

12/10/04 RDS received

From: "Jean Sideris" <jean@envirocitizen.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 3:03 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

①

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 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,

Jean Sideris
148 Powderhouse Blvd # 1
Somerville, MA 02144-1624
USA
jean@envirocitizen.org

SESP Renew Complete

*E-RDS = ADM-03
adm = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)*

1

Template = ADM-013

12/11/04 RSD received

From: "Amanda Snyder" <amanda@envirocitizen.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 3:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69FR71854

(2)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Amanda Snyder
115 B Cleveland
Charlottesville, VA 22903
USA
amanda@envirocitizen.org

ESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-213

2

F-REDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

*12/10/04
ADD received*

From: "Chandra Sigmund" <chandra@chandrasrealm.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69 FR 7854*

(3)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Chandra Sigmund
418 Milford St Apt H
Glendale, CA 91203-2756
USA
chandra@chandrasrealm.com

*SISP. Better Complete
template = ADM-013*

3

*E-REDS = ADM-03
ack = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (FRW1)*

12/11/04 RDB received

From: "Dale Richard Felker, III" <drf8f@virginia.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(4)

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,

Dale Richard Felker, III
1 Valley Cir
Charlottesville, VA 22903
USA
drf8f@virginia.edu

*SESP Review Complete
Temp late = ADM-013*

4

*E-RDBS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A Williamson (AKW)*

12/11/04 RTDS received

From: "Alex Balboa" <alexbalboa@fastmail.fm>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(5)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Alex Balboa
1996 Waverly Drive
Bel Air, MD 21015-1100
USA
alexbalboa@fastmail.fm

SESP Review Complete

Template = ASD-013

5

F-RTDS = ASD-03
Cdr = J. Curbish (JXCF)
A. Williamson (AWWI)

RDS received 12/10/04

From: "Robert Rutkowski" <r_e_rutkowski@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

(6)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Robert Rutkowski
2527 SE Faxon Ct
Topeka, KS 66605-2086
USA
r_e_rutkowski@hotmail.com

*5/5/05 Review Complete
Template ADM-013*

6

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

12/14/04
RDB

From: "Ron Richards" <richards@email.arizona.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69 FR 71834

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(7)

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,

Ron Richards
1546 E Blackledge Dr
Tucson, AZ 85719-2663
USA
richards@email.arizona.edu

SSP Better Complete
Template = ADM-013

7
E-RFDs = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWS)

12/14/04

AJB received

From: "Ryan Davis" <ryansdavis@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

8

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Ryan Davis
225 W Verdugo Ave Apt 203
Burbank, CA 91502
USA
ryansdavis@yahoo.com

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

F-RIDS = ADM-03

*Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williams (AW1)*

*RDB received
12/14/04*

From: "Peter Buck" <peter.buck@eds.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 7854
9*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Peter Buck
4901 Pole Rd
Alexandria, VA 22309-1727
USA
peter.buck@eds.com

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

9

*E-RFDS = ADM-03
Adm = J. Cushing (SXC)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

12/14/04
BDO received

From: "Stephen Dunne" <sjdunnejr@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 4:53 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
10

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Stephen Dunne
7 Marsh Ave
Worcester, MA 01605-2214
USA
sjdunnejr@yahoo.com

EIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

10

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

12/14/04
BDD Resurval

From: "Kelly Riley" <khanlon74@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FR 71854

(11)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kelly Riley
154 Montgomery Dr
Harleysville, PA 19438
USA
khanlon74@yahoo.com

ESFP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

11

E-RTDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JC09)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/10/04 BDO received

From: "Marilyn Williams" <m.snead@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(12)

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,

Marilyn Williams
4696 Lower River Rd
Lewiston, NY 14092-1055
USA
m.snead@earthlink.net

SISP Better Complete

Temp Cite = ADM-013

12

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Curbish (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)*

12/11/04 BDB Received

From: "Meaghan Patrick" <meggie_p85@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
(13)*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Meaghan Patrick
44 Silverthorne Bush Dr.
Toronto, ON M9C 2X8
Canada
meggie_p85@hotmail.com

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

13

*F-REDS = ADU-03
Call = J. Cochran (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AEW1)*

RDG received 12/14/04

From: "Ana Najera Mendoza" <anajeramendo@macalester.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FR 71854
14

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Ana Najera Mendoza
Macalester College
1600 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
USA
anajeramendo@macalester.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

14

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC?)
A. Williamson (AR601)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Andrew Leonard" <andy@cryptogamic.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854
15

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Andrew Leonard
2600 Fairview Ave E Apt 2
Seattle, WA 98102-3241
USA
andy@cryptogamic.org

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

15

E-RDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williamson (AEM1)

12/14/04 BDB received

From: "Valerie Soza" <valsoza@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(16)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Valerie Soza
500 NW 60th St Apt 1
Seattle, WA 98107-2158
USA
valsoza@msn.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013

16

E-RIDS = ADU-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (FRW2)

RDB received 12/14/04

From: "Andrew Janicki" <ajani810@uwsp.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

(17)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Andrew Janicki
2127A Ellis St
Stevens Point, WI 54481-3811
USA
ajani810@uwsp.edu

*ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

17

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

10/14/04 BDB/curtel

From: "Dawn Winalski" <dwinalski@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

10/10/04

69 FR 71854

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(98)

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,

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

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADH-013

18

E-RFDS = ADH-03

Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (AW's)

10/14/04
RDB observed

From: "Elizabeth Field" <emfield@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(99)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Elizabeth Field
102 Wolfes Neck Rd
Freeport, ME 04032-5317
USA
emfield@hotmail.com

ESRP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-EPIS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JRC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

12/14/04 RDB *Beaure*

From: "Beka Wilson" <bexta63@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854
20

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Beka Wilson
751 E 9th Ave
Denver, CO 80203-3377
USA
bexta63@hotmail.com

SFSR Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

20

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

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Kim Burgess" <khburgess@uofu.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69PR 71854

(21)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kim Burgess
2831 Saint Marys Way
Salt Lake City, UT 84108
USA
khburgess@uofu.net

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

21

FRIDS = ADM-03
add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ACW1)

12/11/04 KDB/Reconsider

From: "Stephanie Sims" <starr77777@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
691-R 71854
(92)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Stephanie Sims
2333 Warwick Dr
Oldsmar, FL 34677
USA
starr77777@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

22

ELIDS-ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWM)

4/11/04 RJB received

From: "nancy spears" <wolffree1@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FB 71854
(23)*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

nancy spears
15 Southgate Dr
Bossier City, LA 71112
USA
wolffree1@aol.com

*SESF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

23

*E-EIS = ADM-03
Cdd = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (APWT)*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Stewart Rosenkrantz" <srosenkr@bellsouth.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FR71854

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(24)

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,

Stewart Rosenkrantz
2319 SE 9th St
Pompano Beach, FL 33062
USA
srosenkr@bellsouth.net

STSP Review complete

Temp Ltr = ADM-013

24

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

12/14/04 R7Bkucered

From: "Betty J. Van Wicklen" <g10121@care2.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(25)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

25

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JCC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Thomas Kay" <tkay@umich.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 5:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FR 71854

(26)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Thomas Kay
824 S. Boulevard St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301
USA
tkay@umich.edu

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

26

E-REDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/11/04 RDB Resured

From: "Stacey Lightfoot" <slightfoot23@planet-save.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR71854
(27)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Stacey Lightfoot
76 Ronald Dr
Burlington, NJ 08016
USA
slightfoot23@planet-save.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Est = J. Cushing (JCO9)
A. Williamson (AKWE)

SESF Review Complete

27

Template - ADM-013

12/14/04 ADBkuree

From: "Ed Devitt" <tylodevitt@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854

28

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Ed Devitt
3228 N Galloway Ave Apt 812
Mesquite, TX 75150-4381
USA
tylodevitt@msn.com

SIS Review Complete

Template = ADH-013

28

E-RIDS = ADH-03
Call = J. Curbish (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)

12/14/04 KDB received

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

(29)

From: "Heidi Rood" <heidi.rood@sympatico.ca>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:12 PM
Subject: Say No to the North Anna nuclear project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

Please reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project. I am writing to ask you 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,

Heidi Rood
10 Daniels Rd
Mendon, MA 01756-1336
USA
heidi.rood@sympatico.ca

5158 Review Complete
Template = ADH-013

29

E-REDS = ADH-03
ack = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AW1)

12/14/04 RTD received

From: "Sue Sjolín" <suesjolin@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

30

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Sue Sjolín
8031 Danette Ct
Spring, TX 77379
USA
suesjolin@hotmail.com

30

SSSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RFD5 = ADM-03
Card = J. Arching (JRC 9)
A. Williamson (AW01)

12/14/04 RDB/covered

From: "Michael Bennett" <resolver33@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(31)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Michael Bennett
1711 W 69th St Apt 4
Cleveland, OH 44102
USA
resolver33@yahoo.com

SESP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

31

F-RTDS = ADM-03
all = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

12/14/04. RDB reviewed

From: "KL Matlock" <KLMatlock@earthlink.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:32 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04**69FR 71854**32*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

KL Matlock
 895 Jackson St
 San Jose, CA 95112-3011
 USA
 KLMatlock@earthlink.net

*SISP Review Complete**Template = ADM-013***32***F-PROS = ADM-03**Call = J. Curbney (JRC9)**A. Williamson (ARW1)*

12/14/04 RDD received

From: "Merrill Cole" <merrillcole@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:32 PM
Subject: Please Find an Alternative to the North Anna Nuclear Project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
33

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,

Merrill Cole
15211 Highway 77
Panama City, FL 32409-2661
USA
merrillcole@earthlink.net

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

33

E-SPDS = ADM-03

Coord = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 BDB received

From: "Kevin Laffey" <illum@comcast.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 6:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FK 71854
34

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kevin Laffey
5670 Holly Oak Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90068
USA
illum@comcast.net

EIS Review Complete

Temp. Cont. = ADM-013

34

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

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Clancey Kilcoyne" <ckilcoyn@vfna.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
35

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,

Clancey Kilcoyne
8167 Southwestern Blvd Apt 248
Dallas, TX 75206-2014
USA
ckilcoyn@vfna.com

STSD Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

35

E-RFDS = ADM-03

Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A-Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 JDB received

From: "Mark Johnson" <ninmar@mindspring.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
36

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,

Mark Johnson
141 E 3rd St Apt 8E
New York, NY 10009
USA
ninmar@mindspring.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

36

E-RIDS = ADM-03
All = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)

12/14/04 RDO received

From: "Lesley Bensinger" <Labmu@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854
37*

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,

Lesley Bensinger
1605 Shimer Ave
Bethlehem, PA 18018-4723
USA
Labmu@aol.com

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*37 E-RIDS = ADM-03
Att = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

12/14/04
ADB received

From: "Nate Beuttenmueller" <beuttenmuellern@ripon.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
38

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,

Nate Beuttenmueller
600 Campus Dr Unit 61
Ripon, WI 54971-1400
USA
beuttenmuellern@ripon.edu

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADU-013

38

E-EDS = ADU-03
All = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

12/14/04
BDB received

From: "Kris McCradic" <krisccradic@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
39

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,

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

SFSR Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

39

E-RFDs = ADM-03
Ack = J. Quibing (JRC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 ADB received

From: "Barbara L Wood" <barbara@dobsis.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
40

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,

Barbara L Wood
PO Box 423
Burley, WA 98322
USA
barbara@dobsis.org

ESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

40

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWS)

12/14/04 ADJ received

From: "Kevin Vaught" <klvaught@bellsouth.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 7:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FR 71854

(41)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kevin Vaught
505 Oak Forest Cir
Antioch, TN 37013-1842
USA
klvaught@bellsouth.net

ST of Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

41

E-RIDE-ADM-03
Cee - J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

10/14/04 RDB received

From: "Steve Summers" <ssum@vcn.bc.ca>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

42

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.

California was able to eliminate the construction of many nuclear power plants years ago through conservation programs.

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,

Steve Summers
8349 Laurelridge Rd
San Diego, CA 92120
USA
ssum@vcn.bc.ca

5758 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

42

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (AWW1)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Sally Simpson" <sally.simpson@sbcglobal.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

43

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Sally Simpson
326 Crooked Crk
Garland, TX 75043-3100
USA
sally.simpson@sbcglobal.net

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

43

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

12/14/04 R. Williamson

From: "martha leahy" <martha638@webtv.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69FK 71854

(114)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

martha leahy
39 Lockeland Rd
Winchester, MA 01890-3341
USA
martha638@webtv.net

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

44

E-KIDS = ADM-03

add = J. Cushing (JX09)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 BDB received

From: "Martha Waltman" <marthawaltman@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

115

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,

Martha Waltman
PO Box 643
Newberry, FL 32669-0643
USA
marthawaltman@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

45

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (AEWI)

12/14/04 RDB

From: "Corina Anderson" <meloncollie78@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
46

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,

Corina Anderson
600 McLaughlin Dr # 28
Santa Cruz, CA 95064-1086
USA
meloncollie78@hotmail.com

SIOP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013

46 E-RDS = ADU-03
u = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williams (ARWS)

12/14/04 BDB *unclear*

From: "Mitchell Maness" <mitchellmaness@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
47

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Mitchell Maness
2800 Knight St Apt 1
Dallas, TX 75219-6249
USA
mitchellmaness@earthlink.net

ESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

47 E-RFDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 BDBkousal

From: "Charles Alvarez" <caaps6m@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FC 71854
48

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Charles Alvarez
8550 Forest Pkwy Apt 2M
Woodhaven, NY 11421
USA
caaps6m@yahoo.com

SIS & Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

48

E-REDS = ADM-03
Addr = J. Cushing (5X09)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 RDD received

From: "Shyla Raghav" <supershyler@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

695R 71854

49

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Shyla Raghav
5 Morning Star
Irvine, CA 92612-3746
USA
supershyler@hotmail.com

SISP Review - Complete
Template - ADM-013

49

E-RJDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Quelling (JXC9)
Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 RD3 received

From: "Richard Spotts" <spotts@infowest.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 8:52 PM
Subject: Please reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

50

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

Please reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project. It would be wrong to issue this permit on the highly speculative grounds that it will not adversely impact the environment.

Please also carefully examine the "cradle to grave" 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 at least some 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 very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard Spotts
1125 W Emerald Dr
Saint George, UT 84770-6026
USA
spotts@infowest.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

50

*F-RIDS = ADM-03
All = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARWL)*

12/14/04 ADD reviewed

From: "Dorothea Fransson" <dfransso@tulane.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(51)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Dorothea Fransson
MR 812
31 McAlister
New Orleans, LA 70118
USA
dfransso@tulane.edu

STSP Review Complete
template = ADM-013

51

E-RFDS = ADM - 03
Call = J. Cushing (JRC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)

12/14/04 RBB received

From: "rachel atwood" <ra892@bard.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69 FR 71554
52

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

rachel atwood
69 Pomeroy Ln
Amherst, MA 01002-2905
USA
ra892@bard.edu

52

SISF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RTDS = ADM-03
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 RD B secured

From: "BettyJean Herner" <Kitrynak@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854
53

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

BettyJean Herner
9087 Prospect Rd
Strongsville, OH 44149-1304
USA
Kitrynak@aol.com

53

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARWI)

ESRP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

12/11/04 KDBurkhardt

From: "kerry burkhardt" <muddydog69@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(54)

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,

kerry burkhardt
182 Ferndale Ave
Kenmore, NY 14217
USA
muddydog69@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

54

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW3)*

Template = ADM-013

12/14/04 RDD received

From: "Beth Goldstone" <bg003k@mail.rochester.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69FR 71854
(55)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Beth Goldstone
3037 Kathleen Ln
Flossmoor, IL 60422
USA
bg003k@mail.rochester.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

55 E-RIDS = ADM-03
D = J. Cochran (9XC9)
A. Williamson (ACW1)

12/10/04 RDB received

From: "Marina Spitkovskaya" <moonsidhe@gmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:22 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(56)

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Marina Spitkovskaya
 125 Dwight St
 New Haven, CT 06511-4501
 USA
 moonsidhe@gmail.com

56

E-REDS = ADM-03
Ed. J. Coughlin (3109)
G. Williamson (Aews)

STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Candace Johnson" <canjohnson@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 7185A

57

Dear NRC,

Please reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be detrimental to the environment. Lake temperature will be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Thank you,
Candace Johnson

Sincerely,

Candace Johnson
10466 Moselle St
San Diego, CA 92131-1419
USA
canjohnson@aol.com

STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

57

E-RIDS = ADM-03
re = J. Cushing (JCS)
A. Williamson (NEWS)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Ben Reed" <anarchyscapitalist@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 11:52 PM
Subject: Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

58

Dear NRC,

I write today to 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,

Ben Reed
3 Saddlewood Ct
Hilton Head Island, SC 29926-2607
USA
anarchyscapitalist@hotmail.com

copy Ben Reed Complete
Temp Cite = ADM-013

58

E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Arching (JXC9)
cc = A. Williamson (AW01)

12/14/04

ADD received

From: "Kathleen Mikulski" <kmyski@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

59

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,

Kathleen Mikulski
55 Sewall Ave # PHB
Brookline, MA 02446-5249
USA
kmyski@hotmail.com

5/23/05 Berke Complete
Template = ADM-013

59 E-VIDS = ADM-03
= J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (AW1)

*12/14/04
BDB received*

From: "Thomas Matsuda" <matsudat@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 9:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

60

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,

Thomas Matsuda
655 Roaring Brook Rd
Conway, MA 01341
USA
matsudat@yahoo.com

SISF Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

60

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
File = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)*

12/11/04 ASD/Kourne

From: "Wanda S. Ballentine" <wsb2001@adelphia.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 10:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69PR 71854
61

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,

Wanda S. Ballentine
1195 Sylvania Rd
Cleveland Heights, OH 44121-2523
USA
wsb2001@adelphia.net

61 E-RFDs = ADM-03
rel = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISF Review Complete
template = ADM-013

12/11/04 RDB secured

From: "Phillip Rockey" <philrockey@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 10:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
62*

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,

Phillip Rockey
547 Del Rio Cir
Oakdale, CA 95361-2531
USA
philrockey@hotmail.com

SFSB Better Complete

Template=ADU-013

62

*FRIDS=ADU-03
cc = J. Canning (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AW1)*

12/11/04 BDB received

From: "Warren Wright" <wwwright@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 10:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(63)*

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,

Warren Wright
1011 Stanford Ave
Oakland, CA 94608-2317
USA
wwwright@earthlink.net

*SISP Better Complete
Template = ADH-013*

63

*E-RFS = ADH-03
cc = J. Cushing (JKC9)
A. Williamson (AW1)*

12/14/04 RDD received

From: "Neil Asselin" <nasselin3@comcast.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 11:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 7185H
64

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,

Neil Asselin
47545 American Way Drive
Macomb, MI 48044-2511
USA
nasselin3@comcast.net

523P Better Complete
Template = ADU-013

64 = RFDs = ADU-03
= J. Cushing (JXC9)
= A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 BJB received

From: "Claire Watson" <ce99watson@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 11:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
65*

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,

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

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADU-013

*65 E-RIDS = ADU-03
C = J. Cushing (JYC9)
Williamson (AEW1)*

10/14/04 RTB/muse

From: "Michael Mihok" <largo31@redjellyfish.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 2004 11:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 08, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

10/10/04

69FR 71854

66

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,

Michael Mihok
792 Atlantic City Blvd
Bayville, NJ 08721-3030
USA
largo31@redjellyfish.net

EIS p. 8, Renew Complete
template = ADU-013

66

E-RIDS = ADU-03
= J. Cushing (CJX09)
J. Williamson (ARW16)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Sarah Kendall" <bohemia82@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854*

(67)

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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 lifefoms 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,

Sarah Kendall
296 Missouri Ave
Herndon, VA 20170-5421
USA
bohemia82@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADU-013

*F-RIDS = ADU-03
67 = J. Arching (JAC9)
J. Williamson (JRW1)*

10/11/04 ARB received

From: "Barbara Singer" <barbsinger6260@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

68

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

SISF Banner Complete

Template = ADM-013

68

5-BDS = ADM-03
LL = J. Curborg (JX09)
J. Williamson (ARW)

12/14/04 BTB/received

From: "Khaalen East" <keast@lclark.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(69)

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Khaalen East
MSC# 1993
0615 SW Palatine Hill Rd.
Portland, OR 97219
USA
keast@lclark.edu

STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

69

RTOS = ADM-03
- J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Michael Evans" <c_thomas_flood@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FE 71854
(70)

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Michael Evans
1406 Humboldt St
Denver, CO 80218-2310
USA
c_thomas_flood@hotmail.com

