less than elite, sometimes inattentive, which is to say a human, work force; though when push comes to shove I would today part company with the engineers right there. But the doubts it seems to me lethal for the engineering mind to place under quarantine are those that attach to the storage and shipment of that constantly accumulating spent waste. The problem this toxic mass poses seems to me insoluble under real world conditions; and yet it is one that grows worse daily, as the mass increases and the containers age. When you come to driving cargo containers of this stuff through my city down I-64, you have moved beyond engineering controls into the sphere of sheer luck, where in time the probabilities have got to tell against you, which is to say, horribly against us all, and all those future generations so rightly if fatiguingly invoked on Thursday night. This is not an extra, or a distinct, problem from the challenges that arise with nuclear plant construction. It's smack dab in the middle of the problem. Stopping

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

nuclear plant operations today won't solve it. But going out of our way on a bankruptingly costly endeavor to build yet more of the things can only make matters worse.

I did not file a comment or pick up the microphone on Thursday. Please record this e-mail as a citizen's new vote against the site permit, and the unacceptably risky construction that it would facilitate.

Chip Tucker
42 Canterbury Road
Charlottesville VA 22903
434 / 295-2929

CC: <peoplesalliance@yahoo.com>

Mail Envelope Properties (421A2E78.6AF : 2 : 59055)

Subject: site plan approval
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 1:55 PM
From: Herbert Tucker <tucker@virginia.edu>

Created By: tucker@virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

yahoo.com
peoplesalliance CC

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov
	yahoo.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3875	Monday, February 21, 2005 1:55 PM
Mime.822	5267	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

826

From: "Kelly Taylor" <keltay3@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 7:27 PM
Subject: Comments on draft Environmental Impact Statement

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Page 3-7:
"Based on the PPE, the maximum temperature increase between the intake and the discharge will be 10°C (18°F) and the maximum discharge temperature will be 52.8°C (127°F). Dominion specified in the PPE that the flow rate through the
condenser will not exceed 71,900 L/s (1,140,000 gpm)."

I would like to see the basis for the 127°F conclusion more explicitly spelled out. I believe the number is in error (too high) and does not appear to be supported by the information in the ESP application.

Page 8-2:

"The staff estimates that the proposed once-through cooling system for Unit 3 could extend
waste heat treatment facility (WHTF) conditions into the main body of Lake Anna. Based on the
additional heat load and associated flow, the staff estimates that WHTF conditions could extend
into approximately 19 percent of the main body of the lake."

"WHTF conditions" is unclear, and should be defined.
Please include a basis for the calculation of the 19 percent, and a more precise description of the conclusion. 19% of the surface area?
Specifically where?
19% of the water volume?
A temperature increase that is 19% of something?

Also an apparent typo, on page 7-2: "Cumulative thermal effects are discussed in section 7.4."
I believe you intended section 7.5, since the aquatic ecosystem is more likely to experience thermal effects than the terretrial ecosystem.

Kelly L Taylor
Louisa County Resident

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421A7C82.A75 : 14 : 64117)

Subject: Comments on draft Environmental Impact Statement
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 7:27 PM
From: "Kelly Taylor" <keltay3@yahoo.com>

Created By: keltay3@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1439	Monday, February 21, 2005 7:27 PM
Mime.822	2483	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RPB received
3/1/05
(827)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: Lillian Mezey <lmezey@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 8:02 PM
Subject: oppose new reactors-public comment

I am writing in OPPOSITION to new nuclear reactors at the North Anna nuclear power plant. In my opinion, it is irresponsible to create more dangerous radioactive nuclear waste when there is no safe disposal method or location. What is your plan for the radioactive waste? Also, I am concerned about the potential for a major nuclear accident, endangering citizens in Charlottesville as well as Richmond and Washington DC. This is an acceptable safety risk!

Please deny these permits.

Sincerely,

Lillian Mezey, M.D.
2529 Holkham Drive
Charlottesville, VA 22901

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWJ)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421A8481.C7F : 11 : 64639)

Subject: oppose new reactors-public comment
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 21, 2005 8:01 PM
From: Lillian Mezey <lmezey@earthlink.net>

Created By: lmezey@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	577	Monday, February 21, 2005 8:01 PM
Mime.822	1521	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

828

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "John Patrick Smith" <patreek@uky.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 22, 2005 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

February 22, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I urgre the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will not adversely impact the environment. I am writing to ask the NRC to examine the "cradle to cradle" effects of building a new nuclear plant. From construction, to power generation, to disposing of and storing the spent fuel, the proposed nuclear site would be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Further, Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact the lake and could lower property values. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Should the spent fuel rods from North Anna be kept on site, or should they be shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose a threat to the environment and local communities. Fuel rods have gone missing in the past years, and until the nation has a safe and secure means to store spent fuel, the rods pose a risk to the environment and in a worst-case scenario, could end up in the wrong hands.

I am opposed to new nuclear power. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean energy like wind or biomass. In reevaluating the ESP and the EIS, the NRC should urge Dominion to consider other alternatives to an expensive nuclear plant. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

John Patrick Smith
PO Box 82
Smiths Grove, KY 42171-0082
USA
patreek@uky.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421AF53A.C10 : 17 : 7184)

Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 22, 2005 4:02 AM
From: "John Patrick Smith" <patreek@uky.edu>

Created By: patreek@uky.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2007	Tuesday, February 22, 2005 4:02 AM
Mime.822	3210	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: "Benjamin_T Brown" <btb_lskb@lycos.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 22, 2005 6:29 PM
Subject: comments

(829)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Comments on the North Anna Draft Environmental Impact Statement February 19, 2005
My name is Benjamin T. Brown and my address is 3687 Turnpike Road Lexington VA 24450.
I am opposed to granting a preliminary permit for more reactors at North Anna because the plan submitted for cooling the reactors is inadequate.

I attended the public meeting at Louisa Middle School on February 17, 2005, and I enjoyed the sincerity and the clarity of the public speakers, both those opposed and in favor. There is a great distance between them! I am a long time opponent of nuclear power, but I was very interested in listening to the proponents, to learn how they could hold such views. Many of them were not "illuminating" because they work for Dominion Power and support their employer.
One of them was Lisa Shell who works for Dominion as an engineer for the storage of fuel rods. She rapidly gave the speech that she had prepared, but the surprising thing about it was her anger at the opponents. She thought they unfairly disparaged her competence and the high safety level that she feels she and her co-workers have achieved at North Anna. I thought about her anger on the ride home.
For her, the issue of the desirability of nuclear power revolves around what she knows: the wonderfully strong and carefully tended storage of fuel as practiced at North Anna. Highly educated, dedicated workers, top grade equipment, and safety concerns are constantly stressed. She has put the entire issue of nuclear power into the compartment that she is familiar with. The popular expression for this is, "Can't see the forest for the trees."
Nuclear Power should not be used because:
1) The fuel cycle produces "small" amounts of radiation at every stage.
2) An accident would be a disaster to eclipse the Indian Ocean Tsunami.
3) An attack or sabotage by terrorists would be a disaster to eclipse the Indian Ocean Tsunami.
4) Secure storage of the waste for tens of thousands of years cannot even be imagined.
5) The spread of nuclear power expertise through the world enables hostile nations to convert that expertise to weapons' development.
6) Government subsidies of development, the fuel cycle, promotion, security, and insurance make it impossible to compare the costs of nuclear, fossil, and renewable power.
7) The same for the unknown cost of decommissioning and guarding old reactors after they have become too brittle to use.
8) We use power so frivolously and inefficiently now that we do not need additional generators.
The time limit at the hearing constrained Ms. Shell to one point, but the NRC has months to consider the North Anna Early Site Permit. For the NRC to decide at this stage to ignore the forest of objections to North Anna 3 and 4 is willfully ignorant. Oops! Your bias is showing.
--