70

E-RIDS=ADM-OB
Call = J. Cushing (5XC-9)
A. Williamson (AR101)

SESP Better Complete
Template = ADM-013

12/14/04 BDB received

From: "Jane Kimbrough" <janekimbro@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854-
(71)*

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,

Jane Kimbrough
906 Via Casitas
Greenbrae, CA 94904
USA
janekimbro@aol.com

71

*E-RIDS = ADU-03
L = J. Oushing (JYC9)
A. Williamson (AP-W1)*

*ESIP Review Complete
Transphoto = ADU-013*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Ann Hardy" <aaa@strato.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 7:12 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR. 71854
72

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,

Ann Hardy
2009 Lakewood Dr
Sebring, FL 33872-4000
USA
aaa@strato.net

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

72

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = S. Covelung (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Sandy Eichert" <seichert@horizon-productions.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 9:12 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
73

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,

Sandy Eichert
7104 Bluecrest Dr
Cincinnati, OH 45230
USA
seichert@horizon-productions.com

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RDS = ADM-03
= J. Cushing (JXC9)
73 = J. Williamson (ACWI)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Adrienne Moumin" <Photowonder2010@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

74

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Adrienne Moumin
2807 Byron St
Silver Spring, MD 20902-2606
USA
Photowonder2010@hotmail.com

SESP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

74
F-RIDS = ADM-03
C = J. Cochran (JRC 9)
A Williamson (ARW)

12/11/04 BDB/curved

From: "Kirk Rhoads" <kirkrhoads@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

10/10/04
69FR 71854

(75)

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kirk Rhoads
301 Cooper St
Mountain Home, AR 72653
USA
kirkrhoads@hotmail.com

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

75

E-RIDS = BDM-03
cc = J. Cushing (EXC9)
I. Williamson (ARW1)

12/11/04 RDB received

From: "Scot Phillips" <bittersweettooth@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:12 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
691-R 71857
76

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Scot Phillips
500 E 61 Terr
Kansas City, MO 64110
USA
bittersweettooth@msn.com

F-RDS = ADM-03

76

ACC = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW2)

315P Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "ROGER KEMPTON" <rogkempton20002000@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:32 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
6917C 71854
77

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,

ROGER KEMPTON
55 W Prospect St
Nanuet, NY 10954-2622
USA
rogkempton20002000@yahoo.com

SISF Review Complete

77

E-XFDS = ADM 03
Jed = J. Quehning (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)

Template = ADM 013

12/11/04 BDB received

From: "Debbie Burack" <dhurwitz@prodigy.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:42 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
697R 71854
78*

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,

Debbie Burack
225 E 46th St
New York, NY 10017
USA
dhurwitz@prodigy.net

STSP - Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

78

*F-REIDS = ADM-03
- J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ACWI)*

12/14/04 BDB/revurd

From: "Christopher Hargrove" <HargroveFire368@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:52 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854
79

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Christopher Hargrove
3534 S Haven Rd
Knoxville, TN 37920
USA
HargroveFire368@aol.com

ESF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

79 E-RIDS = ADM-03
= J. Cochran (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Jamie Brown" <mosejam@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 11:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 17185H

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

80

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,

Jamie Brown
1785 Halbro Dr
Marietta, GA 30062-1926
USA
mosejam@yahoo.com

ESP Review Completed

Template = ADH-013

80

E-RFDS - ADH-03
All = J. Bushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Sandra Wagner" <sandy1@bright.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 11:12 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*10/10/04
69 FR 71854*

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(81)

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,

Sandra Wagner
126 Avenue B
Bryan, OH 43506
USA
sandy1@bright.net

*EIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

81

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

10/14/04 RDB

From: "Janice Foss" <libraj@comcast.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 11:12 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

10/10/04
69FR 71854

82

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Janice Foss
633 Richmond St
El Cerrito, CA 94530-3212
USA
libraj@comcast.net

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

82

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

12/14/04 RDBKucurid

From: "Judith Carlson" <judie_carlson@cnt.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 11:22 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04
694271854*

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

83

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,

Judith Carlson
1
Maple Grove, MN 55369
USA
judie_carlson@cnt.com

E-EIS = ADM-03

*cc = J. Cushing (5009)
A. Williamson (7001)*

83

*ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

12/11/04 RD B. Reconsider

From: "Jerry Dalton" <gdalton@worldnet.att.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 11:32 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04
6972 71854*

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

84

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,

Jerry Dalton
874 Benedetti Dr Apt 202
Naperville, IL 60563
USA
gdalton@worldnet.att.net

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

84

*ECFDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Ousbrug (JX09)
A. Williams (ARW1)*

10/14/04 RDO received

From: "Anthony Sanchez" <anthony@envirocitizen.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 11:52 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*10/10/04
69FR71854*

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

85

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,

Anthony Sanchez
91 Kenrock Rdg
San Antonio, TX 78254-2520
USA
anthony@envirocitizen.org

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

85

*ECDS = ADM-03
add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Michelle Palladine" <mpalladine@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 12:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854
86

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Michelle Palladine
2825 E Tahquitz Canyon Way
Palm Springs, CA 92262-6906
USA
mpalladine@earthlink.net

FRIDS = ADM-03

cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (ARUM)

86

SESP Review Complete
template = ADM-013

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Doug Finkelburg" <doca21@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 12:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FR.71854

87

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Doug Finkelburg
910 1/2 E E St
Moscow, ID 83843-3226
USA
doca21@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADU-013

87

FBIIS = ADU-03

cc = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williamson (AKW1)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Brendan Hoffman" <bhoffman@citizen.org>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 12:17 PM
Subject: January 19 public meeting

12/10/04

69PR 71854

88

I would like to register to speak.

Brendan Hoffman
Organizer, Nuclear Energy & Waste
Critical Mass Energy and Environment Program
Public Citizen
p: 202.454.5130
f: 202.547.7392
bhoffman@citizen.org
www.citizen.org/cmep

STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

88

ERFDS = ADM-03
See = J. Quinlan (SAC9)
A. Williamson (AKI2)

12/14/04 BDB received

From: "Heidi Holeman" <lewru@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 12:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69712 71854
89

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Heidi Holeman
1503 Barkley St
Norman, OK 73071
USA
lewru@hotmail.com

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

89

R-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (5x09)
A. Williamson (ARU1)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Sheila Ward" <asopao@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 12:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(90)

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Sheila Ward
265 Calle Sorbona Apt 2
San Juan, PR 00927-4106
USA
asopao@yahoo.com

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

90

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Del = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 BDB received

From: "Chell D Pfeffer" <thetreehugger@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 1:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69PR 71857
(91)

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,

Chell D Pfeffer
8125 Stewarts Ferry Pike
Mount Juliet, TN 37122
USA
thetreehugger@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete -
Template = ADU-813

E-RIDS = ADU-03
91 cc = J. Cushing (JRC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

10/14/04 RDB received

From: "Joanna F. Welch" <joannawelch@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 1:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69PC 71854

92

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,

Joanna F. Welch
PO Box 7584
Yellowtail, MT 59035-7584
USA
joannawelch@hotmail.com

SIsp Review Complete -

Template = ADA-013

E-RFD5 = ADA-03

92

cc = J. Carlsberg (SXC)
A. Williamson (FRWI)

12/14/04 RDB reserved

From: "Patricia Larch" <yona_@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 1:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854

93

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Patricia Larch
507 N Brunswick Ave
South Hill, VA 23970-1601
USA
yona_@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

93

FRDS=ADM03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (FRWI)

12/10/04 RDB received

From: "Andrea Cimino" <amcimino9@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 2:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
(94)*

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,

Andrea Cimino
9908 Killarney Ln Apt 101
Gaithersburg, MD 20877
USA
amcimino9@aol.com

*ESP Better Complete
Template - ADU-813*

94

*FRIDS - ADU-813
Call - J. Cushing (JXC9)
Addr - A. Williamson (ARW1)*

10/14/04 RDB received

From: "rebecca golden" <bex_golden@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 2:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(95)

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

rebecca golden
1223 Bonnyvale Rd
Brattleboro, VT 05301-2578
USA
bex_golden@hotmail.com

SISP Report Complete
Template - ADU-013

95

ERDS = ADU-03
Acc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ACWI)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Audrey Blumeneau" <blumeneau@aboutaudrey.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 2:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FRL 71854

96

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Audrey Blumeneau
310 Morrissey Blvd
Santa Cruz, CA 95062-1256
USA
blumeneau@aboutaudrey.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = A.11.013

96

E-RDS = ADH 03
CRR = (JXC9) S. Carlsberg
A. Williamson (ARR) 1

12/11/04 RDB/rev

From: "Nina Keefer" <shieldmaiden_m@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 2:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FR 71857
97

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

There will always be adverse impacts on the environment when a nuclear plant is built! No more!!!

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,

Nina Keefer
1029 Terry St
Longmont, CO 80501-4316
USA
shieldmaiden_m@yahoo.com

SIS? Review Complete
Template = ARW-013

97 E-RFDS = #34-03
20 = J. Coulter (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/11/04 RBB received

From: "Sara Lemmon" <lemmonsara@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 3:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(98)

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,

Sara Lemmon
975 Washington St Apt 4
Denver, CO 80203-3350
USA
lemmonsara@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

98

-EIS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (J.C.G.)
A Williamson (FRUS1)

12/11/04 R.D. M. received

From: "Virginia Cassidy" <virginia.cassidy@unisys.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 3:03 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FC 71854
99*

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,

Virginia Cassidy
1772 Hendricks Station Rd
Harleysville, PA 19438
USA
virginia.cassidy@unisys.com

*SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

99

*ERIDS = ADU-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

12/14/04 RDB manual

From: "Steve Jerbi" <lengthwise@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 3:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

100

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,

Steve Jerbi
1100 E 55th St
Chicago, IL 60615-5134
USA
lengthwise@hotmail.com

E-REDS-ADM-03

100 = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

ESP Review Complete =
Template - ADM-013

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Julio Torres" <jct165@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 3:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

10/10/04
69 F.R. 71854
101

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,

Julio Torres
Calle Lamas#13-05
Santa Cruz de Aragua, CO 2123
Venezuela
jct165@hotmail.com

E-RDS=ADU-03

101 = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AW1)

SIS Review Complete
Template = ADU-013

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Felix Aguilar, MD, MPH" <felix.aguilar@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FC 71857
102

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,

Felix Aguilar, MD, MPH
771 Raymond Ave
Long Beach, CA 90804-4629
USA
felix.aguilar@earthlink.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-213

ERTS = ADM-03
102 Res = J. Caveling (5X09)
A. Williamson (ARR)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Linda Harrell" <lhh630@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FR 71854
103

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Linda Harrell
7449 Hendersonville Hwy
Yemassee, SC 29945
USA
lhh630@yahoo.com

Supplement Complete

Template = AN-03

103

E-RTDS = AN-03
C. S. Curbish (EXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWT)

12/14/04 ADJ [unclear]

From: "Ken Irwin" <btrmoon@ameritech.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 4:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
691-R 71854

104

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,

Ken Irwin
4432 N Damen Ave
Chicago, IL 60625-1702
USA
btrmoon@ameritech.net

5198 Belier Complete

Template - ADX-013

K-RJ ID = ADX-03

104 Ack = J. Cushing (JCEP)
H. Williamson (HWS)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Gregory Esteve" <gregatourhouse@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 5:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

105

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,

Gregory Esteve
3655 N Scenic Hwy
Lake Wales, FL 33898
USA
gregatourhouse@hotmail.com

SESP Review Complete

F-RIDS = ADM-03

105 del = J. Aveling (SX09)
A. Williamson (RWT)

Template = ADM-013

10/14/04 RDB Rauer

From: "katarzyna /" <katarzynajong@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 5:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR: 71854
106

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,

katarzyna /
/
/, ON N3C 3C1
Canada
katarzynajong@hotmail.com

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM 013

F-RIDS = ADM-03
106 e = J. Cushing (JCO9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 RDB Resured

From: "Brett Feldman" <feldjamin@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 7:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69F12 71854

107

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,

Brett Feldman
4 Admiral Dr
Emeryville, CA 94608
USA
feldjamin@hotmail.com

SI 98 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

107

E-RTDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JX09)
A. Williamson (ARUK)

12/14/04 BDB Received

From: "Jennifer Heavilin" <Pika1319@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 8:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR71854
108

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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 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.

Also, to help conserve resources, please do not reply via postal mail. Thanks!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Heavilin
1830 High Ave Apt B6
Panama City, FL 32405
USA
Pika1319@aol.com

ESP Better Complete
Template = ADM-013

108 - J. Cushing (5X09)
Williamson (ARW1)
IDS = ADM-03

12/14/04 Resubmitted

From: "Mark Reback" <mark@consumerwatchdog.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 8:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 77854
(109)

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,

Mark Reback
2915 St George St Apt 3
Los Angeles, CA 90027-3026
USA
mark@consumerwatchdog.org

SISP Review Complete
template = ADM-013

109

E-SPDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (5X09)
A. Williamson (HR02)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Chelsea Snelgrove" <chsnelgrove@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 8:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
(110)

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,

Chelsea Snelgrove
290 Southerland Ter NE # 3
Atlanta, GA 30307-2344
USA
chsnelgrove@yahoo.com

110 - RFD 5 - ADH-03
S. C. ... (5X09)
... (AKWA)

SDS P Review Complete
Template = ADH-013

10/14/04 RDB received

From: "Jeffri Frontz" <jhf@infinet.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 9:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

10/10/04
69FR 71854
111

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

111

FRIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Arching (JXC9)
Williamson (FRWI)

12/14/04 RJB secured

From: "Linda York" <lindayork5@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 9:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

December 09, 2004

69F12 71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

112

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,

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

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

112

E-RIDS = ADM-03
= J. Cushing (JX09)
Williamson (ARWS)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Linda Prostko" <lprostko@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 10:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69 FR 71554

113

December 09, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

ESP Report Complete
Template = ADM-013

113

E-RIDS = ADM-03
2 = S. Cochran (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWS)

10/14/04 BDB received

From: paxus calta <paxuscalta@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 2:36 AM
Subject: wanting to speak at the draft EIS hearing Jan 19th in Louisa

Dear NRC:

I am interested in speaking at the public hearing on the North Anna Draft EIS.

I am a Louisa County resident.

Please let me know if you need any other information to approve this request.

Paxus Calta
566 Tupelo Ridge Road
Louisa VA 23093
540-903-9343

10/10/04
69 FR 71854
114

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

EIS Review Complete
Template = ANM-013

114 E-RIS=ANM-03
J. Cushing (JXC9)
Lester (AKW1)

12/14/04 RDB:cc:cc

From: "Victoria Campbell" <directtrash@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR 71854

115

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Victoria Campbell
286 S Batavia St
Orange, CA 92868-3902
USA
directtrash@hotmail.com

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-D13

115
E-RDS = ADM-D3
= J. Cushing (JXC9)
? Williamson (ARWE)

12/14/04 NRC received

From: "Lindsey McConnell" <linsmac@ufl.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 4:32 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

6942 718 54

116

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,

Lindsey McConnell
419 NW 14th St Apt A
Gainesville, FL 32603-1942
USA
linsmac@ufl.edu

*SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013*

116 *E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (5X09)
Williamson (12/10/04)*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Mary Hirose" <wearejedi@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 6:52 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
117

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,

Mary Hirose
1774 Westbury Dr
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195-1042
USA
wearejedi@aol.com

E-TRIS = ADU-03

117 ID = J. Armstrong (EXC9)
A Williamson (ARW1)

ESP Review Complete

Template = ADU-013

12/17/04 KDB received

From: "Sharon Smith" <taosharon@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 8:12 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69PR 71854

118

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Sharon Smith
752 Greenwich St Apt 3C
New York, NY 10014-2172
USA
taosharon@aol.com

ESRP Review Complete
Template = ADH-013

118 E-RFD5-ADH-03
c. = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 RDB because

From: *JIM HEAD* <jimheadjr@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 11:52 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

December 10, 2004

69 FR 71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

919

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,

JIM HEAD
2279 Thomas Ave
Berkley, MI 48072-3239
USA
jimheadjr@hotmail.com

STSP Review Complete
Template = ADK-013

119 EREDS = ADK-03
= J. Cushing (SXC9)
Williamson (ARW3)

12/14/04 RDBhucure

From: "Ariel Graham" <Dance7ag@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 12:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FC 71554

120

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,

Ariel Graham
308 Orange Ave Apt 24
Coronado, CA 92118-1494
USA
Dance7ag@hotmail.com

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013

120 E-RIDS = ADU-03
- J. Queuing (JXC9)
- Alicia Williamson (ARWI)

12/14/04 KDB received

From: "Paul Williams" <lovemotherearth@ecoisp.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 2:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
121

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,

Paul Williams
37 N Boston Ave
Atlantic City, NJ 08401-3534
USA
lovemotherearth@ecoisp.com

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

121

FRFDS-ADM-03
Del = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (ARW)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Sarah Harris" <cerahshocker@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 4:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FC 7185H
122

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,

Sarah Harris
405 Strand Ave
Missoula, MT 59801-5712
USA
cerahshocker@hotmail.com

SISF letter complete
Template = ADM-013

122

RIDB = ADM-03
= Cushing (5x0.9)
www (ARW1)

12/11/04 RDB record

12/10/04

69FR 71854

From: "Mary Beier" <sml_beier@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 11:12 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

123

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,

Mary Beier
4200 S 4th St
Leavenworth, KS 66048-5054
USA
sml_beier@hotmail.com

5/5/05 Beier Complete
Template = ADM-013

123

E-REDS=ADM-03
ed = J. C. C. (5K69)
G. A. Williamson (AKWIE)

12/10/04 RDB received

From: "Paula Jaramillo" <PJaramillo23@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 6:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

124

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,

Paula Jaramillo
1199 Sioux St
Los Alamos, NM 87544-2827
USA
PJaramillo23@hotmail.com

124

*E-REDS = ADM-03
J. Quishing (JQC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

12/14/04 ROB [unclear]

From: "Matt Moore" <lightfoot_32@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 8:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69FR.71854
105

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Matt Moore
PO Box 984
Miller Place, NY 11764
USA
lightfoot_32@hotmail.com

STSP Review Complete
Template - ADM-13

125

E-RTDS-ADH-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (ARWIS)

12/14/04 RBH received

From: "M. Mathewson" <califoto@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 8:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69FC 71854

126

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

M. Mathewson
PO Box 2249
Culver City, CA 90231-2249
USA
califoto@yahoo.com

E-RFDS=ADM-03

126

J. Gashung (JXC9)
Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "tom jackson" <tomj7@colbi.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 10:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69FL 71854
127

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

tom jackson
720 16th St Apt 418
Denver, CO 80202-3238
USA
tomj7@colbi.net

SIS of Reheat Complete
Template = ADM-013

127

E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cusack (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Monica Allen" <monicakayallen@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 10, 2004 11:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854
128

December 10, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Monica Allen
4631 Amesbury Dr Apt 3122
Dallas, TX 75206
USA
monicakayallen@hotmail.com

SESF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

128

E-REDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cochran (JRC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 ADB received

From: "Bobbie Dee Flowers" <b_flowers@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

129

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.