Find what you are looking for with the Lycos Yellow Pages
http://r.lycos.com/r/yp_emailfooter/http://yellowpages.lycos.com/default.asp?SRC=lycos10

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421BC038.DD7 : 23 : 32215)

Subject: comments
Creation Date: Tue, Feb 22, 2005 6:28 PM
From: "Benjamin_T Brown" <btb_lskb@lycos.com>

Created By: btb_lskb@lycos.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3095	Tuesday, February 22, 2005 6:28 PM
Mime.822	4547	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(830)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Pates, Robert D. *HS" <RDP2N@hscmail.mcc.virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 23, 2005 10:00 AM
Subject: NO_NEW_NUCLEARPLANS@NorthAnna

I attended the open meeting at the Louisa County Middle School, which was entitled "Public Meeting to Collect Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement For and Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site" on February 17th, 2005. The opinion of local residents toward this idea was OVERWHELMINGLY NEGATIVE -- SO

IF THIS MEETING MEANS ANYTHING WHATEVER, YOU WILL NOT ISSUE AN EARLY SITE PERMIT TO DOMINION FOR FURTHER NUCLEAR REACTORS TO BE LOCATED AT NORTH ANNA.

As a local resident, I was unimpressed that the NRC team had done a decent job in their draft proposal (some of the language was plagiarized from other sources!). I am highly unclear and suspicious of the relationship between Dominion and the NRC of a government clearly committed to revamping the nuclear industry in the US as a whole - and is clearly prepared to do anything or tell any lie to get their way (e.g. their certainty that "weapons of mass destruction" existed in Iraq led us into an expensive, illegal, murderous, ruinous war).

Also - clearly dirty politics are at work here from the nuclear industry. What in heavens name were PRO-nuclear representatives from CHICAGO doing in Louisa, VA on 2/17/05?? Clearly, the nuclear industry is keen to give the impression of a PRO-nuclear grassroots movement. Which does not exist. The whole thing reeks of corruption and deceit.

THE PEOPLE OF VIRGINIA WILL NOT BE USED IN THIS WAY -

NO MORE NUCLEAR REACTORS AT NORTH ANNA - WE ARE WATCHING YOU CLOSELY!

Rob Pates

Charlottesville, VA

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

Mail Envelope Properties (421C9A8F.135 : 19 : 49461)

Subject: NO_NEW_NUCLEARPLANS@NorthAnna
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 23, 2005 10:00 AM
From: "Pates, Robert D. *HS" <RDP2N@hscmail.mcc.virginia.edu>

Created By: RDP2N@hscmail.mcc.virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1568	Wednesday, February 23, 2005 10:00 AM
TEXT.htm	6551	
Mime.822	10246	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(831)

From: Jennifer Meyer <jam995@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Feb 23, 2005 4:28 PM
Subject: No to new nuclear reactor

I am writing to express my belief that we do not need any more nuclear reactors at Lake Anna. This type of power is unsafe and produces waste that cannot be stored safely. Currently, as I understand it, there is no location for storage of spent fuel.

Please do not bring any more nuclear reactors to our area.

Thank you,
Jennifer Meyer

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

SISP Review Complete
Templat = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (421CF56B.B4F : 18 : 64335)

Subject: No to new nuclear reactor
Creation Date: Wed, Feb 23, 2005 4:27 PM
From: Jennifer Meyer <jam995@earthlink.net>

Created By: jam995@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	341	Wednesday, February 23, 2005 4:27 PM
Mime.822	1312	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05 (832)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: "Bob Oldham" <boldham@smv.org>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 10:13 AM
Subject: North Anna ESP

Dear Sirs,

I am opposed to the granting of any early site permits to Dominion Nuclear North Anna for future construction of additional nuclear power plants at North Anna Power Station.

I live a short distance from the site and I am concerned about safety issues related to the plant operations. However, I am also very concerned about the potential damage to the environment and to wildlife and fish in the area of the lake.

I believe that Dominion would be better served by working to help its power users reduce demand than to construct additional generating capacity at this time. I also think that an investigation of the potential for tidal hydro generating systems in the Chesapeake Bay and Virginia coastal areas would be a much better use of financial resources, although environmental concerns would also have to be carefully addressed.

I hope the NRC will require Dominion Nuclear North Anna to withdraw their application and consider other alternative electricity generating technologies before endangering the large, and growing, population of this area.

Sincerely,

Robert Oldham
12276 Welling Hall Rd
Doswell VA 23047

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421DEF27.79F : 4 : 18335)

Subject: North Anna ESP
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 10:20 AM
From: "Bob Oldham" <boldham@smv.org>

Created By: boldham@smv.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1147	Thursday, February 24, 2005 10:20 AM
TEXT.htm	2750	
Mime.822	5609	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

833

From: mirabai mcleod <mirabai888@yahoo.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 11:11 AM
Subject: north anna

dear friends at the nrc,

my name is beth mcleod and i am a registered voter living in rockbridge county, virginia.

i am writing to voice my opposition to the building of additional reactors at the north anna site. i believe this would be environmentally, as well as economically, unsound.

thank you for your attention to this matter.
sincerely,
beth mcleod

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Mail - You care about security. So do we.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Ashing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421DFCC6.F69 : 23 : 20329)

Subject: north anna
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 11:11 AM
From: mirabai mcleod <mirabai888@yahoo.com>

Created By: mirabai888@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	491	Thursday, February 24, 2005 11:11 AM
TEXT.htm	708	
Mime.822	2512	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(834)

From: "Helen Reutlinger" <hrr146@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 12:14 PM
Subject: New Nuclear Plant

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

To who it may concern:

I am writing to oppose the building of a new nuclear power plant at the North Anna site. I don't believe that all the issues concerning nuclear energy have been addressed with the current power plant - waste disposal/storage, terrorism and security, health effects, and evacuation and safety planning - just to mention a few.

Wouldn't the investigation into more sustainable energy be a more prudent apporach?