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,

Bobbie Dee Flowers
418 W 17th St Apt 22A
New York, NY 10011-5826
USA
b_flowers@hotmail.com

*5758 Better Complete
Template = ADM-013*

129

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
ed = J. Custis (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW8)*

12/11/04 RDB/secure

From: "Mitchell Maness" <mitchellmaness@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 6:52 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69FR 71854

130

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Mitchell Maness
2800 Knight St Apt 1
Dallas, TX 75219-6249
USA
mitchellmaness@earthlink.net

SISF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

130

=-RIDS = ADM-03
= J. Cochran (SXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

10/14/07 RDB Keur

From: "Sherry Barnes" <sherry_l_barnes@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 2:14 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69FR 71854

(131)

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Sherry Barnes
PO Box 3020
Crested Butte, CO 81224-3020
USA
sherry_l_barnes@yahoo.com

*ESP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

131

*ERIDS = ADU-03
1 = O. Cushing (SXC9)
2 = C. Williams (ARW1)*

10/14/04 *Robert*

From: "Colleen McGlone" <crmclone@moose-mail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 4:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69FR 71854

132

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Colleen McGlone
3540 Hartland Dr
New Port Richey, FL 34655-2505
USA
crmclone@moose-mail.com

ESP Report Complete
Template = ADM-013

132

E-RTDS-ADM-03
cc = J. Campbell (QXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

10/14/04 RDD received

From: "Tavis Schmidt" <tavisschmidt@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 4:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

10/10/04
69FR71854
133

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM 013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
133 - J. Cushing (JRC1)
A. Williamson (AW1)

12/11/04 ADD received

From: "Jennifer Doob" <jkdoophi@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 6:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

134

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

*EIS? Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*= EIDS = ADM-03
134 = J. Cushing (JX29)
A. Williamson (ARW2)*

12/11/04 RDID *reconsider*

From: "Carol DeAntoni" <athena2@ctelco.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 8:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/11/04
69 FR 71854
135

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Carol DeAntoni
PO Box 220
Crestone, CO 81131-0220
USA
athena2@ctelco.net

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

135 = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (ARK1)
RIDS = ADM-03

12/14/04 RDB/klw

From: "Gail McGlone" <grmcglone@snail-mail.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 11, 2004 10:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
691-R:71854
(136)

December 11, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Gail McGlone
3510 Dellefield St
New Port Richey, FL 34655
USA
grmcglone@snail-mail.net

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

136 = -VIDS = ADM-013
- = J. Culmick (JXC9)
Williamson (ARW)

12/11/04 RDB received

From: "Lynn Tarek" <lynntarek@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

December 11, 2004

137

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Lynn Tarek
6320 N 16th St Apt 15
Phoenix, AZ 85016-1520
USA
lynntarek@hotmail.com

*5 ESP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

*E-RIDS = ADU-03
137 cc = J. Enslin (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

12/14/04 RDB received

12/10/04

69FR 71854

138

From: "Kimberley Graham" <biggal21@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 8:32 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kimberley Graham
308 Orange Ave Apt 24
Coronado, CA 92118-1494
USA
biggal21@yahoo.com

138

E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARWI)

5758 Better Complete
Template = ADM-03

12/11/04 RDB received

12/10/04

69FR 71857

139

From: "Seth Silverman" <SSilverman86@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 12:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Seth Silverman
60 E End Ave Apt 8B
New York, NY 10028
USA
SSilverman86@hotmail.com

ESP Review Complete

Template = ADM 013

139

*FRIDS = ADM 013
all = J. C. ... (JXC'9)*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Wayne Kelly" <waynekins@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 2:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69FR 71854

(140)

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Wayne Kelly
1257 Siskiyou Blvd # 1133
Ashland, OR 97520-2241
USA
waynekins@hotmail.com

*SIIP Rivier Complete
Template = ADU-013*

140 *E-KIDS - ADU 03
all = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Michael Neil" <mneil@du.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 3:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

141

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

ESP Review Comp Ltr
Temp Ltr - ADM-013

141

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

12/14/04 RDB/ucw

From: "David Randall" <dave32@ecologyfund.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 5:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69FR.71854

142

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

David Randall
5 Longacre Ct
Port Jefferson, NY 11777
USA
dave32@ecologyfund.net

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM - 013

E-EIS = ADM - 03

ADD = J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARUI)

142

10/11/04 RDB received

From: "A. Patrick" <ap_dakin Haven@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 5:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

143

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

A. Patrick
3100 Ewing Ave
Altadena, CA 91001
USA
ap_dakin Haven@yahoo.com

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADH-013

*E-RIDS = ADH-013
Adm. = J. Cushing (JXC1)
Williamson (ARW)*

143

12/14/04 KDB received

From: "Diana Sette" <dsette@drew.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 5:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69FR 71854

144

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

FRIDS = ADM-03

~~_____~~ = J. Cheung (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/14/04 KDB received

From: "Hollis Toal" <hollistoal@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 12, 2004 10:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

145

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Hollis Toal
3281 S Rainburst Pl
Tucson, AZ 85713-6834
USA
hollistoal@hotmail.com

Self Review Complete

Template = ADU-013

145

*FLIDS = ADU-03
all = J. Cushing (X09)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

12/14/04 RDB received

From: "Claire Watson" <ce99watson@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Dec 13, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

(146)

December 12, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

FRFDS = ADM-03

146 *add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

*SFSF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

12/14/04/EDB received

From: "Eve Venema" <accordioneve@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Dec 13, 2004 10:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
09 FR 7185A
147

December 13, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

ERFIS = ADM 03

SESP Review Complete

Doc = J. Canning (JCES)

147 Williamson (ARW1)

Template = ADM - 013

*RTB received
12/14/04*

From: "Erika Shamo" <erika.shamo@brinker.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Dec 13, 2004 10:52 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
148*

December 13, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Erika Shamo
1031 N Wolcott Ave
Chicago, IL 60622-3760
USA
erika.shamo@brinker.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

148

*F-RTDS = ADM-013
Ack = J. Overberg (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

*RD/Received
12/15/04*

From: "Katie Wolff" <kwolff34@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Dec 13, 2004 9:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 13, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
149*

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,

Katie Wolff
1110 Ann St
Beaufort, NC 28516-2003
USA
kwolff34@hotmail.com

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-213*

*F-EDS = ADM-03
149
cc = J. Cushing (JCK9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)*

From: "Simone Gourguechon" <ahmisa88@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 14, 2004 8:32 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*RD B received
12/15/04*

December 14, 2004

*10/10/04
E9FR 71834*

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

150

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,

Simone Gourguechon
2046 W Morse Ave
Chicago, IL 60645-4910
USA
ahmisa88@hotmail.com

*SESP Review complete
Template = ADM-013*

*E-IDS = ADM-03
150 see = J. Cwelling (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

From: "Sandra Carrubba" <vze2fxmp@verizon.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 14, 2004 8:52 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

10/15/04
RDB received
69FR 71854
12/10/04
151

December 14, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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.

Nuclear generation of energy causes more global warming than other energy generation methods. More green house gases are released. Besides, there is the radioactive material left to be disposed of.

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,

Sandra Carrubba
200 E Hazeltine Ave
Kenmore, NY 14217
USA
vze2fxmp@verizon.net

E-RTDS = ADM-D3

151

See = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWA)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

*ADP received
12/15/04*

From: "rebecca golden" <bex_golden@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 9, 2004 2:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

December 09, 2004

695K 71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

152

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,

rebecca golden
1223 Bonnyvale Rd
Brattleboro, VT 05301-2578
USA
bex_golden@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

152

*ack = J. Curbish (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

From: "Kirk Clayton" <kirkclayton@hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 2:32 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 15, 2004

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

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

12/15/04
 RDB secured

10/10/04
 C09FR 71854

(153)

SESP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

153

E-RIDS = ADM-03
 Call = J. Cushing (5X C9)
 A. Williams P.O. (ARWI)

12/17/04

RDB received

From: "Caryn Corriere" <corrierecl@excite.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 4:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 15, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

154

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,

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

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

154 E-RFDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (JRW1)

From: "Craig Williams" <porterrockwell@if.rmci.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 5:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/17/04
RDB received

December 15, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

10/12/04

69FR 71854

155

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,

Craig Williams
240 Ronglyn Ave
Idaho Falls, ID 83401
USA
porterrockwell@if.rmci.net

SISP Review Complete

template = ADM-013

155

ERIDS = ADM-03
Ack = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

From: "L. Carter" <lcarter1@luc.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 6:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/17/04 RDB
received

December 15, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

10/10/04

69FR 71854

156

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,

L. Carter
4343 N Clarendon Ave Apt 1803
Chicago, IL 60613-1588
USA
lcarter1@luc.edu

F-RFDS = ADM-03

SESP Review Complete

cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

156

Template - ADM-013

From: "nancy spears" <wolffree1@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 6:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/17/04
BDD received

December 15, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
157

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,

nancy spears
15 Southgate Dr
Bossier City, LA 71112
USA
wolffree1@aol.com

SIS Review complete
template = ADM-013

157

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

From: "Michael Fish" <mcf@gwu.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 7:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/17/04
RDB received

December 15, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
158

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,

Michael Fish
2769 Cohansey Cir
Roseville, MN 55113-2346
USA
mcf@gwu.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADH-013

158

E-RIDS = ADH-03
Call = J. Cushing (5xc9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

12/17/04

RDB received

From: "Timothy Johnston" <tjohnst@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 16, 2004 11:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 16, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR71854

159

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,

Timothy Johnston
3094 Lake Dr Apt F7
Marina, CA 93933-2867
USA
tjohnst@hotmail.com

EIS P Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIS = ADM-03
ll = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/17/04

RTB received

From: "K Zalewski" <kzalewski@rareformtech.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 16, 2004 11:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 16, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

160

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,

K Zalewski
8366 Islandview Ct
Brighton, MI 48114-8789
USA
kzalewski@rareformtech.com

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

160

=-RIDS=ADM-03

L = J. Quastberg (SXC 9)
A. Williamson (PRWI)

12/17/04

ADB received

From: "Douglas Krueger" <dkrueger@csusb.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 16, 2004 5:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 16, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69F1271834

161

Dear NRC,

What to do with the WASTE...Millions and Millions of years!!!

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,

Douglas Krueger
PO Box 2744
Crestline, CA 92325
USA
dkrueger@csusb.edu

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Call - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

161

SFSP Review Complete

template=ADM-073

From: "Brian Hebeisen" <peru_boy@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 19, 2004 4:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*Revised
12/19/04*

December 19, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*10/12/04
69FR71857*

Dear NRC,

162

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,

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

E-IDS = AD4-03

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

162

SISP Review Complete

Template = AD4-013

From: "Brian Butcher" <tonycherry23@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Dec 18, 2004 4:02 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*RTB.
received
12/21/04*

December 18, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
6972 71854
163*

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,

Brian Butcher
20433 Montalvo Rd
Saratoga, CA 95070-6335
USA
tonycherry23@aol.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

*E-RIS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cusling (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW4)*

163

*KDB received
12/29/04*

From: "Elena Day" <elenaday@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 28, 2004 10:02 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 28, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854*

Dear NRC,

164

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 lifefoms 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,

Elena Day
151 Buckingham Cir
Charlottesville, VA 22903-2909
USA
elenaday@aol.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

164

*ERFDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williams (ARW1)*

From: "brianne boylan" <brianneboylan@fresnomail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 22, 2004 5:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*NDB received
10/29/04*

December 22, 2004

10/10/04

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69FR 71854

165

Dear NRC,

I am a resident of Louisa County and live less than 20 miles away from the North Anna power plant. I oppose new nuclear reactors there for the very environmental and safety reasons which were not "allowed" during the early site permit process. I do not see how any environmental impact statement is complete without addressing waste and how that waste will one day be reintegrated into the environment. Because it can not be contained forever. The Yucca Mountain proposal is still just a possibility (court cases are pending), and even if it were created as a national disposal it would soon fill. I am also opposed for safety reasons. Accidents do still happen around the world. The addition of two more nuclear reactors would make for an even more appealing terrorist target. I don't want more radioactive waste anywhere, let alone in my backyard. And I want for energy providers to educate the public on ways to reduce our use of resources and to provide safer, cleaner options like solar, biomass and wind energy.

I urge the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project on the basis that it will 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.

E-RFDS=ADM-03

SESP Review Complete

165

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

Template=ADM-013

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

brianne boylan
private
Louisa, VA 23093
USA
brianneboylan@fresnomail.com

From: "Sandra Williamson" <enchant100@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 26, 2004 7:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/29/04
RTD received
[Signature]

December 26, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

166

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,

Sandra Williamson
2500 E Harmony Rd Lot 391
Fort Collins, CO 80528-8577
USA
enchant100@hotmail.com

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADU 013

167

F-RTDS = ADU 03
Call = S. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

*RDB received
12/09/04*

From: "Dee Hoke" <dthoke@lisco.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 26, 2004 4:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 26, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

167

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 serious 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,

Dee Hoke
1516 S 2nd St
Oskaloosa, IA 52577-3928
USA
dthoke@lisco.net

E-2FD5=ADM-03

*Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWA)*

168

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

12/29/04
KDB received

From: "sue frankel-streit" <littleflowercw@wildmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sun, Dec 26, 2004 12:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 26, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
697271854
168

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,

sue frankel-streit
16560 Louisa Rd
Louisa, VA 23093-4835
USA
littleflowercw@wildmail.com

SIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

F-RIDS = ADM-03
169 = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

12/9/04
RDB received
(signature)

From: "Kerry Johnson" <johnsokl@jmu.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 24, 2004 1:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 24, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FE71854

169

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,

Kerry Johnson
40 Winsome Ln
Fredericksburg, VA 22406-4453
USA
johnsokl@jmu.edu

E-RDS=ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

170

add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)

Template = ADM-013

12/29/04
ADB received
DP

From: "Lauren Bouyea" <labouyea@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 22, 2004 5:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

December 22, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR71854

170

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,

Lauren Bouyea
1601 Shoreline Hwy
Muir Beach, CA 94965
USA
labouyea@hotmail.com

K-BIDS = ADM-03

Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
171 A. Williamson (ARWI)

STSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

12/29/04
RDB received

From: "Jana Cutlip" <jana@nexet.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 22, 2004 12:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 22, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FE 71854
171

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,

Jana Cutlip
1885 Craigs Store Rd
Afton, VA 22920-2013
USA
jana@nexet.net

E-RIDS = ADU-03

Call = J. Oushing (JXC9)
Williamson (AAWI)

172

ESIP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013

12/09/04
BDM received
P.

From: "Bill Johnson" <bjohnson@insysco.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 21, 2004 2:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 21, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR 71854
172

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,

Bill Johnson
40 Winsome Ln
Fredericksburg, VA 22406-4453
USA
bjohnson@insysco.com

ERFDS = ADM-03

ESP Review Complete -
Template = ADM-03

173² = J. Cochran (5X09)
William Cox (ARUI)

*RDB reviewed
1/3/05*

From: David Williams <devilliams@juno.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 21, 2004 8:15 AM
Subject: public comment

No to any new nuclear plants ! We do not have a safe depository for waste & the nature of working with radioactivity is extremely hazardous. Stop Now. Research the sustainable alternatives of wind, solar, biomass, and many others.

Sincerely,
David Williams

148 Murdock Ave
Asheville NC. 28801

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

173

*STSP Review Complete
Template = ABK...*

174

*E-RIDS = ADH-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)*

*RD/Corriere
1/3/05*

From: "Caryn Corriere" <corrierecl@excite.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 28, 2004 9:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

December 28, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

174

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,

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

*SFSF Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

*E-REFS = ADU-03
cc = J. Cullvig (JXC9)
175 A-Williamson (ARW1)*

RTB received

From: "pete lafoillette" <plafollette@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 29, 2004 4:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

11/5/05 [Signature]

December 29, 2004

12/10/04

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69FR 71854

175

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,

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

FRIDS = ADM-03

SI SP Review Complete

ack = A. Williamson (ARW)

J. Cushing (JXC9)

176

Template = ADM-013

From: "Kate Skolnick" <krs1123@stanford.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 30, 2004 9:53 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*RTB review
1/5/05*

December 30, 2004

12/10/04

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69FR 71854

(176)

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,

Kate Skolnick
130 Edgemont Rd
Scarsdale, NY 10583-2749
USA
krs1123@stanford.edu

E-RFDs = ADM-03

*Call = A. Williamson (ARWI)
J. Cushing (JXC9)*

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

*BDB received
1/5/05*

From: "LINDA SAFLEY" <lindasafley@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 30, 2004 2:37 PM
Subject: Register to Speak at Public Meeting on the North Anna Draft Environmental Impact Statement

LINDA SAFLEY
1936 E. 30TH ST.
BALTIMORE, MD 21218

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
177*

December 30, 2004

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

MY NAME IS LINDA SAFLEY, I AM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE, "ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS CENTER," AND OUR AGENDA IS HAVING CLEAN ENERGY, NOW! WE AS CITIZENS HAVE THE RIGHT TO PROTEST AGAINST ANYTHING ELSE THE DOE, WOULD SUBMIT, SUCH AS BUILDING MORE NUCLEAR PLANTS. WE KNOW ABOUT THE ENERGY EXECUTIVES GIVING THE BUSH INAGURAL MONIES. THIS SENDS A CLEAR MESSAGE THAT THE DOE, HAS FURTHER TO GO IN DEVELOPING CLEAN ENERGY AND SAVING THE PLANET FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. PLEASE NOTE, MANY GROUPS WILL BE WATCHING IN WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN, WITH THE ENERGY ISSUES. PEACE & BLESSINGS!

Sincerely,

LINDA SAFLEY
410-243-6535

*SISF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = A. Williamson (ARW1)
J. Cushing (JX09)*

From: "Carolyn Doswell" <Dog5261@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Dec 30, 2004 10:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

December 30, 2004

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Carolyn Doswell
3501 Laurel Canyon Blvd
Studio City, CA 91604-3715
USA
Dog5261@aol.com

*RD13 received
1/5/25
12/18/24
69FL71854
178*

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

*E-RIDS = ADU-03
ell = A. Williamson (ARWI)
J. Cushing (JXC9)*

179

From: "Cheryl Costigan" <AbbeyThoreauvian@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 1, 2005 3:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*ADP received
1/5/05 [signature]*

January 01, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69F12 71537*

Dear NRC,

179

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,

Cheryl Costigan
PO Box 490
Athol, ID 83801-0490
USA
AbbeyThoreauvian@aol.com

E-REDS = AD4-03

*SESP Review Complete
Template = AD4-013*

*cc = A. Williamson (ARW1)
S. Cushing (JXC9)*

180

*RDB received
1/5/05*

From: "CARY Brief" <carybrief@direcway.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 4, 2005 1:35 AM
Subject: Register to Speak at Public Meeting on the North Anna Draft Environmental Impact Statement

CARY Brief
3 CHARLES ST
delaware, nj 07833

*12/10/04
69FR 7854
180*

January 4, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I AM AGAINST ALL NUCLEAR REACTORS FROM BEING BUILT. As you well know, creating the cores requires BURING COAL, so Nuclear Reactors are not CLEAN, not SAFE (they let out tons of radiation) the spent cores are a danger and we still have nothing to do with them except drop them on Innocent IRAQI WOMEN AND CHILDREN or use It to irradiate food which is just poison. GET SOME SENSE IN YOUR HEADS. DO YOU NOT CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THIS PLANET. FOR THE BILLIONS YOU WASTE ON NUCLEAR POLLUTION, YOU COULD BUILD WINDMILLS AND SOLAR CELLS THAT WOULD POWER THE NATION. YOU JUST WOULDNT MAKE SO MUCH MONEY. SO THAT IS WHY IT DOES NOT GET DONE. PURE GREED PLAIN AND SIMPLE.

Sincerely,

CARY BRIEF
973 800 5137

*SIOP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

181

*E-REDS = ADM-03
add = J. Ouelving (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

*RD Bressner
1/5/05*

From: Donna <refuge821@yahoo.com>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 4, 2005 2:28 PM
Subject: North Anna Nuclear License

In the same generation as two nuclear disasters (Three Mile Island and Chernobyl) I cannot believe approval to build another nuclear plant is even being considered. This would be the first license since Three Mile Island.

12/10/04

We live in Fluvanna County, a neighboring county of Louisa, where the proposed site is being considered. When we moved to VA, one of the first things we did was to look up the location of nuclear plants and measure distance to be from it when choosing a homesite.

69 F12 71854

I am shocked that there is even a consideration of this highly potential disaster. Nuclear power has never been safe and certainly not cheap in terms of dollars, but what is more important is the cost of the waste to our society. Yucca Mountain doesn't have capacity for the waste, so where is it going to go?

181

What is the evacuation plan going to be for those within 40 miles of this plant which includes portions of Charlottesville? Washington, DC, itself is only 90 miles away down wind. What a poor choice of location for our national security! My thoughts would be that the people who are considering this have already had their brains polluted enough not to be thinking clearly.

My only hope is that there's a chance for the public to make a difference and get this stopped. There is too much research on safety and waste to allow this to happen which is not even being allowed to be presented.

Where's the government for the people?

Randal and Donna Watkins
27 Fleetwood Drive
Palmyra, VA 22963

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADU-013

182

*E-RIDS = ADU-03
Att = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

RIDB received
1/7/05

From: Alicia Williamson
To: Abhaya Thiele
Date: 1/5/05 11:53AM
Subject: Re: May I please speak at the Jan. 19th Public Hearing about the North Anna new nuclear reactors?

Ms. Thiele
I have recieved your request and will be sure to place your name on the list to speak at the January 19 meeting.
If you have any other questions please let me know.

Thanks

12/10/04
69FR-71854
182

Alicia Williamson
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts
301-415-1878 (office)
1800-368-5642 X1878
301-415-2002 (fax)

>>> Abhaya Thiele <abhayathiele@yahoo.com> 01/05/05 11:49AM >>>
Dear Alicia:

I'd be very grateful if you'd kindly add my name and email address to the list of people who would like to speak on January 19th at the NRC public hearing on the Draft EIS for the proposed new nuclear reactors at North Anna in Virginia.