Sincerely,

Helen R. Reutlinger
1108 Parker Place
Charlottesville, Va 22903
hrr146@hotmail.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421E0B2B.906 : 9 : 22790)

Subject: New Nuclear Plant
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 12:12 PM
From: "Helen Reutlinger" <hrr146@hotmail.com>

Created By: hrr146@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	540	Thursday, February 24, 2005 12:12 PM
Mime.822	1530	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(835)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <cburtner@vmfa.state.va.us>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:38 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW3)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

caryl Burtner
3228 Patterson

Richmond, VA 23221

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2D33.CC7 : 16 : 27847)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:38 PM
From: <cburtner@vmfa.state.va.us>

Created By: cburtner@vmfa.state.va.us

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6230	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:38 PM
Mime.822	7122	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RIDB received
3/9/05

836

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <dindamcp4@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:38 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

dinda evans
POB 178695

SAN DIEGO, CA 92117

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2D33.CC6 : 15 : 27846)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:37 PM
From: <dindamcp4@yahoo.com>

Created By: dindamcp4@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6225	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:37 PM
Mime.822	7111	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(837)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <kurt.schroeder@navy.mil>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:41 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AR01)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Kurt Schroeder
5324 North Point Court

Virginia Beach, VA 23455

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2DE0.D32 : 23 : 27954)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:40 PM
From: <kurt.schroeder@navy.mil>

Created By: kurt.schroeder@navy.mil

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6245	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:40 PM
Mime.822	7135	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(838)

12/10/05
69 FR 71854

From: <shclark288@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:41 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Scott Clark
1000 Stillwell Rd

Richmond, VA 23226

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2E00.D3E : 10 : 27966)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:41 PM
From: <shclark288@yahoo.com>

Created By: shclark288@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6231	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:41 PM
Mime.822	7118	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: <SiljaS@solo.ee>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:43 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

839

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Silja Sistok-Katz
801 North Monroe Str, #733

Arlington, VA 22201

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2E65.D6F : 9 : 28015)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:43 PM
From: <SiljaS@solo.ee>

Created By: SiljaS@solo.ee

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6247	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:43 PM
Mime.822	7128	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(840)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <klrouth@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:43 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-03

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Kira Routh
3314 Grandview Drive

Richmond, VA 23225

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2E65.D6E : 8 : 28014)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:43 PM
From: <klrouth@yahoo.com>

Created By: klrouth@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6233	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:43 PM
Mime.822	7117	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(841)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <callahasu@tycoelectronics.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:44 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = AON-63
Add J. Cushing (JXC 9)
A. Williamson (AIW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = AON-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Susie Callahan
6809 Colonial Hwy.

evington, VA 24550

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2E88.D7B : 21 : 28027)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:43 PM
From: <callahasu@tycoelectronics.com>

Created By: callahasu@tycoelectronics.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6235	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:43 PM
Mime.822	7131	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(842)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <lotus@whid.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:45 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template : ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Blake Puhak
2517 Kenwood Ave.

Richmond, VA 23228

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2ECA.D97 : 24 : 28055)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:44 PM
From: <lotus@whid.net>

Created By: lotus@whid.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6231	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:44 PM
Mime.822	7112	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

From: <contact@alrdesign.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:46 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

(843)

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Noah Scalin
2701 Edgewood Ave

Richmond, VA 23222

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2F0F.DC6 : 21 : 28102)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:46 PM
From: <contact@alrdesign.com>

Created By: contact@alrdesign.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6231	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:46 PM
Mime.822	7119	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(844)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <danadcook@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Dana Cook
2118 Military Rd.

Arlington, VA 22207

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2F78.DFF : 3 : 28159)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:47 PM
From: <danadcook@yahoo.com>

Created By: danadcook@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6230	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:47 PM
Mime.822	7116	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

845

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <tpence@colonyins.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-03

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Tina Pence
4959

Disputanta, VA 23842

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2F7A.E04 : 8 : 28164)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:47 PM
From: <tpence@colonyins.com>

Created By: tpence@colonyins.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6219	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:47 PM
Mime.822	7106	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ROB received
3/9/05

(846)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <joner@shensol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Are you all nuts???? We already have a big target sign on our state for terrorists since we border DC, do you want to add another reason for Virginia to be a "place" of interest?

If terrorist interest wasn't bad enough, have you considered the environmental impact of more nuclear waste?

Please Please do not approve this.

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWW)

risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an

evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Jone Shilliday
898 Calmes Neck Lane
Boyce, VA 22620

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2F9D.E1A : 5 : 28186)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
From: <joner@shensol.com>

Created By: joner@shensol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6563	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Mime.822	7458	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(847)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <gbesasc@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. I live in Richmond, VA and I am very concerned with the safety of nuclear power.

The North Anna site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)

late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Glen Besa
4896 Burnham RD
Richmond, VA 23234

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2F9D.E1C : 7 : 28188)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
From: <gbesasc@earthlink.net>

Created By: gbesasc@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6321	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Mime.822	7213	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(848)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <amoret@downerandassociates.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:49 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS = AOM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = AOM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Amoret Bruguiere
955 Locust Avenue

Charlottesville, VA 22901

Mail Envelope Properties (421E2FBE.E2D : 24 : 28205)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:48 PM
From: <amoret@downerandassociates.com>

Created By: amoret@downerandassociates.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6243	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Mime.822	7140	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
3/9/05

(849)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <janbvin@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:50 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS: ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Jan Vinegar
12112 Denford Ct

Glen Allen, VA 23059

Mail Envelope Properties (421E3001.E4F : 8 : 28239)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 2:50 PM
From: <janbvin@aol.com>

Created By: janbvin@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6232	Thursday, February 24, 2005 2:50 PM
Mime.822	7114	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(850)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <mgoodman@thedeal.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 3:01 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Michael Goodman
145 Hicks St
Apt. B28
Brooklyn, NY 11201-2325

SISP Review Complete
Template- ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (4224CA28.091 : 20 : 16529)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 3:01 PM
From: <mgoodman@thedeal.com>

Created By: mgoodman@thedeal.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1392	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 3:01 PM
Mime.822	2517	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(851)

From: "brown pride" <desi666@hindunet.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:45 PM
Subject: comments on environmental review of Dominion Resources' application

12-10-04
69 FR
71854

Please OPPOSE granting an Early Site Permit (ESP) to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ravi Grover
POB 802103
Chicago IL 60680

--
This email was brought to you by Hindunet Mail
http://hindunet.com/

ERIDS ADM-03
Add
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM 013

Mail Envelope Properties (4224C635.EB1 : 15 : 16049)

Subject: comments on environmental review of Dominion Resources' application
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:44 PM
From: "brown pride" <desi666@hindunet.com>

Created By: desi666@hindunet.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	381	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 2:44 PM
Mime.822	1185	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
852

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <michael_j_bernier@yahoo.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:28 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

michael bernier
1939 Village Grn S Apt A
Riverside, RI 02915-4017

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM 013

ERIDS- ADM-03
add
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (4224C24D.C40 : 15 : 15424)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:27 PM
From: <michael_j_bernier@yahoo.com>

Created By: michael_j_bernier@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1396	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 2:27 PM
Mime.822	2528	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
853

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <darkj2000@hotmail.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:16 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Jason Pooler
16498 E Alameda Pl Apt 103
Aurora, CO 80017-1119

ERIDS: ADM03
ADD
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4224BF93.A1C : 17 : 14876)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:16 PM
From: <darkj2000@hotmail.com>

Created By: darkj2000@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1392	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 2:16 PM
Mime.822	2518	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3.9.05
(854)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <msalisbury@wesleyan.edu>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:12 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Michelle Salisbury
79 Benjamin Rd
Belmont, MA 02478-2332

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM013

Mail Envelope Properties (4224BE82.8FA : 2 : 14586)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:11 PM
From: <msalisbury@wesleyan.edu>

Created By: msalisbury@wesleyan.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1387	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 2:11 PM
Mime.822	2514	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
855

From: <palmquist@comcast.net>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:01 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

Sincerely,

Elaine Palmquist
762 Shallow Ridge Ct
Abingdon, MD 21009-3016

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4224BC1F.6B6 : 22 : 14006)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 2:01 PM
From: <palmquist@comcast.net>

Created By: palmquist@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1392	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 2:01 PM
Mime.822	2518	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
856

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <syeaman@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 1:50 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Suzanne Yeaman
3323 Woodcreek Dr.

Charlottesville, VA 22911

Mail Envelope Properties (4224B952.562 : 7 : 13666)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 1:49 PM
From: <syeaman@earthlink.net>

Created By: syeaman@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6242	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 1:49 PM
Mime.822	7127	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(857)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: "Diana Parker" <erthshr@comcast.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 1:37 PM
Subject: Draft EIS Comment on North Anna

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by e-mail (sent no later than March 1, 2005) to NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov.

Dear Sir:

The Falls of the James Group Sierra Club (central, southern Virginia) is opposed to the building of additional nuclear reactors in central Virginia and oppose an Early Site Permit (ESP) for Lake Anna. Our membership of 1900 ask that our letter is included in with your comment period of the Draft EIS and ask that as Conservation Chair of our group that you keep me informed of the progress of this case.

The Sierra Club position is that currently, two reactors operating at Lake Anna draws 1.9 million gallons of water per minute from the waters of the South Anna, and discharges hot water back. Hot water has a negative affect on the striped bass, one of the most thermally-sensitive fish species. This statement is supported by VDEQ statement of "a tenuous situation" for the health of the striped bass population. We fear that the maximum daily surface temperature would increase near the dam and intake pipe.

According to the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, "It is likely that even a small increase in reservoir water temperature would have a dramatic effect-further reducing the already limited habitat and perhaps jeopardizing the entire striped bass fishery." We cannot afford this impact on our populations of sport fishery and recreation that Sierrans around the state enjoy.

We definitely have enjoyed the last few years of increased rains, but we know that these have been unusual. We know that increased water withdrawals up to 60% over current conditions would impact recreation to an estimated 43,000 recreational users and also for home water usage during normal or drought conditions. During the 2002 drought, boats could not launch from many of the home and recreation sites so desired by our members.

For Sierrans the nuclear waste storage issue is unresolved, additional plants would only exacerbate this national problem. Our concerns are for insurance and bonding against costs of a major nuclear accident and the dangers of transportation of this spent fuel. Our concerns are for security and safety of our members and citizens of Virginia.
Washington DC is only 90 miles down wind and less than forty from Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Charlottesville where many of our members reside. You must address these concerns, why have citizens been offput on these points?

Also we are concerned that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission admitted two of the arguments--that Dominion had failed to analyze the environmental impact if they took no action at all, and that Dominion had failed to fully analyze the impact of new reactors on the striped bass population in the lake. Again please keep us advised of progress in this case.

ERIDS-ADM.03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template- ADM-013

Sincerely,

Diana C. Parker, Conservation Chair 3/1/05
Falls of the James Group (central Virginia) of the Virginia Chapter Sierra Club
10700 Chalkley Road
Richmond Virginia 23237-4048 804-748-7842
erthshr@comcast.net

Mail Envelope Properties (4224B659.446 : 23 : 13382)

Subject: Draft EIS Comment on North Anna
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 1:38 PM
From: "Diana Parker" <erthshr@comcast.net>

Created By: erthshr@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3206	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 1:38 PM
Mime.822	4287	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

858

From: "Matthew Holland" <meh6j@nrotc.rotc.virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:50 PM
Subject: Propoesed Nuclear Power Plants on Lake Anna

Good afternoon,

I fully support this initiative. I am a Louisa County resident and the benefits to our county and state are extensive. This kind of an initiative must occur if we are to lessen our country's dependence on fossil fuels.

If I could lend an outside perspective, I believe that the health risks associated with a nuclear reactor should be brought to the forefront. If a comparision between coal burning power plants and nuclear power plants were ever fully debated there would be no question to which one is more environmentally friendly. Be proactive and inform as many people as possible.

Respectfully, Matthew Holland

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

ERIDS-ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4224AB42.E8E : 9 : 11918)

Subject: Propoesed Nuclear Power Plants on Lake Anna
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:49 PM
From: "Matthew Holland" <meh6j@nrotc.rotc.virginia.edu>

Created By: meh6j@nrotc.rotc.virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	650	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 12:49 PM
Mime.822	1860	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(859)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <mmgrant@bulldog.unca.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:46 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Mariah Grant
1709 Old Forge Rd.

Charlottesville, VA 22901

Mail Envelope Properties (4224AA55.E1A : 18 : 11802)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:45 PM
From: <mmgrant@bulldog.unca.edu>

Created By: mmgrant@bulldog.unca.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6240	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 12:45 PM
Mime.822	7128	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(860)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <marthaw200@aol.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:16 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Martha Williams
PO Box 13691
Roanoke, VA 24036-3691

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC4)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4224A36B.A52 : 0 : 10834)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:16 PM
From: <marthaw200@aol.com>

Created By: marthaw200@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1382	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 12:16 PM
Mime.822	2505	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(861)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <Cristamor@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:10 PM
Subject: I oppose any new nuclear reactors

NRC Regulators:

I am writing in strong opposition to any new nuclear reactors at North Anna or any location. We can figure out better ways to boil water that do not come with terrorist threats, the destruction of DNA for thousands of years or cancer.

I live within the impact zone of North Anna, and I don't want to pay for the subsidies involved.

Please consider the future.

Rebecca Farris
Charlottesville, VA

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM 013

ER105-ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (4224A1E3.977 : 6 : 10615)

Subject: I oppose any new nuclear reactors
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 12:09 PM
From: <Cristamor@aol.com>

Created By: Cristamor@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	422	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 12:09 PM
TEXT.htm	591	
Mime.822	2152	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(862)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <meswehner@hotmail.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 11:50 AM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Michaela Wehner
2017 23rd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112-2935

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
Add G. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

Mail Envelope Properties (42249D38.6F4 : 13 : 9972)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 11:49 AM
From: <meswehner@hotmail.com>

Created By: meswehner@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1385	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 11:49 AM
Mime.822	2510	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-1-05

863

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: Lisa Shell <lisashell_1995@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 11:46 AM
Subject: Comments on DEIS

Please find attached the unedited remarks I prepared for the 2/17 hearing. As my time was limited, my actual statement at the hearing was a bit shorter.

Thank you,
Lisa Shell
Vice-President, North American-Young Generation in Nuclear
Richmond, Virginia

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Sports - Sign up for Fantasy Baseball.
http://baseball.fantasysports.yahoo.com/

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM 013

ERIDS ADM.03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A Williamson (ARW1)

LAS Remarks at 2/17 NRC Public Hearing

My name is Lisa Shell and I live in Henrico County. I am a nuclear engineer with degrees from the University of Missouri-Rolla and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and have worked in the nuclear industry for 10 years. When I first chose nuclear engineering as a career path, I was fascinated by the science and inspired by the opportunity to contribute to an industry that benefits our society, our health, our economy, and our environment. Although many challenging years of school took the technical mystery away from me, I have remained excited about the benefits of nuclear science and technology. Like many of you, the one issue that concerned me the most was nuclear waste. So, as I progressed in my education I began to concentrate more on waste management. Following my studies, nearly all of my 10 years working in the industry has been focused on spent nuclear fuel management, first defense-related and then commercial.

I am also the Vice-President of the North American-Young Generation in Nuclear (NA-YGN) and a member of the local Virginia section. Many of the local members that are here tonight are residents of Louisa or other immediately surrounding counties. NA-YGN was formed in 1999 as an organization that unites young professionals that share a personal conviction that nuclear science and technology make important and valuable contributions to our society.