My email address is:
abhayathiele@yahoo.com

Thank you so much!

Gratefully,
Abhaya Thiele

CC: Cushing, Jack

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

183

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW3)

*PSB received
1/7/05*

From: Abhaya Thiele <abhayathiele@yahoo.com>
To: <arw1@nrc.gov>
Date: 1/5/05 11:50AM
Subject: May I please speak at the Jan. 19th Public Hearing about the North Anna new nuclear reactors?

Dear Alicia:

I'd be very grateful if you'd kindly add my name and email address to the list of people who would like to speak on January 19th at the NRC public hearing on the Draft EIS for the proposed new nuclear reactors at North Anna in Virginia.

My email address is:
abhayathiele@yahoo.com

Thank you so much!

Gratefully,
Abhaya Thiele

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
183*

*STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*E-RFD5 = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)*

184

From: "Wendy McFadden" <wendyfromwonderland@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 5, 2005 6:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

1/10/05
RDB received @

January 05, 2005

12/10/05

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69FR 7165H

184

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 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,

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

E-RTDS-ADM-03

cc = J. Caveling (JRC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

185

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

From: <todd1@cavtel.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 6, 2005 3:46 PM
Subject: North Anna's Public Meeting on the ESP Application

1/10/05
RD B/covered
RD

Ms. Williamson,
I am planning on attending the public meeting on North Anna's ESP application and would like to voice my support of Dominion's efforts to maintain nuclear power as an energy option with the potential construction of new nuclear power plants in Virginia.

12/10/04

Thank you-

69FR 71854

Todd Flowers

185

4013 Stuart Avenue
Richmond, Virginia
804-918-0884

SISF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

F-RTDS = ADM-03
L = J. Cuthbert (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

186

1/11/05
RDB received *(signature)*

From: Jennifer Meyer <jam995@earthlink.net>
To: <northanna_esp@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 8, 2005 2:40 PM
Subject: North Anna Nuclear Reactor

12/10/04
69FR 71854

184

Dear Sir/Madam,

I OPPOSE the expansion of nuclear power at the North Anna site for several reasons: 1) nuclear power is expensive and highly dependent on government subsidies; 2) nuclear reactors present an unacceptable risk for the public; 3) the highly radioactive spent fuel will most likely be stored at the North Anna site and will be vulnerable to terrorist attack; 4) additional power plants will have serious consequences for water temperature and water levels at Lake Anna and the rivers that flow from it.

Thank you,

Jennifer Meyer

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

187

*FRIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williamson (ARWA)*

116 Harris Road
Charlottesville, VA 22903
USA

Voices for Animals

January 7, 2005

*RDS received
1/12/05*

*10/10/04
69FR 71854*

187

Chief, Rules & Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

We repudiate the Commission's (NRC) and heavily subsidized industry's efforts to license new nuclear power plants despite unresolved safety and waste issues which include immunizing plant operators from liability in the event of a massive nuclear accident.

Stop wasting taxpayer monies for the most expensive and dangerous means for electrical power.

If you deem nuclear power is safe, why cannot you find a private insurance company to insure against an accident?

Nuclear Insurance A.L.S.

Where would the waste go from two reactors since Yucca Mountain, if ever built, has capacity only through 2012?

What is the evacuation plan for the neighboring community and for Washington, DC, Richmond and Charlottesville?

Why are citizens being told they cannot raise issues of nuclear reactor safety and nuclear waste?

Sincerely,

cc: Nils J. Diaz, NRC
Thomas E. Capps, Dominion Resources

Nazen Merjian, VFA

E-IDS=ADM-03

add = J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (AR201)

*SESP Better Complete
Template=ADM-013*

RSD Rec'd
11/2/05
R

12/10/04

695R 71854

188


Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear-Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555_0001

Dear Madame/Sir and all:

Do not license any new nuclear power plants. There are many unresolved safety and waste issues.

Thank you for any and every consideration you can make toward this request.

Sincerely yours,



Sarah Sherwood Litchfield

13 Leisure Court
Palmyra, Virginia 22963
Tel/fax 434-589-1843

CC: Nils J. Diaz, Chairman, and Thomas E. Capps, CEO

STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RTDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC 9)
A. Williamson (ARWL)

1/14/05
BDB reviewed
to

From: "mandy shipler" <mandyshiplier@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 13, 2005 4:03 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 13, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
691R 71854
189

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,

mandy shipler
2624N Sumac Ct # 8
Janesville, WI 53545-0347
USA
mandyshiplier@yahoo.com

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

190

E-RFDs = ADM-03
add = J. Queving (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

From: "J R Bolon" <jrbolon@highstream.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 11, 2005 4:25 PM
Subject: Comments on the North Anna ESP

4/14/05
KJB record
②

12/10/04

69PL 71854

190

I am a resident whose property abuts the waste heat treatment facility of the North Anna nuclear plant (known as the "hot side" of Lake Anna). I am writing to oppose the use of additional water from Lake Anna to cool a third unit at the North Anna plant, as envisioned by the draft environmental impact statement issued in connection with the North Anna ESP.

I oppose the use of water from Lake Anna mostly because it would increase the water temperature in the waste heat treatment facility by 5 to 15 degrees. I purchased my lot about three years ago based on the water being about 10 degrees warmer than the main lake (known as the "cold side" in local vernacular). I found that acceptable. I do not find it acceptable for that temperature to be increased by another 5 to 15 degrees. That would make the water unusable for water sports for at least two months of every year and would chase the fish to the cooler areas of the lake, making fishing useless.

If I had known three years ago that there was a chance that the water abutting my lot would be that much warmer, I would not have purchased the lot. I believe that, if the proposal to use water from the lake to cool another reactor is approved, the value of real estate on the hot side will be greatly reduced from what it would be if the proposal is not approved. It may be true that the reactor will not be built until I am long gone, but I will be affected because the value of my property will be suppressed or reduced.

If all real estate values on the hot side are reduced, county revenue will be reduced by the reduced property values. Thus, real estate taxes for the rest of the county will have to be raised to make up the difference.

Please take these factors into account in your deliberations.

Jay R Bolon
318 Lois Lane
Mineral, Virginia 23117
540-872-2707

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

191

R-IDS = ADM-03
Case = J. Cushing (JXC 9)
A. Williamson (AEWI)

*From [unclear]
1/19/05*

January 10, 2005

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

191

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

Ref: Comments / Dominion – North Anna Power Station Early Site Permit

With regard to the information posted for comments for Dominion-Virginia Power's North Anna Early Site Permit, please consider my comments based on the published information regarding the preliminary recommendation on the issuance of this permit.

First and foremost the information in Part 2 – Site Safety Analysis, Chapter 2 – Site Characteristics, Section 2.1.3 pertaining to population distribution. This information references the most recent Evacuation Time Estimate (ETE) for the NAEP is based on the Census 2000 data and the total population is noted as 20,292. This information is contradictory to the information noted in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1.1 Groups Vulnerable to Physical Impacts, 4.4.1.1.1 People – This section notes the area within 10 miles of the ESP to be estimated to be populated by approximately 15,500 people. This information references Section 2.5, 2.5.1.1. The information contained in Section 2.5 is current data. This information is contradictory in it's self, which leads to believe that there are more contradictions other than these since the data referenced is from various time spans dating back to the mid-1980s.

The population data needs to be strongly scrutinized as new developments in the Louisa area around Lake Anna are consistently developing, as well as areas of Spotsylvania and Hanover County. I also feel that route alerting needs to be addressed in the Emergency Planning Section as well, if sufficient sirens are not currently yet in place.

Tables 2.5-1 through 2.5-6 discuss the fault that runs through this region, however the data that is provided is based on Crone & Wheeler of 2000 prior to the relatively recent strong earth quake (tremors) that occurred in early May of 2003 and on December 9th, 2003 in this region. Also, the information referenced in Figure 2.5-14 Seismic Source Zones and Seismicity in Central & Eastern North America is based on magnitude

E-2535-ADM-03

Doc = J. Arching (JRC9)

H. Williamson (ARW1)

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Information from 1987 data, which is over 18 years old. Figure 2.5-19 Bechtel Group EPRI Sources, no date on this data is noted other than the Bechtel/EPRI data, which is, dated 1987-1989. The opening letter in Appendix J – Down Hole Seismic Report & Data to Mr. J. A. Price is dated March 17th, 2003, which is also before both of these previous events. Since these events have occurred in this specific region, and significant boring will occur during construction, I feel that this information should be re-evaluated using current data, and not based on data that is over 18 years old.

The information in Tables 2.5-16 – Table 2.5-21 all specifically state that the information is from 1989 EPRI data. This information is over 16 years old. Certainly there is more current information from EPRI – this information is closer dated for the use for previous construction at North Anna Power Station than for new units not yet constructed. No information is provided which stipulates what the data is based on. The other remaining Tables do not include this date reference on or within the data, which leads you to believe that the basis of this data is also more than 15 years old.

Section 4, 4.4.1.1.3 Roads – The transportation network in the Louisa County area is very well-developed, however, new construction and development in this area has hampered travel on many instances especially during the peak vacation time around the lake area and also during inclement weather as most roadways are two lane rural. Further investigation in to this information would be beneficial, especially with regard to route alerting should it be necessary for any reason during construction activities as the roadway network could be hampered during construction, should an emergency event occur.


Section 4.4.1.1.4 – Recreational Facilities – Where this information mentions that fugitive dust would not be a discernible impact on Lake Anna or adjacent environs, additional information should be evaluated. This information mentions discernible impact. To whose discretion? This information also mentions installing a barrier to prevent the migration of turbid water plume into the lake, *if necessary*. This should be a requirement based on Dominion's commitment to public safety and health measures and today's environment concerning potential hazardous risks to the public.

Section 4.4.3 – Environmental Justice Impacts – In this Section the information only mentions the potential for disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts *on minority and low-income populations that reside within an 80-km (50 mile) radius of North Anna during construction*. This information could be construed as discriminatory. This implies that only minorities and low-income individuals reside within a 50-mile radius to the plant or that the implications and analysis was only performed on impact to low income residents located within this area and that other populations within this region were not considered. However, again the information mentioned in Section 2.5 is current data with regard to this information. I would suggest that the NRC take a very wholesome look at this population data and the potential effects on the *entire population* within this region of 80-km (50 mile radius) of the plant. With the increased development within this region some of the housing

developments and homes around Lake Anna are valued up to and well over \$300,000.000. There are also several very large housing developments and expensive farm operations within this area that do not seem to be considered in this evaluation in the areas of Louisa, Orange, Spotsylvania, Hanover, Montpelier, Charlottesville and Goochland. There are many schools within the region of the 80-km (50 mile radius) of the plant that are only briefly mentioned and could be affected should conditions warrant. I am sure that additional plans and measures will be developed as time permits, however, all of this data should be evaluated from current data not data that is 15 to 18 years old. A determination should be made to accurately use the information based on the 2000 Census data or current information. The total population totals mentioned in Section 4.4.3 now far exceeds the totals referenced in this section, and the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects mentioned.

Again, much of the data used in these evaluations and analysis seem to be the same data used during earlier planned construction at the North Anna ~~Power~~ Station. With the increased technology available, the most current data should be analyzed for a project of this magnitude that could have potential significant effects on the safety protection and welfare of a large area the population in this region during this time of a heightened awareness towards security. Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,



Deborah O. Fahrner



CLARADAN FARM

P.O. Box 477, Dogue, Virginia 22451
99

Telephone (803) 775-9010
540

RBB received

1/19/05

lu

12/10/04

69FK71854L

1/11/05

192

To Chief of Rules and Directives;

For the record we are all opposed to any nuclear expansion either here at North Anna, or anywhere else in the world, until science has discovered a way to neutralize the waste.

It is patently immoral to poison our Earth to this degree.

In addition my family and all the rest of living things are close enough downwind (from the predominate prevailing westerlies) that should there be an accident, there would be no way to warn us in time.

Please consider putting your efforts toward clean energy.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elena Ellis

ELENA ELLIS

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

195

EREDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JCK9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB received
1/31/05

Jan. 20, 2005

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

12/10/04

69FR 71854

(193)

Dear Madam or Sir:

I am writing to express my opposition to the granting of a new license for ~~new~~ the nuclear power plant in Louisa County, Virginia. Nuclear power is the most unsafe form of electricity generation. The waste from nuclear power plants is an environmental poison and a deadly health hazard. There is no safe place to store nuclear waste, and the deadly effects of it last for tens of thousands of years.

I urge you to work for the development of safe, renewable, environmentally-friendly methods of electricity production such as wind power, solar power, and geo-thermal energy.

Sincerely,

Deborah L. Bois

cc: Nils J. Diaz, U.S. NRC
and

Thomas E. Capps, Dominion Resources

STSP Review Complete

K-EDS = ADM-03

Att = J. Cushing (OC9)
A. Williamson (FRW1)

Chief, Rules & Directives Branch
Division of Admin. Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555-0001
Email: NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov

RJB received
1/28/05

12/10/04

69FR 71854

194

2005-01-20

Greetings,

I write to express my deep concern about the expansion of the nuclear power facility at North Anna, operated for the moment by Dominion Resources (and formerly known as "Virginia Power").

1. My late father was an insurance agent. He told me, "If a company can't find affordable insurance, then the business isn't safe." Since North Anna and other plants can't seem to find a free market insurer, that means the free market is telling us all that nuclear power is too risky. Let's listen to the free market!
2. Waste by-products from nuclear fission of uranium and plutonium is incredibly toxic, radioactive and long-lived, lasting for tens of thousands of years at least. All of human history is only 8000 years or so. So far, humanity hasn't proven it can care for anything longer than a few centuries, and that amounts to a few pots and some dusty scraps of writing. How are we going to take care of this unbelievably dangerous stuff for so long? Even if Yucca Mountain or some other salt dome opens up soon, over the very understandable opposition of neighbors worried about their health and property values, these places will fill up in no time from the waste of established plants. How can you add to an already huge, dangerous problem like this when you haven't bothered to figure out a real solution? It's like packing your house full of drums containing oil and fertilizer, making popcorn in the fireplace, and wondering what might happen when the sparks start to fly. I don't want to be up in that house! And I sure don't want to be anywhere near an expanded North Anna nuclear power station!
3. Let's say you do find a safe place to bury the waste. Then you have to transport it out of North Anna and other plants by rail. After what happened on January 6th at Granitville, SC, with the awful, deadly chlorine gas spill, I have no faith that there won't be a nuclear spill at some point. Unlike simple chemicals like chlorine, which kills only a relative few and causes evacuations of just a couple of towns and neighborhoods, radioactive nuclear waste would wreck whole regions and disrupt lives and the environment literally for eons. I can't even imagine a security protocol that could deal with this danger. There's only one way to handle it: DON'T DO IT! And certainly don't add to the risk by building more plants that create the waste!

SISF Behavior Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-REFS-ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (5XC9)
A. Williams (ARW)

4. While I'm on the topic of disaster and disruption, I'd like to know what plan NRC has for evacuating my county of Louisa, plus nearby cities like Charlottesville, Richmond, and Washington DC (less than 100 miles downwind) if anything goes wrong with waste transport, or there is a reactor failure, or a terrorist attack occurs. If NRC or the Dept. of Homeland Security don't have these plans in place, there is no point in even talking about expanding a ripe target like North Anna.
5. I read that NRC plans to "prime the pump" of nuclear power expansion by providing various incentives, rebates and subsidies. If the nuclear power industry can't manage to make a go of it in the free market after 40+ years, and if North Anna's two existing reactors can't turn enough of a profit to make expansion there worthwhile, then this is simply corporate welfare. Slap those grasping hands back! Let the free market rule!

Thanks for your attention. If you think you can deal with my concerns, send me a response. Otherwise, stop North Anna and fission plants like it from expanding. Get on with the task of developing safe energy like fusion reactors, fuel cells, and best of all renewables like solar, wind, and hydro.

Sincerely,



Keith Schlesinger
138 Twin Oaks Rd
Louisa VA 23093

Cc:

Thomas E. Capps, CEO
Dominion Resources
120 Tredegar St
Richmond VA 23219



RDB received
2/07/05

12/10/04
69FR 71554

195

E-RDS-ADM-03

SISF Review Complete

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

all =
A. Williamson (AKA)

template = ADM-013

J. Cuelberg
(SIC 9)

From:

J
Gail Troy
3036 Dutch Creek Ln
Shipman, VA 22971

January 18, 2005

To: Chief

Rules & Directives Branch

Division of Administrative Services

Office of Administration

Mailstop T6D59

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Chief -

... Please stop wasting money on the most expensive electric power generation - which is nuclear - Don't expand North Anna

Where would the waste go - Yucca Flats, still unbuilt will only hold current plant waste to 2012?

What is your evacuation plan? I live within 70 miles of the current plant* & have never received evacuation info.

* North Anna

Washington, DC is less than 90 miles
downwind. What evacuation plans are
in place?

Remember Three Mile Island, it
did happen in the U.S.

The only safe nuclear power
plant is the sun - go solar!

Thank you,

Gail Troy

cc: Nils J. Diaz, Chair, US Nuclear Reg. Comm
Thomas E. Capps, CEO Dominion Resources
Senator John Warner
Senator Geo. Allen
Rep. Virgil Goode

RDB received
2/9/05

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

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

196

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

January 21, 2005

Dear sir or madam:

I am dismayed to read that the NRC concluded the draft of its Environmental Impact Statement by saying "the 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-catastrophes 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 nation'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 shipping containers are not required to undergo full physical 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,
Marione M. Cobb
(Ms.) Marione M. Cobb
138 Twin Oaks Road
Louisa, Virginia, 23093

SISF Review Complete

template = ADM-013

E-RDS = ADM-03

Cobb = J. Cushing (SXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

*ADB received
2/9/05*

2/1/05

2/1/05

Evelyn Noel

2221 Orchid Drive

Falls Church, VA 22046

10/10/04

69 FER 71854

197

Chief
Rules and Directives Branch
Administrative Services
Office of Administration
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington D.C. 20555-0001

Chief,

Most of the time accidents are minor and life as we know it and cherish endures.


Sometimes accidents happen, thousands die, the landscape is contaminated and it takes thousands of years to recover.

Please, no new nuclear power plants for Virginia. I love this state. Help me protect it for a very, very long time.

Please. It just is not worth the risk. Our country has developed technologies that are safer and more enduring in the long term. Let's use them.

I appreciate your attention to this.

Gratefully yours,



Evelyn Noel
Falls Church resident

*SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

203

*ERDS-ADM-03
Call = J. Cuelburg (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)*

*ADB/peccard
01/31/05*

From: "Wanda S. Ballentine" <wsb2001@adelphia.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:02 PM
Subject: No more nuclear plants!!!

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
198*

Dear NRC,

No new nuclear power plant should be build ever, and all those that exist should be shut down. Nuclear energy has been hyped as being clean, green, and cheap, and it is none of those things. The fact that nuclear waste remains lethal for hundreds of thousands of years, much longer than any nation has lasted is all the reason any sane person needs to ban any kind of nuclear use or production. WHO is going to monitor the waste??? None of the ideas of dealing with it make any sense - shooting it into space, burying it under an earthquake-fault ridded mountain.

There has not been one single nuclear plant that has not had leaks, spills, accidents or near accidents, incurring tremendous cost in attempts to fix them (not always successful), and the final decommission cost is outrageous.

The Davis-Besse plant near-disaster is a case in point, and in that situation, both the NRC and the utility, First Energy, were extremely negligent in inspecting the plant and in following up with necessary maintenance and repairs.

Utilities that have fallen for the nuclear hype end up with enormous costs they then foist off on the ratepayers as "stranded costs." Then there is the carefully concealed fact that breast cancer rates rise around such facilities, and I'm sure other types of cancer do too. Finally, there is the fact that nuclear plants are prime targets for terrorists.

Thus, I'm urging the NRC to retract the Early Site Permit for the North Anna nuclear project. There is no way such a facility will NOT adversely impact the environment. It will affect the environment during construction, during power generation, and during the attempts to dispose of and store the spent fuel.