One of the group's primary missions is public information. We believe that public discourse often does not give fair play to the benefits of nuclear technology or the truth about solutions to safety and environmental concerns. As young nuclear professionals we are in a unique position to give balance to the issues and share our firsthand knowledge and expertise with our friends, neighbors, elected officials, and media representatives.

As nuclear technology relates to electricity generation, we want to tell everyone the success story that is nuclear power in our country. Nuclear energy is safe, clean, and reliable, and is an important part of a balanced energy mix. Currently, nuclear provides about one-fifth of our nation's electricity and about one third of Virginia's. In Virginia, the power output of the Surry and North Anna plants represent about 7 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions avoided each year.

Furthermore, we support the ESP process as the means to guarantee an open and thorough evaluation of future nuclear projects, while ensuring the timeliness and predictability of the process.

In particular, as nuclear professionals AND as concerned local citizens we concur with the NRC's conclusion that environmental impacts would not prevent issuing an Early Site Permit for the North Anna site.

The Environmental Report of Dominion's ESP application and the NRC's draft Environmental Impact Statement demonstrate in great detail what has become patently obvious in an era of increasing concerns about global warming, air pollution, environmental protection, and industrial safety. That is, in spite of the misinformed and skewed claims of a small minority of career antinuclear activists, nuclear power has perhaps the SMALLEST impact on the environment including water, land, habitat, species and air resources. And LIFE-CYCLE emission analyses show that, per kilowatt-hour, the impact of nuclear energy is among the lowest of ANY form of electricity generation INCLUDING wind and solar.

And as an aside, though we are not here to debate the issue of spent nuclear fuel, I would like to add that as an engineer who has years of experience working and performing research in the management

of nuclear waste, I can say with confidence that the problems of transportation and disposal are political, not technical.

I was tempted to begin presenting a list of facts and figures here but I would rather save the full technical treatment for when my time to speak isn't limited. The matter of nuclear power here in Virginia has become an emotional issue so I want to share with my friends and neighbors some of my own experiences along with some of the facts. Here are things that I know:

- I have seen the scare tactics, skewed data and misinformation that characterize the campaign of career antinuclear ideologues. Recently, two venerated leaders of the Green Movement, James Lovelock in the United Kingdom and Patrick Moore, a founder of Greenpeace, publicly criticized such distortion of the facts. Lovelock has said that the fears these types of antinuclear organizers have about the safety of nuclear energy are "irrational and exaggerated." Moore has said that such groups have "abandoned science and logic in favor of emotion and sensationalism."

- I have found that in many cases, the misinformation campaign is intentional. Ten years ago, I met a scientist from the Natural Resources Defense Council at a public hearing. He must have assumed from my casual appearance that I agreed with his position. This man told me that even if DOE and the NRC could convince him technically that Yucca Mountain was safe, he wouldn't tell his constituency that because it would undermine their goal of forcing the shutdown of all nuclear power plants.

- More recently I was stunned when a physicist speaking for PACE led people to believe that extracting plutonium and making a bomb from spent fuel like that at North Anna was about as easy as a high school chemistry experiment.

- Career antinuclear ideologues continue to trot out Dr. Mangano to scare the public even though his Tooth Fairy study has been debunked by the likes of the Center for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, the NY Times, and the Health departments of New York, Connecticut, and Illinois, just to name a few.

- A young engineer and former colleague of mine was in utero mere miles from the Three Mile Island plant at the time of the 1979 accident. She and many of her high school classmates were born and near TMI in the year following the problems at Unit 2. She told me that they are always perplexed by the exaggerated claims made by antinuclear ideologues . She told me that they would read stories alleging all sorts of alarming effects and they would laugh and wonder what the brouhaha was all about.

- And though I am not speaking for Dominion here tonight, I can tell you my experiences as an employee. Now, I wouldn't claim they are perfect, I would certainly like a higher salary, but I have found the management to be uncompromising when it comes to safety and ethics. As an engineer at Dominion it has been constantly reinforced that I am not only encouraged, but REQUIRED, to bring to management's attention immediately any safety or ethics concern. And in practice, I have done so, particularly in my former position overseeing the fabrication of spent nuclear fuel casks. Even if addressing my concerns meant schedule delays or additional cost, even if in the end my concern was UNFOUNDED, I have always had the support of my management in pursuing questions of safety, design, and ethics.

- And engineers and management are far from the last or only lines of defense. In addition to the inherent and designed safety features of the plants, I know the people that make them work. I have crawled through spent fuel casks with some of the dedicated inspectors whose full-time jobs are to monitor the fabrication of Dominion's critical equipment. I personally know some of the operators and their incredible attention to detail, safety, and peer-checking every time they move fuel. Though they haven't always made my job easy, I personally know the thoroughness of the people that write and review procedures. And my list could go on.

- Antinuclear ideologues like to say that it only takes one person to make a mistake for there to be a catastrophic event. Not only is that patently false, but the opposite is true: If there were something seriously wrong with the plant, it would take only one person to shut it down.

And that brings me to the last item I want to address. For several months now, I've listened to antinuclear extremists claim that severe accidents can happen at power plants at anytime, and that nuclear power poisons the public and the environment. I've realized that they are implying one of two things. They are implying either that all of us who work in the nuclear industry are clueless idiots that blindly go about our own sinister jobs or that we are all greedy mercenaries in collusion with the corporations for which we work.

In fact, last Saturday, at a meeting organized by PACE, Public Citizen, NIRS, and BREDL, the leaders explicitly charged me with either ignorance or greed. Either they are insulting my intelligence and education, or they are insulting my character and integrity. Either way, I am personally offended. My health and safety and that of my family and friends ALWAYS come first. I also believe that we as a society must be good stewards of the environment. I would not work in this industry if it violated these principles and I believe I speak for most if not all of the nuclear professionals here tonight.

Mail Envelope Properties (42249C46.656 : 5 : 9814)

Subject: Comments on DEIS
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 11:45 AM
From: Lisa Shell <lisashell_1995@yahoo.com>

Created By: lisashell_1995@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	422	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 11:45 AM
Public remarks rev 2.doc	31232	
Mime.822	44974	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(864)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <TCOLSEN@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 11:40 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM.03
add J. Lusheng (JKC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM.013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Thomas Olsen
470 Hemlock Road

Salem, VA 24153

Mail Envelope Properties (42249AEA.5A5 : 3 : 9637)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 11:40 AM
From: <TCOLSEN@earthlink.net>

Created By: TCOLSEN@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6228	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 11:40 AM
Mime.822	7113	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(865)

12-16-04
69 FR 71854

From: <asb76@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 10:46 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing
(JXC9)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

A. Williamson
(ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Andy Barton
3422 Kensington Ave.

Apt. 2
Richmond, VA 23221

Mail Envelope Properties (42248E31.EBB : 8 : 7867)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 10:45 AM
From: <asb76@hotmail.com>

Created By: asb76@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6241	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 10:45 AM
Mime.822	7123	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

866

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: Fred Dove <ftd22901@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 3:07 PM
Subject: NO NEW NUCLEAR

What a lovely group of hornswogglers you are ! Seems our government's nose is growing longer than Pinocchio's. Why don't you just tell the TRUTH ? There will come a time when all of your lies are going to catch up with you and I hope that I'm around to escort you to the prison of my choice. Why damage Virginia any more than you already have? I understand that Iran is in the market for your services. Have a happy non-nuclear day, F.T.Dove

---

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Sports - Sign up for Fantasy Baseball.
http://baseball.fantasysports.yahoo.com/

ERIDS-ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template

Mail Envelope Properties (4224CB7B.12C : 0 : 16684)

Subject: NO NEW NUCLEAR
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 3:07 PM
From: Fred Dove <ftd22901@yahoo.com>

Created By: ftd22901@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	610	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 3:07 PM
Mime.822	1673	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(867)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <Kuhlik3@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 10:38 AM
Subject: No more nuclear power

Dear Folks,

Please do not revisit nuclear power!! We still have not adequately cleaned up the waste from previous plants and it is unfair to expect the taxpayers to subsidize the industry.