It is indisputable that we are facing an enormous energy crisis because of the pending end of the oil era. However, switching to nuclear only introduces a plethora of other problems already mentioned. Dominion and all utilities should put all their resources to work developing alternative and renewable forms of energy like wind or biomass. Constructing new reactors would be a danger to Virginia and its neighbors; it would be bad for Virginia's environment, bad for taxpayers, and bad for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Wanda S. Ballentine
1195 Sylvania Rd

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

*E-RFDs = ADM-03
Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

Cleveland Heights, OH 44121-2523
USA
wsb2001@adelphia.net

From: "Thomas Matsuda" <matsudat@yahoo.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:42 PM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Thomas Matsuda
 655 Roaring Brook Rd
 Conway, MA 01341
 USA
 matsudat@yahoo.com

SIS P Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RTD secured
 01/31/05

10/10/04

69FR 71854

199

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

RDB Received
1-31-05

From: "Mark Reback" <mark@consumerwatchdog.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
200

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,

Mark Reback
2915 St George St Apt 3
Los Angeles, CA 90027-3026
USA
mark@consumerwatchdog.org

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add: J. Cushing (Jxc9)
A. Williamson
(ARWZ)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

From: "Evan Albright" <e-albright@animail.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 10:52 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Evan Albright
 1370 B Mail Pouch Ln.
 San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
 USA
 e-albright@animail.net

SIS P Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ROB Received
 1-31-05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854

(201)

ERIOS = ADM 03
 Add: J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson
 (ARWI)

From: "Neil Asselin" <nasselin3@comcast.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:12 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Neil Asselin
 47545 American Way Drive
 Macomb, MI 48044-2511
 USA
 nasselin3@comcast.net

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

202

ERIOS = ADM-03
 Add: J Cushing (Jxcg)
 A. Williamson
 (ARWI)

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "kerry burkhardt" <muddydog69@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

(203)

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,

kerry burkhardt
182 Ferndale Ave
Kenmore, NY 14217
USA
muddydog69@hotmail.com

ER105=ADM-03

Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson

(ARW1)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Kim Burgess" <khburgess@uofu.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
204

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,

Kim Burgess
2831 Saint Marys Way
Salt Lake City, UT 84108
USA
khburgess@uofu.net

ERIOS=ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson
(ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "Corina Anderson" <meloncollie78@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

205

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,

Corina Anderson
600 McLaughlin Dr # 28
Santa Cruz, CA 95064-1086
USA
meloncollie78@hotmail.com

ERIOS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson
(ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Terrance Hutchinson" <thutchinson@iwon.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
206

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,

Terrance Hutchinson
21305 Conklin Ct
California City, CA 93505
USA
thutchinson@iwon.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
Add J. Cochring (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Sandy Eichert" <seichert@horizon-productions.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:22 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854

(207)

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,

Sandy Eichert
 7104 Bluecrest Dr
 Cincinnati, OH 45230
 USA
 seichert@horizon-productions.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JCX09)
 A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

From: "Michael Bennett" <resolver33@yahoo.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:22 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Michael Bennett
 1711 W 69th St Apt 4
 Cleveland, OH 44102
 USA
 resolver33@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (208)

ERIDS=ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Debbie Burack" <dhurwitz@prodigy.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
209

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Debbie Burack
225 E 46th St
New York, NY 10017
USA
dhurwitz@prodigy.net

ERIDS=ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "Rdolfo Holz" <himencken@hal-pc.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(210)

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,

Rdolfo Holz
17911 Shady Bridge Ct
Houston, TX 77095-4433
USA
himencken@hal-pc.org

ERIOS = ADM-03
Cud J. Cushing (JCC) (5/20/09)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Paul Williams" <lovemotherearth@ecoisp.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

211

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,

Paul Williams
37 N Boston Ave
Atlantic City, NJ 08401-3534
USA
lovemotherearth@ecoisp.com

ERIS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JYC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Elaine Matthew" <gosioux@comcast.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
212

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,

Elaine Matthew
7317 64th Ave N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55428-2316
USA
gosioux@comcast.net

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "liz fuerst" <liza1014@hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:32 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

(213)

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,

liz fuerst
 736 Hudson River Rd
 Mechanicville, NY 12118
 USA
 liza1014@hotmail.com

ERIOS = ADM-03

Add: J. Cushing (Jxcg)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
 Yumplate = ADM-013

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Rebecca Louis" <becylou2@yahoo.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:32 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(214)

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,

Rebecca Louis
 77 Washburn St
 Simi Valley, CA 93065-4051
 USA
 becylou2@yahoo.com

ERIDS - ADM-03

Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)SIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
. 1/31/05

From: "Meaghan Patrick" <meggie_p85@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71859
215

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,

Meaghan Patrick
44 Silverthorne Bush Dr.
Toronto, ON M9C 2X8
Canada
meggie_p85@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Complete = ADM-013

ERIS=ADM-03
Add J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Victoria Campbell" <directtrash@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
216

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,

Victoria Campbell
286 S Batavia St
Orange, CA 92868-3902
USA
directtrash@hotmail.com

SIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Renee Duprey" <belladonna592@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
217

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,

Renee Duprey
236 Trim Rd
Morrisonville, NY 12962-3948
USA
belladonna592@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
ADD - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "David W. Cook Jr." <dwcooknb@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(218)

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,

David W. Cook Jr.
18230 Hereford Ln
Houston, TX 77058-3434
USA
dwcooknb@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

ADB Received
1/31/05

From: "Francisco Maya" <rigpath@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(219)

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,

Francisco Maya
Juan Enriquez 545 Col Juan Escutia
Del Iztapalapa Mexico DF
Mexico, 09100
Mexico
rigpath@hotmail.com

Ⓢ RIDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

A.M.A.

226

J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Robert Seltzer" <rsscpa@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
220

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,

Robert Seltzer
6465 Kanan Dume Rd
Malibu, CA 90265-4040
USA
rsscpa@earthlink.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (Jxcq)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

AOB Received
1/31/05

From: "Sarah Kendall" <bohemia82@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
221

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,

Sarah Kendall
296 Missouri Ave
Herndon, VA 20170-5421
USA
bohemia82@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "sarah pope" <sallyapope@aol.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:02 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(222)

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,

sarah pope
 327 W 19th St
 New York, NY 10011
 USA
 sallyapope@aol.com

SIS Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Linda Schweppe" <linda071862@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

223

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Linda Schweppe
1495 Balsam St Apt 1
Lakewood, CO 80214-4080
USA
linda071862@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
ADD - J. Cushing
(Jxcg)
AWilliamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Kim Brooks" <kimagic@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(224)

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,

Kim Brooks
PO Box 426
Patterson Lakes, 3197
Australia
kimagic@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
Add J. Bushong (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/21/05

From: "Barbara L Wood" <barbara@dobsis.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
225

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,

Barbara L Wood
PO Box 423
Burley, WA 98322
USA
barbara@dobsis.org

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Jason J Green" <protectanimals@care2.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:32 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(226)

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,

Jason J Green
 451 Pine Hill Dr
 Stanardsville, VA 22973-2073
 USA
 protectanimals@care2.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
 Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received

11/31/05

From: "Audrey Blumeenau" <blumeneau@aboutaudrey.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69FR 71854

227

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Audrey Blumeenau
310 Morrissey Blvd
Santa Cruz, CA 95062-1256
USA
blumeneau@aboutaudrey.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Joanna F. Welch" <joannawelch@hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:32 PM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Joanna F. Welch
 PO Box 7584
 Yellowtail, MT 59035-7584
 USA
 joannawelch@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
 Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

228

From: "Ron Richards" <richards@email.arizona.edu>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:32 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received

1/31/05

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

(229)

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,

Ron Richards
 1546 E Blackledge Dr
 Tucson, AZ 85719-2663
 USA
 richards@email.arizona.edu

SIS P - Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
 add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Stewart Rosenkrantz" <srosenkr@bellsouth.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:42 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Stewart Rosenkrantz
 2319 SE 9th St
 Pompano Beach, FL 33062
 USA
 srosenkr@bellsouth.net

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM 013

RDB Received
 11/31/05

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

230

ERIOS = ADM -03
 add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Steve Summers" <ssum@vcn.bc.ca>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
1/31/05

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(231)

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,

Steve Summers
8349 Laurelridge Rd
San Diego, CA 92120
USA
ssum@vcn.bc.ca

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Michael Mihok" <largo31@redjellyfish.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
232

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,

Michael Mihok
792 Atlantic City Blvd
Bayville, NJ 08721-3030
USA
largo31@redjellyfish.net

ERIOS = ADM-03
Add S. Cushing (Jyc9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM.013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Nancy Gathing" <gathingn@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 6:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
233

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,

Nancy Gathing
3701 Tulane Ave
Madison, WI 53714-2952
USA
gathingn@yahoo.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

From: "Felix Aguilar, MD, MPH" <felix.aguilar@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

RDB Received
1/31/05

January 14, 2005

12/10/04

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69 FR 71854

234

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,

Felix Aguilar, MD, MPH
771 Raymond Ave
Long Beach, CA 90804-4629
USA
felix.aguilar@earthlink.net

ERIS-ADM-03
add J. Cashing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Charles Alvarez" <caaps6m@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(235)

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Charles Alvarez
8550 Forest Pkwy Apt 2M
Woodhaven, NY 11421
USA
caaps6m@yahoo.com

ERDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

From: "Marlene Stanley" <marlene@veggiekids.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
1/31/05

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

236

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,

Marlene Stanley
2110 N B St
Fairfield, IA 52556-2097
USA
marlene@veggiekids.org

ERIOS = ADM-03
Add J.Cushing (JXC9)
A.Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Martha Waltman" <marhawaltman@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
237

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,

Martha Waltman
PO Box 643
Newberry, FL 32669-0643
USA
marhawaltman@hotmail.com

ER105=ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (Jxcq)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template= ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "tom jackson" <tomj7@colbi.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:32 PM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
238

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,

tom jackson
 720 16th St Apt 418
 Denver, CO 80202-3238
 USA
 tomj7@colbi.net

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Kevin Vaught" <kivaught@bellsouth.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(239)

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,

Kevin Vaught
505 Oak Forest Cir
Antioch, TN 37013-1842
USA
kivaught@bellsouth.net

ERIDS=ADM-03
Add:
J. Cushing (Jxcg)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Kelly Riley" <khanlon74@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 7:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(240)

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,

Kelly Riley
154 Montgomery Dr
Harleysville, PA 19438
USA
khanlon74@yahoo.com

ERIOS-ADM-03
Add: J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Michael Evans" <c_thomas_flood@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
(241)

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,

Michael Evans
1406 Humboldt St
Denver, CO 80218-2310
USA
c_thomas_flood@hotmail.com

ERIOS = ADM-03
add: Scushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Richard H. Williams" <adamen@mindspring.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69FR71854
242

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,

Richard H. Williams
PO Box 381
Camden, NC 27921-0381
USA
adamen@mindspring.com

ERIS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Richard Spotts" <spotts@infowest.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:32 PM
Subject: Please Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
243

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

Please 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 grave" 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 very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard Spotts
1125 W Emerald Dr
Saint George, UT 84770-6026
USA
spotts@infowest.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

S/SP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Jason Trew" <jasontrew@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(244)

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,

Jason Trew
505 Cowhand Dr
Harker Heights, TX 76548-2438
USA
jasontrew@hotmail.com

ERIOS = ADM-03
ADD - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

12/16/04

69 FR 71854

(245)

From: "Amber Crooks" <robotmaster@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:22 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Amber Crooks
1032 SE 18th Ave
Cape Coral, FL 33990-1839
USA
robotmaster@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Implate = ADM-013

ERDS = ADM-03
ADD - J. Cushing (Jxg)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received

1/31/05

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

246

From: "Christopher Meder" <chris.meder@alum.rpi.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:02 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Christopher Meder
1114 N 78th St
Seattle, WA 98103-4812
USA
chris.meder@alum.rpi.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Laura Walters" <waltersl@dickinson.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 8:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(247)

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,

Laura Walters
56 Wilson St
Carlisle, PA 17013-2842
USA
waltersl@dickinson.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JVC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Jon Roberts" <jonroberts@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(248)

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Jon Roberts
3111 E Highway 101 # 25A
Port Angeles, WA 98362-9070
USA
jonroberts@hotmail.com

ERIS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
11/31/05

From: "Jesse Gore" <jesse.gore@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(249)

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,

Jesse Gore
6013 Kenwood Dr
Nashville, TN 37215-5703
USA
jessegore@yahoo.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add G. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Kirk Rhoads" <kirkrhoads@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:02 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(250)

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Kirk Rhoads
301 Cooper St
Mountain Home, AR 72653
USA
kirkrhoads@hotmail.com

ERDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Paula Stober" <paulastober@triad.rr.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 5:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
251

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,

Paula Stober
3607 Timberoak Dr
Greensboro, NC 27410
USA
paulastober@triad.rr.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
Add. J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Alex Balboa" <alexbalboa@fastmail.fm>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
252

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Alex Balboa
1996 Waverly Drive
Bel Air, MD 21015-1100
USA
alexbalboa@fastmail.fm

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Bill LaFleur" <furry@world.std.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:52 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69 FR 71857
253

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Bill LaFleur
66 N Village Rd
Cape Neddick, ME 03902-7932
USA
furry@world.std.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Craig Williams" <porterrockwell@if.rmci.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:52 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
254

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Craig Williams
240 Ronglyn Ave
Idaho Falls, ID 83401
USA
porterrockwell@if.rmci.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add g. Guebing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Timothy Johnston" <tjohnst@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

(255)

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Timothy Johnston
3094 Lake Dr Apt F7
Marina, CA 93933-2867
USA
tjohnst@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (Jxc9)
Williamson (ARWD)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Ferris Kavar" <ferrisk2@verizon.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: No Early Site Permit for Lake Anna - Please

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
256

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Ferris Kavar
1798 1/2 Washington Way
Venice, CA 90291-4702
USA
ferrisk2@verizon.net

CRIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "John Golembieski" <suztripltree@mac.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
257

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,

John Golembieski
15 Crows Nest Ln
East Hampton, CT 06424-3038
USA
suztripltree@mac.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add. J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "ROGER KEMPTON" <rogkempton20002000@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

RDB Received
1/31/05

January 15, 2005

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
258

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

ROGER KEMPTON
55 W Prospect St
Nanuet, NY 10954-2622
USA
rogkempton20002000@yahoo.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Scot Phillips" <bittersweettooth@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

259

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Scot Phillips
500 E 61 Terr
Kansas City, MO 64110
USA
bittersweettooth@msn.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JKC)
A. Williamson (~~AW~~)
(ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Vicki Johnson" <vjohnson@kc.rr.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(260)

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,

Vicki Johnson
10735 Spruce Ave
Kansas City, MO 64137-1853
USA
vjohnson@kc.rr.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (Jxc9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Adrienne Moumin" <Photowonder2010@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(261)

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,

Adrienne Moumin
2807 Byron St
Silver Spring, MD 20902-2606
USA
Photowonder2010@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-03

CRIPS = ADM-03
add - J. Custung (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Peggy Conroy" <gilletlb@northnet.org>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:30 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
262

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Peggy Conroy
30 Conroy Rd
West Chazy, NY 12992
USA
gilletlb@northnet.org

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "John Mark Robertson" <jarre@interlog.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:29 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
253

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,

John Mark Robertson
573 Ossington Avenue
Toronto, ON M6G 3T4
Canada
jarre@interlog.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = Adm-013

ERDS = Adm-03
add - J.Cushing (Jycq)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Michelle Palladine" <mpalladine@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:28 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

RDB Received
1/31/05

January 15, 2005

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(264)

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Michelle Palladine
777 E Tahquitz Canyon Way
Palm Springs, CA 92262
USA
mpalladine@earthlink.net

ERIDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Caroline Pott" <cmpott@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
265

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Caroline Pott
134 Wade Hampton Dr SW
Vienna, VA 22180-6233
USA
cmpott@yahoo.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

From: "Merrill Cole" <merrillcole@earthlink.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
 Subject: No to a New Nuclear Power Plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I write to oppose the issuance of an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project. The proposed nuclear site would be detrimental both to the environment and to local communities. Please consider the effects of construction, power generation and the disposal and storage of spent fuel in calculating environmental impact.

With its truck traffic, smog, and building waste, the construction would be detrimental to the environment. Moreover, Lake Anna will not physically support the addition of new reactors. Increased water use would cause the lake level to drop significantly. Lower water levels would adversely affect the lake. Lake temperature would be affected, probably killing the lifeforms that inhabit it.

Currently, there is no national policy on nuclear waste storage. Whether the spent fuel rods are kept on site, or be shipped to another site, they would pose a threat to the environment and to one community or another.

I firmly oppose 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.

Sincerely,

Merrill Cole
 15211 Highway 77
 Panama City, FL 32409-2661
 USA
 merrillcole@earthlink.net

RDB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (266)

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
 add J. Cushing (JTC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Sally Simpson" <sally.simpson@sbcglobal.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(267)

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,

Sally Simpson
326 Crooked Crk
Garland, TX 75043-3100
USA
sally.simpson@sbcglobal.net

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J Cushing (JCEG)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-03

RDB Received
11/31/05

From: "Claire Watson" <ce99watson@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
268

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,

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

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

CRWS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RFB Received
1/31/05

From: "Dale Krewson" <Dalak@webtv.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
269

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,

Dale Krewson
3383 Snow Peak Pl
Lebanon, OR 97355-1035
USA
Dalak@webtv.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXCJ)
A. Williamson (ARW)

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Chelsea Snelgrove" <chsnelgrove@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
270

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Chelsea Snelgrove
290 Southerland Ter NE # 3
Atlanta, GA 30307-2344
USA
chsnelgrove@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-03
013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RAG Received
1/31/05

From: "Warren Wright" <wwwright@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
271

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,

Warren Wright
1011 Stanford Ave
Oakland, CA 94608-2317
USA
wwwright@earthlink.net

ERIS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JKC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SIS P Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Shyla Raghav" <supershyler@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(272)

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Shyla Raghav
5 Morning Star
Irvine, CA 92612-3746
USA
supershyler@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Jane Kimbrough" <janekimbro@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

273

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Jane Kimbrough
906 Via Casitas
Greenbrae, CA 94904
USA
janekimbro@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add =
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB received

1/31/05

From: "Dan Brook" <Brook@california.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plants in North Anna or anywhere else!

12/16/04
69 FR 71854

(274)

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

No nuclear power plants in North Anna or anywhere else!

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.

No nuclear power plants in North Anna or anywhere else!

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Dan Brook
150 Font Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94132
USA
Brook@california.com

ERIOS = ADM-03

Add:

J. Cushing (JXCQ)

A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

281

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "David Wilcox" <davidwilcox@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(275)

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

David Wilcox
201 W Crystal Ave
Lombard, IL 60148-1550
USA
davidwilcox@earthlink.net

ERIDS = ADM-03
add = J. Cushing
(JXC9)

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM-013 282

A. Williamson
(ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Valerie Soza" <valsoza@msn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/16/04
69 FR 71854

276

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Valerie Soza
500 NW 60th St Apt 1
Seattle, WA 98107-2158
USA
valsoza@msn.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWi)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Adrienne Hohenberg" <AHlight@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:26 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
277

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Adrienne Hohenberg
9007 SW 62nd Ter
Miami, FL 33173-1669
USA
AHlight@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J Cushing (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Brenda Barnhart" <nmgirl@frys.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 11:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(278)

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,

Brenda Barnhart
1272 Clover Ln
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
USA
nmgirl@frys.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Dinda Evans" <dindamcp4@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 11:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
279

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,

Dinda Evans
PO Box 178695
San Diego, CA 92177-8695
USA
dindamcp4@yahoo.com

ERIS = ADM-03
add:
J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Monica Allen" <monicakayallen@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 11:22 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
280

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,

Monica Allen
4631 Amesbury Dr Apt 3122
Dallas, TX 75206
USA
monicakayallen@hotmail.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Stephanie Sims" <starr77777@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 11:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
381

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,

Stephanie Sims
2333 Warwick Dr
Oldsmar, FL 34677
USA
starr77777@yahoo.com

ERDS = ADM-03
Rdd J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

From: "Chad Derosier" <poogebear@Hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 11:02 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Chad Derosier
 PO Box 969
 Jacksonville, OR 97530-0969
 USA
 poogebear@Hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854

282

ERIDS = ADM-03
 add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "martha leahy" <martha638@webtv.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 11:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
283

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,

martha leahy
39 Lockeland Rd
Winchester, MA 01890-3341
USA
martha638@webtv.net

ERIS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "Stacey Lightfoot" <slightfoot23@planet-save.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 10:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

284

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,

Stacey Lightfoot
76 Ronald Dr
Burlington, NJ 08016
USA
slightfoot23@planet-save.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM 013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Barbara Arcure" <espritjole@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 10:42 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
285

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,

Barbara Arcure
4218 W Fountain Way
Fresno, CA 93722-4652
USA
espritjole@yahoo.com

ERIOS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Carmen Rico" <carmenrico@animall.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 10:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(A86)

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,

Carmen Rico
185 rue Berlioz
Montreal, QC H3E 1c1
Canada
carmenrico@animall.net

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "nancy spears" <wolffree1@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 10:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
(287)

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,

nancy spears
15 Southgate Dr
Bossier City, LA 71112-8603
USA
wolffree1@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JYC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Diba Khan-Bureau" <pbdkb@msn.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 10:02 PM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
288

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,

Diba Khan-Bureau
 40 Hill Top Trl
 Salem, CT 06420
 USA
 pbdkb@msn.com

SKSP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

RAB Received
1/31/05

From: "David Burkhart" <merlinbirdhawk@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
289

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,

David Burkhart
7735 Sunnyside Rd SE
Salem, OR 97306-9537
USA
merlinbirdhawk@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
add g. Cushing (JRC)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received
1/31/05

From: "Ryan Davis" <ryansdavis@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(290)

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,

Ryan Davis
225 W Verdugo Ave Apt 203
Burbank, CA 91502
USA
ryansdavis@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A Williamson (ARWD)

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "Brett Feldman" <feldjamin@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

291

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Brett Feldman
4 Admiral Dr
Emeryville, CA 94608
USA
feldjamin@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-110

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing - (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Elizabeth McAnally" <Elizabeth_McAnally@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

292

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

Elizabeth McAnally
1600 W Oak St Apt 5
Denton, TX 76201-3858
USA
Elizabeth_McAnally@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM = 013

ERIOS = ADM-03
adol J. Cushing (JYCG)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "brandi gartland" <b_land53@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

293

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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,

brandi gartland
2532 Dana St
Berkeley, CA 94704-2822
USA
b_land53@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIOS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC?)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Sarah Harris" <cerahshocker@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 9:12 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

RDB Received
1/31/05

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
294

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,

Sarah Harris
405 Strand Ave
Missoula, MT 59801-5712
USA
cerahshocker@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-C

ERIOS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received

1/31/05

From: "Erika Shamo" <erika.shamo@brinker.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

295

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,

Erika Shamo
1031 N Wolcott Ave
Chicago, IL 60622-3760
USA
erika.shamo@brinker.com

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Yomplate = ADM-013

From: "Laura Herndon" <laura.herndon@disney.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:32 PM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

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,

Laura Herndon
 222 N Buena Vista St Apt 207
 Burbank, CA 91505-3682
 USA
 laura.herndon@disney.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-0

303

RDB Received
 1/31/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (296)

ERIPS = ADM-03

add J. Cushing
 (JXC9)

A. Williamson
 (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Douglas Krueger" <dkrueger@csusb.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:32 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
297

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,

Douglas Krueger
PO Box 2744
Crestline, CA 92325-2744
USA
dkrueger@csusb.edu

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add. J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Gerald Dalton" <gdalton@worldnet.att.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
298

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,

Gerald Dalton
874 Benedetti Dr Apt 202
Naperville, IL 60563-8922
USA
gdalton@worldnet.att.net

ERIOS = ADM-03
add. J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKW)

SIS Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "katarzyna /" <katarzynajong@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(299)

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,

katarzyna /
/
/, ON N3C 3C1
Canada
katarzynajong@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add: ~~J. Cushing~~
J. Cushing (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Peggy Phan" <pphan@umn.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
300

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,

Peggy Phan
77 Pleasant St SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0216
USA
pphan@umn.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-c

ERIS = ADM-03
add -J. Cushing (Jxcg)
A. Williamson
(ARWI)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Mary H Woodward" <mwoodward@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:42 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(30)

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,

Mary H Woodward
460 Old Town Rd Apt 6F
Port Jefferson Station, NY 11776-2211
USA
mwoodward@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (Jxcg)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Judith Shematek" <jshematek119@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
302

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,

Judith Shematek
119 Chisman Lndg
Seaford, VA 23696-2345
USA
jshematek119@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Addg. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Antje Adams" <antjea@email.arizona.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 14, 2005 4:52 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 14, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

303

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,

Antje Adams
1533 W La Pasadita St
Tucson, AZ 85705
USA
antjea@email.arizona.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
1/31/05

From: "Janice Foss" <libraj@comcast.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
304

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,

Janice Foss
633 Richmond St
El Cerrito, CA 94530-3212
USA
libraj@comcast.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "Barney McComas" <barney@planet-save.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: CA

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854
305*

Dear NRC,

I oppose the North Anna nuclear project and urge the NRC to reconsider issuing an Early Site Permit, 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 for considering my views.

Sincerely,

Barney McComas
2806 6th Ave
San Diego, CA 92103-6302
USA
barney@planet-save.com

*SISP Review Complete
Templates - ADM-013*

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW1)*
312

*ADP received
2/4/05*

From: "Helen Kopp" <kopphm@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:36 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

69FR 71857

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

(306)

Dear NRC,

In this current atmosphere of terror alerts and due to the failure to secure currently operating nuclear power plants, I find the desire to permit the building of a new nuke plant to be utter insanity. Furthermore, construction of such a plant is extremely expensive, and its output would add the the present mountain of nuclear waste of which we already have trouble disposing. I urge the NRC to deny Issuing an Early Site Permit to the North Anna nuclear project based on the faulty premise 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,

Helen Kopp
12521 Indian Hollow Rd
Grafton, OH 44044-9190
USA
kopphm@yahoo.com

GISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

313

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC:9)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

From: "Colleen McGlone" <crmglone@moose-mail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

*R3B received
2/4/05*

January 15, 2005

10/10/04

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69FR 71854

307

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,

Colleen McGlone
3540 Hartland Dr
New Port Richey, FL 34655-2505
USA
crmglone@moose-mail.com

E-RFDS = ADM-03

EdL = J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARW1)

314

GISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

*RDD reviewed
2/4/05*

From: "Jennifer Heavilin" <Pika1319@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

69FR 71854

308

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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 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.

Also, to further conserve resources, please do not reply via postal mail. Thanks!

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Heavilin
1830 High Ave Apt B6
Panama City, FL 32405
USA
Pika1319@aol.com

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADH-013

E-RIDS = ADH-03

315 *all = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

RFB received
2/14/05

2/10/04

69FR 41854

(309)

Robert Fener
1011 Swapping Camp Road
Amherst, Virginia 24521

Chief Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration - Mail Stop T-6D59
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 2055-001


February 2, 2005

I am writing you in regards to the permitting of new reactors at the North Anna site in Virginia. I am vehemently opposed. I live in a solar powered house including electricity so I know that technology works with minimal environmental impact. I would remind you that the birth rate of normal children within a radius of Chernobyl is below fifteen percent. As a firefighter and EMT, I am well aware of the health concerns if there is a failure. The literature is rife with details of premature corrosion of various components of reactors. We have NO safe way of disposal of waste. There are issues of general safety, not to mention the terrorist invitation potential.

I could go on but you get my impression. It is a tremendous waste of money for a dangerous technology that is not necessary.

Thank you for allowing me to comment upon this matter.

Sincerely,


Robert Fener

SEARCHED
SERIALIZED
INDEXED
FILED

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

316

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

From: "Sharon Smith" <taosharon@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

RDD issued

2/4/05

10/10/04

69 FR 71854

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

310

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,

Sharon Smith
752 Greenwich St Apt 3C
New York, NY 10014-2172
USA
taosharon@aol.com

SISJ letter complete

template = ADH-013

*F-RIDS = ADH-03
all = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWF)*

*R7B nuclear
2/4/05*

From: "Janet Fotos" <janfotos@charter.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

12/10/04

January 15, 2005

69 FR 71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

311

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,

Janet Fotos
26 Truell Rd
Hollis, NH 03049-6271
USA
janfotos@charter.net

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

318

*E-ADS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (5X09)
A. Williamson (ACWA)*

*RJB received
2/4/05*

From: "Bree Bessette" <erikastar7@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

*10/10/04
69FR 918574*

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

312

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,

Bree Bessette
2717 Newtown Ave Apt 3
Astoria, NY 11102-2461
USA
erikastar7@hotmail.com

E-REDS = ADM-03

*add = J. Quelling (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

319

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*RDB Maurice
2/4/05*

From: "John Ingle" <jingle@lanset.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

10/10/04

69 FR 71854

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

313

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,

John Ingle
1569 Grove St
San Francisco, CA 94117-1320
USA
jingle@lanset.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

320

*STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*RDR received
2/4/05*

From: "Gina Boltz" <KispokoT@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

10/10/04

January 15, 2005

69FR 71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

314

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,

Gina Boltz
4848 N Crestridge Rd
Toledo, OH 43623-1018
USA
KispokoT@aol.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-LEDS = ADM-03

*Adv = J. Cushing (SKEF)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

321

*Bob Usarac
2/4/05*

From: "Shaun Smakal" <smakal@theshrubbery.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69 FR 71854*

315

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,

Shaun Smakal
10177 Byron Rd
Byron, MI 48418
USA
smakal@theshrubbery.com

*STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

322

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
All = J. Cusling (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)*

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "A. Patrick" <ap_dakinihaven@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:31 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 41854*

316

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,

A. Patrick
3100 Ewing Ave
Altadena, CA 91001
USA
ap_dakinihaven@yahoo.com

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

323

*E-RFDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (AWM)*

*RDB Received
2/14/05*

From: "Susanna Blunt" <b_susanna@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:32 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*10/10/04
69FC71854*

317

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,

Susanna Blunt
645 Ingalls St
Lakewood, CO 80214-2347
USA
b_susanna@yahoo.com

5758 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

324

E-RIDS = ADM-03

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

2/4/05
RDB Keared

From: "Demelza Costa" <Denayone@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:32 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
691R 71854

318

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,

Demelza Costa
28626 Ridgeway Rd
Sweet Home, OR 97386
USA
Denayone@yahoo.com

SFSF Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

325

FRIDS = ADM-03

App = J. Cushing (JKC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB received
01/11/05

From: "Rebecca Schild" <r_schild@coloradocollege.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:32 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

10/10/04
69FR41857

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

319

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,

Rebecca Schild
902 N Cascade Ave # 1555
Colorado Springs, CO 80946-3200
USA
r_schild@coloradocollege.edu

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

326

EXIDS = ADM-03
v = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AAWI)

*8713 received
2/14/05*

From: "David Fairman" <dbfairman@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:32 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*10/10/07
69FR 71854*

320

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,

David Fairman
1895 Alpine Ave # E18
Boulder, CO 80304-3630
USA
dbfairman@hotmail.com

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

327

*E-REDS = ADM-03
Ad = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

*ADB received
2/4/05*

From: "Ray Bell" <raysdreamspellkin@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:33 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

*12/10/04
69FR71854*

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

321

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,

Ray Bell
1849 Golden State Ave Apt J
Bakersfield, CA 93301-1015
USA
raysdreamspellkin@hotmail.com

5/5/05 Review Complete

*E-RFDS = ADM-03
u = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ALW2)*

328

Template = ADM-013

*ADB received
2/4/05*

From: "Sheila Ward" <asopao@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:33 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*10/10/04
C9FR 71854*

322

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,

Sheila Ward
265 Calle Sorbona Apt 2
San Juan, PR 00927-4106
USA
asopao@yahoo.com

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADU-013*

329

*E-LFDS = ADU-03
J. Quabing (JXC9)
7. N. Williams box (ARW2)*

*ADB received
2/4/05*

From: "Candace Johnson" <canjohnson@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

323

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,

Candace Johnson
10466 Moselle St
San Diego, CA 92131-1419
USA
canjohnson@aol.com

*STSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

330

*F-BEDS = ADM-03
= J. Cuelving (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AW1)*

*RDB - received
2/4/05*

From: "Keegan Roberson" <poisoncandy@excite.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*10/10/04
69FR 71854*

324

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,

Keegan Roberson
588 Damas Pl
Chula Vista, CA 91910-7944
USA
poisoncandy@excite.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
P. Williamson (AEW1)*

331

*575 f Review Complete
template = ADM-013*

RDB Received

2/04/05

From: "Matthew Tiffault" <tiffault@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69R 71854

325

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,

Matthew Tiffault
4655 Bloomsbury Dr
Syracuse, NY 13215-2328
USA
tiffault@yahoo.com

E-RTDS = ADM-03

332

*Call = J. Cuelving (5XC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)*

*ESF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "James Facette" <gemface@planet-save.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FB 41854

326

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,

James Facette
3140 Waialae Ave # 323
Honolulu, HI 96816-1510
USA
gemface@planet-save.com

*SISF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*K-PIJS = ADM-03
2 = J. Covling (5x09)
A. Williamson (ALWI)*
333

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "Adrienne Moumin" <Photowonder2010@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*10/10/04
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.

327

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,

Adrienne Moumin
2807 Byron St.
Silver Spring, MD 20902-2606
USA
Photowonder2010@hotmail.com

SESP Review Complete

E-RDS = ADM-03

Templates = ADM-013

*Call = J. Cushing (5X09)
A. Williamson (AW1)*

334

*ADP received
2/4/05*

From: "Kevin Laffey" <illumen@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 15, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

328

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,

Kevin Laffey
5670 Holly Oak Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90068
USA
illumen@aol.com

SISF Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RFDS = ADM-03

Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARW1)

335

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "sherry salomon" <sherrystev@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04

January 15, 2005

69FR 71854

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

339

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,

sherry salomon
963 Farm Haven Dr
Rockville, MD 20852
USA
sherrystev@aol.com

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

336

*E-RFDS = ADM-03
GHE = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

RDB received
2/4/05

From: "Amy Wilson" <veggieliving@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:35 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 16, 2005

12/10/04

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

69FR 71854

330

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,

Amy Wilson
16100 NE 150th St
Luther, OK 73054-9438
USA
veggieliving@yahoo.com

SESP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW2)

337

Template = ADM-013

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "Conor Petren" <petrencj@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:36 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

10/10/04

69FR 71854

331

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 marine life that inhabits 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, biomass, or solar. 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 consideration of my view.

Sincerely,

Conor Petren
200 Starcrest Dr Apt 188
Clearwater, FL 33765-3815
USA
petrencj@hotmail.com

F-RIDS=ADM-03

SFSF Review Complete

*AD = J. Cushing (JXC9)
338 A. Williamson (ARW1)*

Template = ADM-013

RDB received

2/4/05

From: "Carlton Robbins" <R_Carlton@Bellsouth.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:36 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

Dear NRC,

332

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,

Carlton Robbins
2602 Confederate Dr
Wilmington, NC 28403-0224
USA
R_Carlton@Bellsouth.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03

= J. Cushing (JXC9)

339 *Williamson (ARW1)*

SFSF Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

ADG received

From: "Donna Cassano" <surjunk2000@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:37 AM
Subject: Public Comment on North Anna Reactor

2/4/05

Donna Cassano
321 Paseo del Flag
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

12/10/04

January 16, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

69FR71854

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

333

How can you even think about building new reactors when we don't even have a place for the waste that we have? Even if Yucca Mountain is built, - and that's not a certainty - that facility will only hold the waste that is currently in existence.

Nuclear energy must be phased out, not revived. The only reason nuclear energy is cheap is because of the Federal subsidies that the nuclear industry receives. I'm all for free trade, but this is Corporate Welfare. Get ready for opposition. The people are getting informed, and they're pissed!

Sincerely concerned,

Donna Cassano

SFSR Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

*E-RIDS = ADM-03
cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
340A. Williamson (ARWI)*

*BDB received
2/4/05*

From: "Kristina Weller" <petzlv@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:37 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FB 7R54*

Dear NRC,

334

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,

Kristina Weller
PO Box 12332
Aspen, CO 81612-9238
USA
petzlv@hotmail.com

*SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

341

*ERFDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKWA)*

*RDB received
2/1/05*

From: "Matt Moore" <lightfoot_32@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:38 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

Dear NRC,

335

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. This is a totally disastrous and ill conceived project and should be rejected.

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,

Matt Moore
PO Box 984
Miller Place, NY 11764
USA
lightfoot_32@hotmail.com

*ESFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

*F-RFDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A Williamson (ARW1)*

RDB received
2/4/05

From: "Marina Spitkovskaya" <moonsidhe@gmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:38 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69FR 71854

336

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,

Marina Spitkovskaya
125 Dwight St
New Haven, CT 06511-4501
USA
moonsidhe@gmail.com

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

343 E-RIDS = ADM-03
Cable = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Alicia Williamson (ARW1)

*RDB/Secured
2/4/05*

From: "Dorothea Fransson" <dfransso@tulane.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:38 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FB 71854*

337

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,

Dorothea Fransson
MR 812
31 McAlister
New Orleans, LA 70118
USA
dfransso@tulane.edu

STSP Better Complete

*E-RDS = ADM-03
Cee = J. Cushing (JXC9)
Williamson (APW?)*

Template = ADM-013

344

*RDB received
2/11/05*

From: "Cheryl Rosenfeld" <rosenfeldc@missouri.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:38 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 16, 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.

338

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,

Cheryl Rosenfeld
4340 Roemer Rd
Columbia, MO 65202
USA
rosenfeldc@missouri.edu

*SISF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013*

345

*F-RIDS = ADM-03
ADM = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWE)*

*RDB received
2/4/05*

From: "Stephen Calkins" <ecstacy2@earthlink.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:39 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
339*

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,

Stephen Calkins
PO Box 766
Ithaca, NY 14851-0766
USA
ecstacy2@earthlink.net

SISF Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

346

*E-EDS = ADM-03
all = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

ADB Rec'd
2/14/05

From: "Ben Reed" <anarchyscapitalist@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:40 AM
Subject: Alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
340

Dear NRC,

I write today because 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,

Ben Reed
711 Long Hill Rd
Guilford, CT 06437
USA
anarchyscapitalist@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM=013

E-R105 = ADM-03
Add - g. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

RDB Received
2/14/05

From: "Paul Schneller" <schnelle@indiana.edu>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:40 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (341)

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,

Paul Schneller
 1500 E Richland Dr
 Bloomington, IN 47408-9755
 USA
 schnelle@indiana.edu

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

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

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Maritza Santana" <spot1@mac.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:41 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
342

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,

Maritza Santana
470 E 41st St
Hialeah, FL 33013
USA
spot1@mac.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIPS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (Jxcg)
A. Williamson (ARwl)

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Bobbie Dee Flowers" <b_flowers@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:41 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
343

January 16, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

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.

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,

Bobbie Dee Flowers
418 W 17th St Apt 22A
New York, NY 10011-5826
USA
b_flowers@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-R105 = ADM-03
add' J. Cushing (Jxcq)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Ken Irwin" <btrmoon@ameritech.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:43 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
(344)

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,

Ken Irwin
4432 N Damen Ave
Chicago, IL 60625-1702
USA
btrmoon@ameritech.net

SISP Review Complete

ERIS = ADM-03
Add - J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

Template = ADM-013

351

RDB Received
2/14/05

From: "Lisa Butch" <butchybonbon@hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:44 AM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854

(345)

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,

Lisa Butch
 850 Georgetown Rd
 Salem, OH 44460-9710
 USA
 butchybonbon@hotmail.com

\$ISP Review Complete

E-RIPS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

Template = ADM-013

352

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Seth Silverman" <SSilverman86@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:45 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
346

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,

Seth Silverman
60 E End Ave Apt 8B
New York, NY 10028
USA
SSilverman86@hotmail.com

E-R105 = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/14/05

From: "alma evans" <soulsetfree@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
347

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,

alma evans
174 S Pascack Rd
Nanuet, NY 10954-5957
USA
soulsetfree@aol.com

E-R10S = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Nicole Totino" <ntotino@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:46 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
348

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,

Nicole Totino
1561 Greencrest Dr
Pittsburgh, PA 15226-1919
USA
ntotino@hotmail.com

ERIDS = ADM-03

add J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/14/05

From: "Kathy Mikulski" <kmyski@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
349

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,

Kathy Mikulski
55 Sewall Ave
Brookline, MA 02446-5249
USA
kmyski@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

356

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received
2/4/05

From: "Ned Fongemie" <madcap23523@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
350

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,

Ned Fongemie
7159 Albany Rd
Fort Myers, FL 33912-5823
USA
madcap23523@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add. J. Cushing (JKC)
A. Williamson (ARW)

357

ROB Received
2/14/05

From: "Gregory Esteve" <gregatourhouse@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
(351)

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,

Gregory Esteve
3655 N Scenic Hwy
Lake Wales, FL 33898
USA
gregatourhouse@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

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

Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/14/05

From: "Eric Mens" <ericthemens@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
352

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,

Eric Mens
1000 Sunset Ave
Petersburg, VA 23805-1918
USA
ericthemens@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
* Complete = ADM-013

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

ROB Received
2/14/05

From: "M. Esseltine" <ratsass@wildmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
353

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,

M. Esseltine
 491 Palmerston Blvd.
 Toronto, ON M6G 2P2
 Canada
 ratsass@wildmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
C. G. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Virginia Cassidy" <virginia.cassidy@unisys.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:47 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
354

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,

Virginia Cassidy
1772 Hendricks Station Rd
Harleysville, PA 19438
USA
virginia.cassidy@unisys.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Khaalen East" <keast@lclark.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
355

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,

Khaalen East
MSC# 1993
0615 SW Palatine Hill Rd.
Portland, OR 97219
USA
keast@lclark.edu

SISP Review Complete

Yumplate = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (J.KC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Sharon Pederslie" <sylvanheart@theoldpath.zzn.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854

356

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,

Sharon Pederslie
525 14th Ave E Apt 1004
Seattle, WA 98112-4559
USA
sylvanheart@theoldpath.zzn.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add: J. Cuckung (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

From: "Kelly Schneider" <schnikies_13@yahoo.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
 2/14/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (357)

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,

Kelly Schneider
 9300 26th PI NW
 Seattle, WA 98117-2821
 USA
 schnikies_13@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RDS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC 9)
 A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
2/14/05

From: "Charlotte Lundemo" <charlotte@computercoop.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04
69 FR 71854
358

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,

Charlotte Lundemo
597 Warrior Trl
Jackson, MS 39216-3227
USA
charlotte@computercoop.com

E-RDS = ADM-03
Crdol = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWD)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/4/05

From: "Andrew Janicki" <ajani810@uwsp.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
359

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,

Andrew Janicki
2127A Ellis St
Stevens Point, WI 54481-3811
USA
ajani810@uwsp.edu

E-R105 = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDJ received
2/9/05

From: "Robert" <rsingle2@adelphia.net>
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:49 AM

Hello,

I got information about this situation off of the Public Citizen website that I use to respect; however, their views are no longer main stream and apparently they are not thinking through the energy problem in this particular case (there are also other issues where they are not in the main stream).