Sincerely,
Barry Kuhlik
773 Lee Ln.
Fincastle, VA 24090

ERIDS-ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42248C79.DE9 : 23 : 7657)

Subject: No more nuclear power
Creation Date: Tue, Mar 1, 2005 10:38 AM
From: <Kuhlik3@aol.com>

Created By: Kuhlik3@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	431	Tuesday, March 1, 2005 10:38 AM
TEXT.htm	1457	
Mime.822	3032	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(868)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <john@jdconsulting.org>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:07 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

John Dukovich
1201 Pine Hill Rd
Mc Lean, VA 22101-2906

ERIDS - ADM.03
add J Cushing - JXC9
G. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBDA9.473 : 19 : 1139)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:06 PM
From: <john@jdconsulting.org>

Created By: john@jdconsulting.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1385	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:06 PM
Mime.822	2514	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05 (869)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <sewise@marlboro.edu>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:02 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wise
507 W Drive Cir
Richmond, VA 23229-6831

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J Cushing - JXC9
G. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBC88.434 : 6 : 1076)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:01 PM
From: <sewise@marlboro.edu>

Created By: sewise@marlboro.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1381	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:01 PM
Mime.822	2508	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(870)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <drpepper1952@yahoo.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:53 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

David Roth
1303 S Walter Reed Dr Apt 201
Arlington, VA 22204-4932

ERIDS-ADM-03
add
J Cushing — JXC9
A Williamson — ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBA70.3BF : 14 : 959)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:53 PM
From: <drpepper1952@yahoo.com>

Created By: drpepper1952@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1395	Friday, February 25, 2005 6:53 PM
Mime.822	2524	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(871)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <erraticity@mac.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:51 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

kris unger
2200 2nd St N Apt 6
Arlington, VA 22201-1564

ERIDS-ADM-03
add
J. Cushing - JXC9
A. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBA12.3AF : 23 : 943)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:51 PM
From: <erraticity@mac.com>

Created By: erraticity@mac.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1385	Friday, February 25, 2005 6:51 PM
Mime.822	2510	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3.9.05
(872)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <kt123dmb@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:26 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J Cushing - JXC9
A Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Katie Stump
3602 Sherwood Place

Lynchburg, VA 24503

Mail Envelope Properties (421FB415.24E : 20 : 590)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:25 PM
From: <kt123dmb@hotmail.com>

Created By: kt123dmb@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6234	Friday, February 25, 2005 6:25 PM
Mime.822	7121	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(873)

From: <pj3whetstone@hargray.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:18 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Joe Whetstone
10 Hamilton Dr
Bluffton, SC 29909-4437

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM013

ERIDS-ADM-03
cc/bcc J Cushing - JXC9
A Williamson - ARW1

Mail Envelope Properties (421FB21B.1E9 : 19 : 489)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:17 PM
From: <pj3whetstone@hargray.com>

Created By: pj3whetstone@hargray.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1383	Friday, February 25, 2005 6:17 PM
Mime.822	2515	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(874)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <jmthiele@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 11:59 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM 03
Add
J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson
(ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Joanne M. Thiele
201 South Blake Rd.

Norfolk, VA 23505

Mail Envelope Properties (421EB0B2.712 : 18 : 38674)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Thu, Feb 24, 2005 11:58 PM
From: <jmthiele@earthlink.net>

Created By: jmthiele@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6238	Thursday, February 24, 2005 11:58 PM
Mime.822	7128	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
875

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <ajp4y@virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 12:05 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Custering (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

anjili pal
109 shamrock rd

charlottesville, VA 222903

Mail Envelope Properties (421EB221.777 : 19 : 38775)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 12:05 AM
From: <ajp4y@virginia.edu>

Created By: ajp4y@virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6236	Friday, February 25, 2005 12:05 AM
Mime.822	7121	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(876)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <tootallgirl@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 12:34 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Sherri Cook

138 Stonebrake Lane
Winchester, VA 22603

Mail Envelope Properties (421EB8D6.995 : 11 : 39317)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 12:33 AM
From: <tootallgirl@hotmail.com>

Created By: tootallgirl@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6236	Friday, February 25, 2005 12:33 AM
Mime.822	7127	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(877)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <namewon@whro.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 12:38 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS- ADM03
add J Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

As a resident of Lancaster, PA, at the time of the near-meltdown of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant in 1979, I am more than usually sensitive to hazards of nuclear power and what can happen in a population when an accident occurs. Believe me, the risk far outweighs the benefits.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected

increases in energy demands over the coming years.

D.D. Delaney
2450 E. Ocean View Ave., Norfolk, VA, 23518
Norfolk, VA 23518-1111

Mail Envelope Properties (421EB9B9.9D4 : 24 : 39380)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 12:37 AM
From: <namewon@whro.net>

Created By: namewon@whro.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6548	Friday, February 25, 2005 12:37 AM
Mime.822	7437	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(878)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <jambon99@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 1:01 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Ryan Cunningham
11796 Rockaway Ln

Fairfax, VA 22030-7958

Mail Envelope Properties (421EBF24.C0A : 15 : 39946)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 1:00 AM
From: <jambon99@aol.com>

Created By: jambon99@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6240	Friday, February 25, 2005 1:00 AM
Mime.822	7123	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(879)

12/16/04
69 FR 71854

From: <vstroga2@fastmail.fm>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 1:01 AM
Subject: Support North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

I support your plan to build another nuclear power plant. Nuclear energy is far cleaner and more efficient then the feasable alnernatives, whatever the radicals may think. I'm pretty liberal, I'm a member of the ACLU, but on Nuclear power I have to break from my usual stance. Don't let the Enviromental groups get you down. You have nuclear energy supporters who are counting on you!

Andrew Dzikiewicz
7804 Suffolk Court
Alexandria, VA 22315

ERIDS-ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421EBF46.C1A : 6 : 39962)

Subject: Support North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 1:01 AM
From: <vstroga2@fastmail.fm>

Created By: vstroga2@fastmail.fm

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	469	Friday, February 25, 2005 1:01 AM
Mime.822	1270	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(880)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <muchnick@capaccess.org>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 2:52 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add - J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Allen Muchnick

1030 S Barton St #274
Arlington, VA 22204

Mail Envelope Properties (421ED93A.064 : 4 : 41060)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 2:52 AM
From: <muchnick@capaccess.org>

Created By: muchnick@capaccess.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6240	Friday, February 25, 2005 2:52 AM
Mime.822	7130	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(881)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <Dextepayne@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 3:20 AM
Subject: NO ESP for Dominion!

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to OPPOSE granting an Early Site Permit (ESP) to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. The draft Environmental Impact Statement states that construction activities permissible under the ESP may stir up heavy metals and other contaminants in the lake sediment, while details about mitigation measures are murky. Further, other effects on the lake, such as temperature increases and reduced water levels, are not fully analyzed. Finally, questions about the adequacy of current security regulations and performance are ignored, as are issues of waste generation and its safe, permanent isolation.

Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP.

Sincerely,
Dexter Payne
2446 7th St
Boulder, CO 80304

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421EDFAB.1B1 : 12 : 41393)

Subject: NO ESP for Dominion!
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 3:19 AM
From: <Dextepayne@aol.com>

Created By: Dextepayne@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1026	Friday, February 25, 2005 3:19 AM
TEXT.htm	1429	
Mime.822	3612	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(882)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <carruthll@erols.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:09 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lynne Carruth
1048 VanderploegDrive

Chesapeake , VA 23320

Mail Envelope Properties (421F076B.60C : 23 : 46604)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:09 AM
From: <carruthll@erols.com>

Created By: carruthll@erols.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6240	Friday, February 25, 2005 6:09 AM
Mime.822	7126	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(883)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <wildwood56@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:33 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J Cushing - (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

MIKE CRAIG
WILDWOOD RANCH

5464 WHEELERS COVE
Shipman, Va 22971

Mail Envelope Properties (421F0CF1.723 : 2 : 46883)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 6:32 AM
From: <wildwood56@hotmail.com>

Created By: wildwood56@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6245	Friday, February 25, 2005 6:32 AM
Mime.822	7135	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RPB Rec'd
3-9-05

(884)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <gae2k@virginia.edu>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 9:38 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM013

ERIDS-ADM03
add J Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Garrett English
3445 Farmington Dr.

Roanoke, VA 24018

Mail Envelope Properties (421F3846.545 : 20 : 50501)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 9:37 AM
From: <gae2k@virginia.edu>

Created By: gae2k@virginia.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6236	Friday, February 25, 2005 9:37 AM
Mime.822	7121	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(885)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: Alan Carlson <discern@visi.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 9:29 AM
Subject: oppose ESP for Dominion Resources

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to OPPOSE granting an Early Site Permit (ESP) to Dominion Resources to build two new reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral, VA. The draft Environmental Impact Statement states that construction activities permissible under the ESP may stir up heavy metals and other contaminants in the lake sediment, while details about mitigation measures are murky. Further, other effects on the lake, such as temperature increases and reduced water levels, are not fully analyzed. Finally, questions about the adequacy of current security regulations and performance are ignored, as are issues of waste generation and its safe, permanent isolation.

Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP.

Sincerely,

Alan Carlson
Saint Paul, MN

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421F3649.45C : 12 : 50268)

Subject: oppose ESP for Dominion Resources
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 9:29 AM
From: Alan Carlson <discern@visi.com>

Created By: discern@visi.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	836	Friday, February 25, 2005 9:29 AM
Mime.822	1805	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

886

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <john-c@albemarle.org>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 9:15 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget -- costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

John Cruickshank
700 Spring Lake Dr.

Earlysville, VA 22936

Mail Envelope Properties (421F32E8.2E7 : 14 : 49895)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 9:14 AM
From: <john-c@albemarle.org>

Created By: john-c@albemarle.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6241	Friday, February 25, 2005 9:14 AM
Mime.822	7128	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(887)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <emiller72us@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:59 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template- ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Lusher (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

JASON MILLER
4429 DORCHESTER RD

NORTON, VA 24273

Mail Envelope Properties (421F2F4D.0E9 : 4 : 49385)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:59 AM
From: <emiller72us@yahoo.com>

Created By: emiller72us@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6231	Friday, February 25, 2005 8:59 AM
Mime.822	7119	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(888)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <atmanom@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:39 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS - ADM03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Albert Fioretti
RR 3 Box 167A

Howardsville, VA 24562-9302

Mail Envelope Properties (421F2A99.F02 : 17 : 48898)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:39 AM
From: <atmanom@hotmail.com>

Created By: atmanom@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6240	Friday, February 25, 2005 8:39 AM
Mime.822	7126	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(889)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <lilliemilyhoffman@earthlink.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:41 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

E-RIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lilli Hoffman
408 E. Market St. Apt. 301

Charlottesville, VA 22902

Mail Envelope Properties (421F1CE0.A54 : 19 : 47700)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:40 AM
From: <lilliemilyhoffman@earthlink.net>

Created By: lilliemilyhoffman@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6250	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:40 AM
Mime.822	7148	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(890)

From: <canoehag@aol.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:02 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing - (JXC9)
A. Williamson - (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

marsha withers
7504 brisbane dr

richmond, VA 23225

Mail Envelope Properties (421F21E3.B88 : 2 : 48008)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:02 AM
From: <canoehag@aol.com>

Created By: canoehag@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6233	Friday, February 25, 2005 8:02 AM
Mime.822	7116	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3.9.05

(891)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <suehayden@mindspring.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:08 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

And most importantly, it is past time to switch to safe, sustainable alternative energy sources -- oil and nuclear energy are filthy, non-sustainable sources that wreak havoc with the health of all beings on this planet and the planet itself.

Sincerely,

Sue Hayden
605 Parkview Dr
Rocky Mount, VA 24151-4012

ERIDS-ADM-03
add
J. Cushing - JXC9
A. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM 013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBDE8.47E : 5 : 1150)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:07 PM
From: <suehayden@mindspring.com>

Created By: suehayden@mindspring.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1349	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:07 PM
Mime.822	2481	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(892)

From: <efficient_freight@msn.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:38 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget -- costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J Cushing (JXC9)
G Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Joseph Tyrrell
411 Friendship Way

Palmyra , VA 22963

Mail Envelope Properties (421F2A55.ECB : 12 : 48843)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:38 AM
From: <efficient_freight@msn.com>

Created By: efficient_freight@msn.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6236	Friday, February 25, 2005 8:38 AM
Mime.822	7128	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3/9/05

(893)

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

From: <i_kat@hotmail.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:03 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Katherine Hollins
2906 Waterford Way West

Richmond, VA 23233

Mail Envelope Properties (421F2227.BA1 : 2 : 48033)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:03 AM
From: <i_kat@hotmail.com>

Created By: i_kat@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6243	Friday, February 25, 2005 8:03 AM
Mime.822	7127	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

(894)

12-10-04
69 FR 71859

From: <robbertkurtz@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:12 AM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process.

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem.

I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Robert Kurtz
609 Belmont Ave.
Charlottesville, VA 22902

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421F243E.C70 : 9 : 48240)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 8:12 AM
From: <robbertkurtz@yahoo.com>

Created By: robbertkurtz@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1232	Friday, February 25, 2005 8:12 AM
Mime.822	2053	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05

12-10-04
69FR71854

(895)

From: <dlcjmb@peoplepc.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 5:55 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing - JXC9
G. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

David Campbell
1033 Emory Place

Virginia Beach, VA 23464

Mail Envelope Properties (421FACE0.057 : 17 : 87)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 5:55 PM
From: <dlcjmb@peoplepc.com>

Created By: dlcjmb@peoplepc.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6239	Friday, February 25, 2005 5:55 PM
Mime.822	7125	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(896)
12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <cqayaq@flash.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 5:53 PM
Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor

Dear Chief Lesar

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. Among my concerns are:

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels will adversely impact water-based recreational uses of the lake, for example by preventing access to boat launch ramps. Lower lake levels lead to mudflats in the back yards of homes located around the lake, and could decrease property values. The application also fails to sufficiently examine the increase in the lake temperature, which will negatively affect the striped bass population, a popular gaming fish, and other marine organisms. Waters downstream will be affected similarly.