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

360

More nuclear plants are needed to offset coal, oil, and especially natural gas plants. I am a customer of VA Power (or whatever you call yourselves now). I do not want power generated by any fossil fuel that comes to my home. North Anna is a possible site to house these plants. A well conformed EIS will tell us (the people by the way, not VA Power, Public Citizen, or the NRC) whether North Anna can safely support more nuclear plants.

Now if we do not have nuclear power, what does that leave? Solar, wind, tidal, etc.... These technologies are either not available or mature enough (or both). The most mature, wind power, is noisy, expensive, and can not supply BASELINE power. It might be great for peak power with more research and maturation, but it will never supply BASELINE power. The same problem exists for solar except that it is even less mature and again, cannot supply BASELINE power. This leaves nuclear to supply BASELINE power. I highlight BASELINE power because this is where Public Citizen apparently is missing the point. What do they suggest to replace BASELINE power when they kill fossil fuel and nuclear?

The source of the power of course says nothing about conservation. Conservation should be the most important item on the energy list, but remember, you CANNOT conserve yourself to zero power usage!

The only source that can supply BASELINE power and NOT foul our atmosphere is well regulated nuclear power. I am writing a book on this issue (and others). As a nuclear engineer, I understand nuclear power and the only thing I worry about is the regulation of this effort. As a federal employee, I also understand the actions of government. As far as I am concerned, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is the best of the regulation agencies within the government. This does NOT mean that more can't be done to strengthen the NRC.

Overall, without just closing down industry and moving our lifestyles back to pre-1900's, nuclear power to include reprocessing like in the Integral Fast Reactor System as developed at Argonne National Laboratory and demonstrated Argonne National Laboratory - West, is the only source of power that should even be considered by any power company, the NRC, and Public Citizen. I think once the REAL facts and the morals behind power generation are given to the people, the citizens of this country will DEMAND no less that nuclear power and the integral fast reactor system.

Thank you
Dr. Robert C. Singleterry
617 Todd Trail

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

SIS p Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

367

Newport News, VA 23602
rsingle2@adelphia.net

These views do not represent NASA or any of my jobs at NASA.

Robert C. Singleterry Jr, PhD
NASA Administrator's Fellow
Analytical & Computational Methods Branch
Research and Technology Directorate
NASA Langley Research Center
(757) 864 1437 (LaRC)
robert.c.singleterry@nasa.gov
(434) 426 6378 (Cell)

CC: <CMEP@citizen.org>, <local-va@list.ans.org>

ROB Received
2/19/05

From: "Rene Horst" <horstrh@appstate.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 11:12 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
361

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,

Rene Horst
294 Eureka Hills Cir
Boone, NC 28607-8362
USA
horstrh@appstate.edu

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add'l. Custody (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/9/05

From: "Ariela Friedman" <a_friedman@coloradocollege.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 1:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

362

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,

Ariela Friedman
902 N. Cascade WB 1721
Colorado Springs, CO 33021
USA
a_friedman@coloradocollege.edu

SISP Review Complete

Y template = ADM-013

E-RIOS = ADM-03
Add. J. Cushing (JK9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

ROB Received
2/19/05

From: "Nina Keefer" <shieldmaiden_m@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 2:32 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

363

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,

Nina Keefer
1027 Terry St
Longmont, CO 80501
USA
shieldmaiden_m@yahoo.com

E-R105 = ADM.03
Add J. Cushing (JCC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM.013

RDB Received

2/19/05

From: "Alva Pick" <wpick@lynchburg.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 3:02 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
364

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,

Alva Pick
107 Saddle Rock Rd
Lynchburg, VA 24503-3853
USA
wpick@lynchburg.net

SIS P Review Complete
Template = ADM 013

E-R105 = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Mitchell Hunt" <damhunt1@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 3:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
365

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,

Mitchell Hunt
1705 West School St
Chicago, IL 60657-1036
USA
damhunt1@yahoo.com

ERIS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AKWI)

ESP Review Complete

Complete = ADM-03

ROB Received
2/19/05

From: "Gail McGlone" <gmcglone@snail-mail.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 3:22 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
366

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,

Gail McGlone
3510 Dellefield St
New Port Richey, FL 34655
USA
gmcglone@snail-mail.net

E-RIDS = ADM-03

add J. Cushing (JKC9)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "RaVani Flood" <ravani@animail.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 3:42 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
367

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,

RaVani Flood
PO Box 2006
Keaau, HI 96749-2006
USA
ravani@animail.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIPS = ADM-03
Asst. J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/9/05

From: "Richard Pasichnyk" <rpasichnyk@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 5:53 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
368

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,

Richard Pasichnyk
1007 W Main St Lot 11
Mesa, AZ 85201
USA
rpasichnyk@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Ald J. Cushing (JXC9)
Alicia Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Victoria Bonsignore" <vbon@juno.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:12 PM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
369

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,

Victoria Bonsignore
 20821 SW 103rd Ct
 Miami, FL 33189-3667
 USA
 vbon@juno.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

E-R105 = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JHC9)
 I. Williamson (ARW)

377

RDB Received
2/9/05

From: "Bill Wilson" <wjwsn@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 7:22 PM
Subject: Please consider issuing an Early Site Permit for North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
370

Dear NRC,

I urge the NRC to consider 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 not be detrimental to the environment and local communities.

The construction of the plant - including truck traffic, smog and building waste, will be negligible compared to the clean air savings from operation of the facility. Further, consider that Lake Anna is an artificial lake that was constructed to provide for cooling of up to four reactors. The increased water use associated with the new reactor(s) would be within the bounds of the lake's constructed capacity. Water level and temperature changes resulting from operation of a new pair of reactors would be regulated such that the effects would not exceed the bounds of the environmental assessments.

Currently, there is a national policy on nuclear waste storage that is being held hostage by politics. However, should the spent fuel from North Anna be kept on site, or shipped to another site, I believe that they would pose little threat to the environment and local communities. Spent fuel cask technology is well-developed and well-regulated. There is little proliferation risk associated with the spent fuel under current regulations.

I support expanding the use of nuclear power in the United States. I would prefer that Dominion meet its power capacity needs using clean, safe, and cost-effective energy like nuclear. Constructing new reactors would be good for Virginia's environment, good for taxpayers, and good for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Bill Wilson
63 Bar Harbour Sq
Scarborough, ON M1C 5E7
Canada
wjwsn@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

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

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Eric Indermuehle" <xennx@netzero.net>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 7:32 PM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
371

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,

Eric Indermuehle
4900 Boardwalk Dr Apt M204
Fort Collins, CO 80525-6290
USA
xennx@netzero.net

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-R105 = ADM.03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received
2/9/05

From: "Mike Garnett" <giovanni379@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 8:12 PM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

372

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,

Mike Garnett
2242 Walnut St
Boulder, CO 80302-2604
USA
giovanni379@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add G. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received

2/9/05

From: "Kris unger" <erraticity@mac.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 10:12 PM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/16/04

69 FR 71854

(373)

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,

Kris unger
2200 2nd St N Apt 6
Arlington, VA 22201-1564
USA
erraticity@mac.com

S/SP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03

Add J. Cushing (JXC9)

381 Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Thomas Kay" <tkay@umich.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 4:02 AM
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
(374)

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,

Thomas Kay
824 S. Boulevard St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301
USA
tkay@umich.edu

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add g Cushing (JYC9)
382 Alicia Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received

2/19/05

From: "Wayne Kelly" <waynekins@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 5:52 AM
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

375

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,

Wayne Kelly
1257 Siskiyou Blvd # 1133
Ashland, OR 97520-2241
USA
waynekins@hotmail.com

SIS R Renewal Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add J. Cushing (JXC9)

J. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received

2/9/05

From: "Nida Sun" <nidasun@yahoo.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 8:42 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

376

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,

Nida Sun
25901 Flintonbridge Dr
South Riding, VA 20152
USA
nidasun@yahoo.com

SIS Review Complete
Template = APM-03

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

RAB Received
2/19/05

From: "Patrick Costello" <pc5w@virginia.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 9:12 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
377

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,

Patrick Costello
124 Watson
Charlottesville, VA 22904
USA
pc5w@virginia.edu

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

EIRIDS = ADM-03

add J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARWD)

RDB Received

2/19/05

From: "Claire Kaplan" <ckaplan@virginia.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 10:22 AM
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

378

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,

Claire Kaplan
104 Diamond Rd
Troy, VA 22974-3248
USA
ckaplan@virginia.edu

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

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Carl Brackett" <CarlBrackett@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jan 19, 2005 10:42 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 19, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

379

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 could be extremely hazardous 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 could be a very poor for Virginia's environment, for taxpayers, and for residential and commercial ratepayers.

Also what about conservation efforts, Where ar they? We have not giving nearly the attention here that is needed

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Carl Brackett

Sincerely,

Carl Brackett
587 Pebblecreek Ct
Charlottesville, VA 22901-0802
USA
CarlBrackett@hotmail.com

E-R105=ADM-03
Add G. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "rachana bhatia" <rachanabhatia@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 9:42 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
380

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,

rachana bhatia
PO Box 1017
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533-1017
USA
rachanabhatia@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW)

From: "Sarah Van Buren" <toegrrl@aol.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 10:12 AM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received

2/19/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (381)

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,

Sarah Van Buren
 150 Maynard St
 Northborough, MA 01532
 USA
 toegrrl@aol.com

SISP Review Complete

Y template = ADM-013

E-RIPS = ADM-03
 Cold J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWD)

389

RDB Received

2/9/05

From: "Dale Richard Felker, III" <drf8f@virginia.edu>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

382

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,

Dale Richard Felker, III
1 Valley Cir
Charlottesville, VA 22903
USA
drf8f@virginia.edu

SISP Review Complete

Tempalte = ADM-01

390

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add G. Cushing (JJKG)
A. Williamson (ARW)

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Marliss Rogers" <marjayrog@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/05
69 FR 71854

383

Dear NRC,

As a concerned citizen, 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,

Marliss Rogers
1121 Crestview Dr
Port Washington, WI 53074-1348
USA
marjayrog@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Alicia Williamson (JXC9)
A. Williamson (A RW)

From: "Sandra J. Carrubba" <vze2fxmp@verizon.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:48 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
 2/9/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (384)

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. Nuclear energy production causes more green house gases than other energy production methods. We are already seeing the results of global warming.

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. The radioactivity from spent nuclear material continues. 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. At this time of terror threats, building a nuclear power plant is reckless.

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,

Sandra J. Carrubba
 200 E Hazeltine Ave
 Buffalo, NY 14217-2802
 USA
 vze2fxmp@verizon.net

ERIOS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-01: 392

From: "Cheryl Costigan" <AbbeyThoreauvian@aol.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:49 AM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
 2/9/05
 12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 385

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,

Cheryl Costigan
 PO Box 490
 Athol, ID 83801-0490
 USA
 AbbeyThoreauvian@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

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

From: "Mary E. McGilligan" <mmcgilligan@frontiernet.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:49 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

Dear NRC,

I oppose any new permits for nuclear plants. 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,

Mary E. McGilligan
 814 5th St
 Duluth, MN 55810-1729
 USA
 mmcgilligan@frontiernet.net

RDB Received

2/9/05

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

386

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add J. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

394

RDB Received
2/9/05

From: "Andrea Cimino" <amcimino9@aol.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:50 AM
 Subject: Stop plans to build nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
(387)

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,

Andrea Cimino
 9908 Killarney Ln Apt 101
 Gaithersburg, MD 20877
 USA
 amcimino9@aol.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIPS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/19/05

From: "Mary Hirose" <wearejedi@aol.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:51 AM
Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

~~CAER~~

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

388

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,

Mary Hirose
1774 Westbury Dr
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195-1042
USA
wearejedi@aol.com

SISP Review Complete
Yimplat = ADM.013

E.RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JK9)
A. Williamson (ARWI)

From: "Rebecca Hamil" <rebeccahamil@hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:51 AM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

RDB Received
 2/19/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 7185-4

389

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,

Rebecca Hamil
 PO Box 9361
 Roanoke, VA 24020
 USA
 rebeccahamil@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-03

E-RIPS = ADM-03

adslg. Cushing (JXC9)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/9/05

From: "Kelly Korenak" <korenakk@hotmail.com>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:52 AM
Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

390

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,

Kelly Korenak
107 Joralemon St Apt 8
Brooklyn, NY 11201-4066
USA
korenakk@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

ER105 = ADM-03
add J. Cushing (JXC9)
G. Williamson (ARW)

From: "Emily Rieber" <emilyrieber@yahoo.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:52 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

ROB Received
 2/19/05

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854
 (391)

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,

Emily Rieber
 2791 McBride Ln Apt 181
 Santa Rosa, CA 95403-2754
 USA
 emilyrieber@yahoo.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-03

ERIDS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC9)
 A. Williamson (ARWI)

RDB Received
2/9/05

From: "Brian Butcher" <tonycherry23@aol.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:53 AM
 Subject: Reconsider the Lake Anna Early Site Permit

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854
392

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,

Brian Butcher
 20433 Montalvo Rd
 Saratoga, CA 95070-6335
 USA
 tonycherry23@aol.com

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add J. Cushing (JXCQ)
A. Williamson (ARWI)SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

From: "Nicole Allard" <nallard@peakpeak.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:53 AM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

RDB Received
 2/9/05

January 17, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
 69 FR 71854

(393)

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 grave" 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,

Nicole Allard
 701 Harlan St Unit E22
 Lakewood, CO 80214-2355
 USA
 nallard@peakpeak.com

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
 Add J. Cushing (JXC@)
 401 Williamson (ARW)

ROB Received
2/19/05

From: "Ariel Graham" <Dance7ag@hotmail.com>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 6:55 AM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(394)

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,

Ariel Graham
 308 Orange Ave Apt 24
 Coronado, CA 92118-1494
 USA
 Dance7ag@hotmail.com

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013E-RIDS = ADM-03
J. Cushing (JXC9)
402 Williamson (ARWI)

ROB Received

2/19/05

From: "Mitchell Maness" <mitchellmaness@earthlink.net>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 7:22 AM
 Subject: No nuclear power plant in North Anna

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

(395)

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.

It's time to re-think our energy needs and start protecting our country and environment.
 NO to nuclear power - YES to renewable energy!

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Maness
 2800 Knight St Apt 1
 Dallas, TX 75219-6249
 USA
 mitchellmaness@earthlink.net

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
 add G. Cushing (JXC9)
 403 Williamson (ARWD)

From: "Steven Heinitz" <srheinit@vcu.edu>
 To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Tue, Jan 18, 2005 8:42 AM
 Subject: Please find an alternative to the North Anna nuclear project

RDB Received

2/19/05

January 18, 2005

Alicia Williamson
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

396

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,

Steven Heinitz
 10215 Still Creek Ln
 Mechanicsville, VA 23116-2701
 USA
 srheinit@vcu.edu

SISP Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

E.RIDS = ADM-03
 adal G. Cushing (JXC9)
 404 Williamson (ARWI)

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

*RDB received
2/15/05*

*12/10/04
64 FR 71854*

397

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, 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.

Nuclear power has proven a dangerous way to go. Increased threat of terrorism and the possibility of catastrophic accident should all be considered before the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission decides to build more nuclear power plants. Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP at North Anna.

Sincerely,

Lauren Agrella
Lauren Agrella
Charlottesville, VA

*E-IDS - ADH-03
OAC = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

405

*ESF Review Complete
Temp Date = AGH-013*

*ADB received
2/15/05*

107 Windham Rd.
Norfolk, Virginia 23505
February 6, 2005

*12/10/04
69FR 71854
398*

Chief, Rules, and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration, Mailstop T6D59
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Sir:

I understand that Dominion Resources has asked for a site permit for a new nuclear plant to be erected in Mineral, Virginia on Lake Anna. I understand the growing need for more energy, but I am opposed to getting this energy from nuclear sources. Solar and wind provide clean and safe energy. I do not want to take the off chance that we could have a another Three Mile Island or a Chernobyl with the killing of thousands of animals and people and contaminating the landscape for thousand of years to come. Would it not be a better solution to be more conservative and efficient in the use of the resources that we have and try safe wind and solar alternatives?

Please to not grant Dominion Resources the site permit.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Campbell
Nancy Campbell

E-RFDS = ADH-03

*Call = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

406

*SISF Review Complete
Template - ADH-013*

RDB received
2/15/05

February 7, 2005

12/10/04

Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop T6 - D59
Washington, DC 20555-0001

69FR 71854

399

Comments on NUREG-1811 (draft) Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site

As a supporter of the rebirth of nuclear power in the U.S.'s power supply mix, I applaud Dominion's pursuit of an ESP and the Staff's timely and thorough review resulting in the issuance of NUREG-1811 (draft). I agree with the Staff's conclusions that the North Anna site appears to be environmentally acceptable for the construction of new reactors, and that Dominion's request to perform limited site preparation and investigation measures will not result in significant environmental insult.

However, I am surprised that one of the conclusions of the Staff is that "there are no environmentally preferable or obviously superior sites". My review of the data presented in NUREG-1811 reaches a different conclusion. It appears to me that the Staff is overlooking a number of factors which are indeed different among the various sites and, if considered, are discriminators which would identify the Savannah River Site as an obviously environmentally preferable site.

In Section 8.4 (page 8-9) The EIS includes the following statement:

"In evaluating the alternative sites, NRC staff found that certain impact areas would not vary among sites, and as a result, would not affect the evaluation of whether an alternative site is environmentally preferable to the proposed site. These impact areas include air quality as it relates to emissions from the sites during construction and operation, nonradiological health impacts, and radiological health impacts to members of the public and during operation and to biota. In addition, the impacts to public service facilities (schools, water, and wastewater treatment, etc.) would not materially impact whether an alternative site is selected or not. As a result, air quality, health impacts, and radiation exposures are not evaluated as part of the site-specific alternatives analysis, but rather are discussed generically in the following sections."

These factors (air quality, health impacts and radiation exposures) are not inherently the same at each site under consideration. While emissions may be assumed equal at all sites, the impact of air pollution and radioactive emissions is dependent on the exposure of the population to these

5/5/05 Review Complete

Template = ADM-D13

E-EFDS = ADM-D3

Doc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

emissions. This exposure is governed primarily by two factors: population density in the area surrounding the plantsite, and distance to the plant boundary. The four sites are obviously different in nearby population density and distance of the proposed reactor to the site boundary. I would suspect that the Savannah River Site has both the longest distance to the boundary and the lowest nearby population of the sites under consideration; therefore would have the lowest impact. The EIS should be modified to evaluate the impact of these emissions at each site and consider both the nearby population and distance, as well as local meteorological effects.

Impacts to nearby public service facilities also need to be considered and are likely to be a differentiator among the facilities under consideration. The EIS notes that construction and operation of a new reactor at the proposed site will result in

- *Traffic congestion (page 4-19 & 4-23)*
- *Reduced housing availability/increasing rents (4-29)*
- *Public water and sewer "concerns" (4-30)*
- *Needed expansion of police and fire capability (4-32)*
- *Increased demand for social services (4-32)*
- *Significant impact on already overcrowded schools (4-33)*
- *Concern with water and sewer infrastructure in Louisa and Orange counties (5-45)*
- *Additional burden on already overcrowded Louisa county schools (5-47)*

The impact of the proposed action needs to be evaluated for its impact at each of the proposed sites to determine the differences that exist. I might point out that the employee population at the Savannah River Site has decreased by almost 15,000 people since the early 1990's and the existing public infrastructure may be much more capable of absorbing Dominion's construction and operational workforce with minimal impact.

I am surprised that the numerous examples of other environmental impacts of the proposed action at the North Anna site were not more closely compared with potentially lesser impacts at alternative sites. For instance:

- *Conversion of land to housing developments (page 4-2)*
- *Alteration of two ephemeral streams and possibly one or more wetlands (4-5)*
- *Dredging resulting in suspension of sediment (4-5)*
- *Depression of the water table (4-6)*
- *Degraded water quality (4-12)*
- *Fishery habitat changed (4-12)*
- *Resuspension of heavy metals from Contrary Creek (4-12)*
- *Increased turbidity and reduced light penetration in Lake Anna (4-13)*
- *Overcrowding of Lake Anna and lessened recreational experience (4-28)*
- *Doubling the time Lake Anna levels will be low, impacting recreational use (5-8)*
- *Economic consequences to the three counties surrounding the lake. The more immediate impacts would be to the marinas and commercial businesses that earn revenue . . . (5-44)*

Each of these should be considered and compared to a similar assessment for the alternative sites before the Staff draws a conclusion that there are no environmentally preferable or obviously superior sites.

The EIS states that *population dose with 80km (50 mi) of those alternative sites that are closer to major population centers (e.g. Savannah River) could be higher than for the proposed North Anna EDP site; (page 8-12).* I would like to see the data supporting this statement, as I do not believe the population within 50 miles of SRS exceeds that of the North Anna site. The 50 mile population of the North Anna region is reported as 1,538,156 in 2000 and expected to grow to 2,160,921 in 2020 (page 4-20). NUREG 1767, EIS on the Construction and Operation of a Proposed Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility the Savannah River Site issued in January 2005 lists the population of the SRS Region of Influence as 475,095 in 2000 and 489,000 in 2002 (projected). The Region of Influence may not be exactly the same as 50 miles but it is similar. Please review this information in the draft. Note that if corrections of nearby population density are needed, then impacts of both routine and accident releases will need to be recalculated. In general, it would be helpful to provide all data for the North Anna and alternative sites in common tables so that the public can see the basis information the Staff is using to reach its conclusions.

In contrast to the many environmental and societal impacts (albeit small or moderate, and potentially mitigable) NUREG-1811 describes for constructing a reactor at North Anna, the only identified environmental impact of locating the proposed reactor at SRS is the potential for land clearing if a new transmission line right of way is required. Since SRS is already tied to the regional grid with four primary feeders in differing directions, it is highly unlikely a new right of way will be needed. Except in the area immediately adjacent to the new reactor to reach an existing line, extensive clearing should not be necessary. Even if some clearing is needed, SRS is expected to be a government reservation in perpetuity, and on-site clearing would have no public impact.

Thank you for consideration of my comments. I am looking forward to them being addressed in the final issue of NUREG-1811.



Richard L. Geddes
807 Big Pine Road
North Augusta, SC 29841

Cc: **Senator Lindsey Graham**
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Senator Jim DeMint
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Congressman Gresham Barrett
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Congressman Joe Wilson
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Congressman James Clyburn
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dr. Susan Wood, Chair
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness
1204 Whiskey Road
Aiken, SC 29803

Mr. Mal McKibben, Executive Director
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness
1204 Whiskey Road
Aiken, SC 29803

*RDB received
2/9/05*

From: Remmers Kenneth D CRBE <RemmersKD@nswccd.navy.mil>
To: "NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov" <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: 1/19/05 6:22AM
Subject: FW: Comments on Draft of Environmental Impact Statement(EIS) for North Anna Early Site Permit (ESP)

*12/10/05
69FR 71854
400*

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Remmers Kenneth D CRBE
> Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2005 6:17 AM
> To: 'North Anna_ESP@nrc.gov'
> Subject: Comments on Draft of Environmental Impact Statement(EIS) for North Anna Early Site Permit (ESP)

>
> Please consider my comments on the Draft EIS for the ESP for North Anna Site
>
> <<ESP at NANPP.doc>>
>
> Kenneth Remmers,
> President, Waterside Property Owners Association of Lake Anna

SIS Renew Complete

*E-LIDS = ADM-03
Case = J. Cushing (JXC 9)
A. Villanueva (ARW 1)*

Template = ADM-013

Comments on the ESP

1. Flow rates are confusing in the report. Some liters/ second, meters³ / second, ft³ / 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.

- 2 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, thereby increasing the output pass through temperature by 18-degree F. 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 14m³/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 gallon per inch of Lake Height, we get the following:

$$13,000 \text{ acres} \times 43,560 \text{ ft}^2/\text{acre} \times 1/12 \text{ ft height} \times 7.48052 \text{ gal/ft}^3 = 353,005,738 \text{ gallons/inch of lake height}$$

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?

- 3 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. 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 times 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.

4. 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).

5. 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 $\frac{1}{2}$, but when three plants are operating only one is shut down, now $\frac{2}{3}$ versus $\frac{1}{2}$ of the heat continues to go into the WHTF.

6. What solution will work with the ESP and not effect current Environmental System?

Two possible solutions are proposed. First, 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 other prescribed conditions. Otherwise the once pass through

cooling would be used. A second 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. Either one of these solutions would be generally acceptable to residents of the lake.

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	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

RDB received 2/17/05

From: Kristin Taverna <kristin@nexet.net>
To: <nrcprep@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Feb 17, 2005 3:28 PM
Subject: Response from "Comment on NRC Documents"

12/10/04

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by

69FR 71854

Kristin Taverna (kristin@nexet.net) on Thursday, February 17, 2005 at 15:27:54

401

Document_Title: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site - Draft Report for Comment

Comments: As a resident of Central Virginia, living in close proximity to the North Anna power plant, 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 fails to consider or to fully acknowledge numerous environmental issues that indicate that the North Anna site is not suitable for additional reactors. It has been said that these issues are not as critical now since the ESP would not permit full construction, but if the ESP is granted, "site preparation" and "preliminary construction activities" can be carried out, including site clearing, stream clearing, and excavation, as well as construction of permanent foundations, intake structures, and outfall structures.

Crucial issues that are not properly addressed in the draft EIS include inadequate water supplies required for the operation of another reactor, temperature increases in the lake (and subsequent effect on fish species) and potential serious impacts on downstream aquatic life due to reduced water flow. In addition, questions about the adequacy of current security regulations and performance are ignored, as are issues of waste generation and its safe, permanent isolation. This is especially important to address considering additional waste created by new reactors at North Anna would have to remain onsite for an indefinite period of time.

Too many questions remain unanswered and too many problems remain unsolved for the NRC to grant an ESP.

Sincerely,

Kristin Taverna
803 Stonehenge Ave.
Charlottesville, Virginia

organization:

address1:

address2:

city:

state: ---

zip:

country:

E-RFDS = ADH-03

*rec = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

415

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADH-013



ADJ received
2/17/05

12/10/04
69 FR 71854

402

E-12105-AM-03

see =

J. Enshing (sic)
A. Williams

STSP Review Complete

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (ARW)

template = AM-013

Ms. Alicia Williamson
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson:


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,

Elaine M Shaw
Hartwick

Elaine Shaw
3172 Duck Island Rd.
Charlottesville, VA 22902



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

20555-0001



417



ADG received
2/17/05

12/10/05

69FR 71854

403

SIS Review Complete

E-REDS=ADM-03

Adm =
J. Cushing (JIC9)

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

A. Williamson
(AEW1)

Template = ADM-013

134 Winston Dr.

Wmmbury, VA 23185

February 10, 2005

To Chief of Nuclear
Regulatory Commission:

Please don't let Dominion Power or anyone else build a nuclear Power Plant. Although it has been many years since the disaster at Three Mile Island, it should still serve as a lesson for all of us not to build such structures. There are real, harmless alternatives, such as solar energy.

We shouldn't trust Dominion Power to protect the environment & thereby our health. They continue to spew out hazardous substances, like mercury. There are now 5 million Virginia residents living in areas below the EPA's Clean Air standards. Dominion Power is one of the key players in this FACT.

Sincerely,

Mr + Mrs David R Hearing



*RDB received
2/22/05*

*12/10/04
69FR 71854*

ADH

E-RTDS = ADM-03

SESF Review Complete *all =
J. Cuthing
(JCL-9)*

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Template = ADM-013

*A. Williamson
(ARW1)*

823 Old Turner Mtr Lr
Charlotteville - VA - 22979

RDB ~~unint~~
2/26/05

RE Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson

I am writing you regarding an Early Site Permit to Abandon Resources to build a new nuclear reactor at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral Va. (or anywhere else for that matter). There are several areas of safety that have not been addressed. From construction effects to the damage done to the land not to speak of dealing with the waste storage.

Contrary to what many nuclear power advocates claim I do not agree that it is a clean energy source. That is such a selfish and shortsighted conclusion. What kind of legacy are we leaving behind us for our children? Are you familiar with the effects of exposure to even the smallest amount of radiation? Ms. Williamson it is a horrific blight to cast upon our future generations for our immediate comforts. We need to find other energy sources. Nuclear power is not it. My tax dollars are subsidizing it to

... ..
... ..

the tune of at least one billion
and upwards dollars and yet I
am adamantly opposed to it,
I want my money redirected
for safer energy sources and
I want bodies like the
N.R.C. to wake up and
see the shambles right now
in junk we are leaving behind
for our children to deal with.
And I do not
want any reactors at North Anna
in Mineral or anywhere else.

Sincerely

Maggie

823 Old Turner Mt. Ln
Charlottesville - VA - 22909

RDB
3/20/05

RE Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson

I am writing you regarding an Early Site Permit to Dominion Resources to build 2 new nuclear reactors at the North Anna nuclear plant in Mineral Va (or anywhere else for that matter). There are several areas of safety that have not been addressed from construction effects to the damage done to the land - not to speak of dealing with the waste storage.

Contrary to what many nuclear power advocates claim I do not agree that it is a clean energy source. That is such a selfish and shortsighted conclusion. What kind of legacy are we leaving behind us for our children? Are you familiar with the effects of exposure to even the smallest amount of radiation? Ms. Williamson it is a horrific blight to cast upon our future generations for our immediate comforts. We need to find other energy sources. Nuclear power is not it. My tax dollars are subsidizing it to

the tune of at least one billion
and upwards dollars and ~~so~~ yet I
am adamantly opposed to it.
I want the money redirected
for safer energy sources and
I want bodies like the
N.R.C. to wake up and
see the horrible, rightmarish
junk we are leaving behind
for our children to
deal with. And I do not
want any reactors at North Anna
or Mineral or anywhere else.

Sincerely

Maggie

BDB received
2/28/05

~~Diaz~~
Reyes, please
for
DM

Evelyne Noel
2221 Orchid Drive
Falls Church, VA 22046

12/10/04

69FR71854

405

2/1/05

Nils J. Diaz, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555-0001

Sir,

Most of the time accidents are minor and life as we know it and cherish endures.

Sometimes accidents happen, thousands die, the landscape is contaminated and it takes thousands of years to recover.

Please, no new nuclear power plants for Virginia. I love this state. Help me protect it for a very, very long time.

Please. It just is not worth the risk. Our country has developed technologies that are safer and more enduring in the long term. Let's use them.

I appreciate your attention to this.

Gratefully yours,



Evelyne Noel
Falls Church resident

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE 10/15/04 BY 60322 UCBAW/STP

UNCLASSIFIED BY 60322 UCBAW/STP DATE 10/15/04

SFSF Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

425

R-27DS-ADM-03
rel = S. Cullum (JXC9)
J. Williams (AR01)

RDB received
2/18/05

Robert Stamm
27 Melissa Court
Hampton, Virginia 23669

February 14, 2005.

Chief of Rules and Directives
Division of Administrative Services,
Office of Administration,
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-001

12/10/04
69FA 71854
1106

Chief,

I herewith voice my opposition to the proposal for expanding the North Anna Power facility in Louisa County with two new nuclear reactors. Although our population is growing, future anticipated electrical power demands can be met with more judicious per capita consumption and development of smaller distributed electrical generation plants using alternative energy sources. The risks of nuclear facilities to the health, safety, and welfare to the public and environment far outweigh any benefits. Granting permit for new facilities, especially in a fast track manner, is deemed most irresponsible for a government agency that should be working for the public's interest.

Respectfully,


7 (3129)
usm (RCS)

FORM-AM-03

426

SESP Review Complete
template=ADH-013

KDD received
2/28/05

Cathy M Douthit
4520 Gage Road
Alexandria, VA 22309

12/10/04
69FR71854
407

February 13, 2005

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

Re: Early Site Permit (North Anna Nuclear Plant in Mineral Virginia) for Dominion Power

To whom it may concern:

I am opposed to nuclear power in general primarily because of the hazards involved in disposal of the irradiated fuel generated by reactor. In addition, the consequences should there be a problem are tremendous with operation and should not be overlooked. There are a number of other issues that I consider to be problematic at Lake Anna; such as the impact on the water levels, the temperature, the fish population, wetlands and other aquatic ecosystems, and safety concerns relative to recreational usage of the Lake.

I am sorry that Dominion seems to only want to provide energy from coal and nuclear power. I would like to see them promote other renewal energy sources such as solar, wind, etc. Disposal of the waste product generated by nuclear power should be enough to make use of this power source only as a last resort.

Sincerely,

Cathy Douthit

Cathy Douthit

Cc Nils J Diaz, Chairman, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, WDC 20555,0005
Thomas E. Capps, CEO, Dominion Resources, 120 Tredegar St, Richmond, VA 23219
Rep. Jim Moran, US House of Representatives, 2239 Rayburn House Ofc Bldg, WDC 20515
Sen George Allen, US Senate, 204 Russell Ofc Bldg, WDC 20510

E-22DS = ADM-03
Add = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

*RDB received
2/25/05*

Thomas Alex Davis
1010 St Clair ave
Charlottesville, VA
22901
alex@d@planet-save.com
434.465.0690

*10/10/05
69FR 71834
HDS*

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed two new nuclear reactors at the North Anna power plant. I believe that the recent Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not take into complete consideration all of the unfortunate effects the new reactors may have on local and national security and environmental health.

According to a study I learned about through the People's Alliance for Clean Energy, after the construction of the first two reactors at North Anna, breast cancer in white women increased by 73%. Also, the rates of stillborns went up by 28%. It is a well known fact that even low levels of radiation (which the two reactors already periodically emit) can cause cancer and genetic disfunction. There is no smoking gun that points directly to the North Anna reactors as culprits for the rise of cancer and other problems in the area. However, looking at the circumstantial evidence, do we really want to build two new reactors that would increase risks?

Beyond health reasons from leaks of radiation there are many other reasons building two new reactors is a bad idea. As the Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors has pointed out in their proposal they support, running nuclear plants uses vast quantities of water. This water is water that all members of Virginia are dependet on. Building new reactors will cut into our supply and pollute what exists.

Also, there remains no real plan for dealing with the vast amounts of highly radioactive waste that will be produced with two new reactors. Where will all the waste go? Sitting at North Anna, less that three hours away from the nation's capital makes it a primo target for terrorists. And how is it possible to transport the waste from the site in a safe and inexpensive way? All forms of transport are also possible terrorist targets, not to mention the possibility of unfortunate accident! (From train derailings or auto crashes.)

There are many other reasons against building the new reactors. Virginia does not need the extra electricity. Most of the power produced at the plant would be sold to other states. The incredible cost to taxpayers of building new reactors does not balance out the benefits of more power. And the cost to future generations of one slight mis-step leading to nuclear catastrophe definitely outweighs any benefits these new reactors would produce.

As a Virginia resident living less than fifty miles from the North Anna power plant, I ask you to please stop the new reactors and work towards sustainable and fiscally responsible energy technology.

Sincerely,

T. Alex Davis

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

*GISP Review complete
Template = ADM-013*

ADD received
2/25/05

1200 E. Jefferson St.
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Feb. 17, 2005

Chief

Rules and Directives Branch

12/10/04

Division of Administrative Services

69PR 71854

Office of Administration

409

Mailstop T-6D59

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Sir/Madam

I strongly oppose granting Dominion Virginia Power an Early Site Permit for constructing any new nuclear plants at North Anna. I oppose the construction for the following reasons:

- 1) Nuclear power has never been shown to be as safe or as economical as the nuclear industry has promised.
- 2) 9/11 has shown us that terrorists can use our own resources against us. It is too easy for terrorists to cause a horrible nuclear accident by attacking the reactors or irradiated waste at North Anna.
- 3) I oppose taxpayer subsidization of the nuclear industry. An industry that claims to be safe and economical should not have its accidents and cost overruns underwritten by taxpayers.
- 4) We need to be putting our funding and planning into alternative energy and conservation - not reviving ^{the} a dangerous and uneconomical industry.

Thank you for your attention

Ken Bezille

429

E-RFDS = PDM-03
Add = J. Quaking (JX09)
A. Williams (NEW)

STSP Review Complete

Temp Date = ADM-2/13

RDB received
2/18/05

6861 Castleberry Court
Crozet, VA 22932
February 18, 2005

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D 59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

(H0)

Dear Sir:

Last night I attended and spoke at the NRC's Public Meeting to Collect Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna Site. I was not given enough time for the full statement that I wished to communicate, so I am giving that to you now, and I am also including a comment on the process itself and a comment on something said by another person at the meeting.

I assert that a Lake Anna site is not suitable for a nuclear reactor due to the catastrophic environmental damage that might ensue from a terrorist strike on the nuclear facility, including damage to places downwind of Lake Anna, such as Washington, D.C. The threat of such a strike on an energy plant is often stated by top government officials.

The war on terrorism is a top priority for this administration. President Bush devoted 40% of his recent State of the Union message to the war on terrorism.

You are a part of the government, so you also have a part in the war on terrorism.

The proliferation of nuclear reactors does not mesh with the goal of preventing a disastrous terrorist strike on the United States.

Warnings of the danger to our country from terrorism come from top government sources.

Last summer, Dr. Philip Zelikov, the Executive Director of the 9/11 Commission, was asked this by an interviewer shortly after the Commission's report was published:

"The 9/11 Commission Report blames a lack of imagination for failing to anticipate that terrorists could crash domestic planes into domestic targets. What imaginings now keep you awake at night, having gone through all of this?"

Dr. Zelikow replied,

"I think we're very worried now, as some people were then, about the use of unconventional weapons, especially nuclear or biological weapons, by a terrorist organization. There are also some different ways of conducting a conventional attack that might use aircraft that are less well guarded or some other parts of the transportation system; we said a little bit about that in the report."

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

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

(Interview in VIRGINIA: The University of Virginia Alumni News; Winter 2004 issue.)

Two days ago, on February 16, Porter Goss, the Director of the CIA, testified before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He said.

“Islamic extremists are exploiting the Iraqi conflict to recruit new anti-U.S. jihadists. These jihadists who survive will leave Iraq experienced and focused on acts of urban terrorism.”

Admiral James Loy, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, also testified before that Committee this week.

He listed energy facilities as being among the areas of greatest concern. He said that real, measurable progress had been made for them.

The trouble is, the terrorists are also working on the problem, and I am sure that you will agree that they have been a lot more creative than the defenders.

Admiral Loy said,

“...we think we are most likely to be attacked with a vehicle-borne, improvised explosive device. However, it remains very clear that our primary adversaries continue to seek weapons of mass effects with which they intend to strike us.”

A strike on a nuclear facility that is upwind of Washington would certainly achieve a mass effect.

I have enclosed a map of the state of Virginia with red circles over Lake Anna and Washington. Washington is a mere 75 miles from Lake Anna, as the wind blows.

And the wind does blow in that direction quite often. As you can see on the map, Lake Anna is somewhere between southwest and south-southwest of Washington. Over and over again, on weather maps in motion, one sees