In a time of increased terrorist threat, new nuclear power plants increase physical and economic risks to central Virginia residents, Dominion customers and shareholders, and nuclear industry employees. Al Qaeda is known to have considered nuclear power plants as a target for an attack. Terrorist threats and heightened Threat Advisory Levels (Orange and Red level) may lead to severe restrictions on public access to Lake Anna, which could impact local businesses dependent on public use of the lake. This has already happened at over a dozen lakes with nuclear plants around the country. Adding additional reactors to the North Anna facility could also increase its attractiveness as a terrorist target, increasing the frequency and likelihood of lake closures.

Safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application also doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia or nationally, or the need for new generating capacity. Virginia currently has a surplus of electrical generating capacity, so excess power will likely be sold outside the state rather than being used in-state to lower prices. Local residents will be forced to live with the risks of the nuclear plant without getting the benefits.

The history of nuclear power demonstrates that constructing nuclear reactors is expensive, with final costs often running billions of dollars over budget – costs that are often passed on to ratepayers. The first 75 reactors constructed in the U.S. had a combined cost overrun of over $100 billion. The average reactor ran 400% over budget and was over 4 years late in start up. The last reactor in the U.S. to be completed, the Watts Bar plant in Tennessee, was finally opened in 1996, 23 years after it was first proposed. It cost $8 billion.

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

ERIDS-ADM-03
add'g Cushing - JXC9
G. Williamson - ARW1

Renewable energy sources such as wind power create more jobs per investment dollar than does nuclear power. Those jobs also require less specialized education, increasing the chances that local workers will be able to secure the jobs rather than requiring outside experts.

A major nuclear accident could leave an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable for decades. The area around the Chernobyl nuclear plant, site of a major accident in 1986, is still closed to public access and radiation levels are still high. Cleanup costs for a major nuclear accident are estimated to be around $500 billion, not including broader economic shockwaves. The nuclear industry's liability for such an accident is capped at around $10 billion, leaving taxpayers with a $490 billion bill, ratepayers with a bankrupt utility, and surviving residents without a home.

Nearly 3½ years after September 11th, 2001, legislation to improve security at nuclear plants has not been enacted, and security improvements by the nuclear industry have been shown to have significant gaps and flaws. Security guards are often ill-trained and ill-equipped. Mock assaults designed to test guards and keep them on their toes are often done in an unrealistic manner, with months of advanced warning, and with added security forces that are not normally present to defend against a real attack.

There is at this time no solution to the problem of nuclear waste, and constructing new reactors will only worsen that problem. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada will not open until 2010 at the earliest, but even industry experts feel 2015 is a more realistic best-case scenario. That doesn't count the remaining scientific questions about the suitability of the site, and the half-dozen lawsuits currently pending – any of which could send the U.S. Department of Energy back to the drawing board. Even if the facility were to open as scheduled, it's not large enough to hold even the amount of waste expected to be generated by currently-operating plants. Waste from new plants will require a new repository. Meanwhile, all the highly-radioactive irradiated fuel from the plants will continue to be stored on-site.

Emergency plans for dealing with an accident or terrorist attack are inadequate, and rely on teachers, bus drivers, doctors, and other civilians to facilitate an evacuation, without taking into account the possibility of role abandonment. Studies of the Three Mile Island accident, which took place in 1979 in Pennsylvania, found that doctors and other key workers abandoned their posts up to 25 miles from the site to tend to their families or save themselves. In the case of a more severe accident, heroic actions would be required to successfully carry out an evacuation.

In light of these concerns, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Gregory Doggett
13415 Deer Creek Rd.

Ashland, VA 23005

Mail Envelope Properties (421FAC80.047 : 1 : 71)

Subject: Oppose North Anna Nuclear Reactor
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 5:53 PM
From: <cqayaq@flash.net>

Created By: cqayaq@flash.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6237	Friday, February 25, 2005 5:53 PM
Mime.822	7120	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05 (897)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <lovecatz69@yahoo.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:10 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

We need to start investing in clean renewable energy - not nuclear!!! We need to leave a cleaner earth for our children's, children's children,

Sincerely,

Eliza Beth Engle
5 E Monroe Ave Apt 210
Alexandria, VA 22301-1978

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

ERIDS - ADM-03
add
J Cushing - JXC9
A. Williamson - ARW1

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBE85.492 : 0 : 1170)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:10 PM
From: <lovecatz69@yahoo.com>

Created By: lovecatz69@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1541	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:10 PM
Mime.822	2670	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3-9-05
(898)
12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <murphy1870@aol.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:10 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Margaret Murphy
2209 Magnolia Grove Way
Midlothian, VA 23113-4904

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

ERIDS- ADM03
add
J. Cushing - JXC9
G. Williamson - ARW1

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBE85.493 : 1 : 1171)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:10 PM
From: <murphy1870@aol.com>

Created By: murphy1870@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1396	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:10 PM
Mime.822	2522	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Rec'd
3/9/05 (899)

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

From: <tkrakes@adelphia.net>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:16 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

Lake Anna cannot physically support the addition of new reactors. Dominion's Early Site Permit application does not adequately address the increased water use associated with new reactors, which will cause the lake level to drop significantly and will raise water temperatures harming game fish.

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

Karen Rakes
621 Southview Ct Apt H
Culpeper, VA 22701-3787

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing - JXC9
A. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template: ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FBFC8.4F0 : 19 : 1264)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:15 PM
From: <tkrakes@adelphia.net>

Created By: tkrakes@adelphia.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1389	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:15 PM
Mime.822	2517	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB rec'd
3/9/04 (900)

From: <jpmorgan2@aol.com>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:48 PM
Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit

12-10-04
69 FR 71854

Dear US Nuclear Regulatory Comm,

Please register my opposition to any plans by Dominion to build any new nuclear reactors at its North Anna nuclear power station in Virginia. The site is unsuitable, and many important factors are not being considered in the decision of whether to approve Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the site. Constructing new reactors would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers. I urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit, and for Dominion to instead focus on finding alternative methods of addressing expected increases in energy demands over the coming years.

I live only a few miles from the existing plant, and have always had concerns about my safety and health from living so close to a nuclear plant. I remember 3 Mile Island, and Chernobyl all too well. My fiance lived in the Ukraine during the time of the explosion, and has horror stories, and long term health problems as a reult of living within 60 miles of the plant.
Also, I do not wish to see G.W. Bush and the DOE blow another 200 million of my tax money to cover the cost of new permits for this proposed facility on behalf of Dominion Power. Cutting the deficit, MY ASS!

Additionally, safer, cheaper alternatives to new nuclear generating capacity are not being explored as part of the Early Site Permit process. The ESP application doesn't consider what the effect might be on the cost of power in Virginia, or the need for new generating capacity.

Sincerely,

John Morgan
208 Robertson Ave
Charlottesville, VA 22903-3645

ERIDS-ADM-03
add J. Cushing - JXC9
A. Williamson - ARW1

SISP Review Complete
Template-ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (421FC756.665 : 17 : 1637)

Subject: DENY Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Fri, Feb 25, 2005 7:47 PM
From: <jpmorgan2@aol.com>

Created By: jpmorgan2@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1673	Friday, February 25, 2005 7:47 PM
Mime.822	2797	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard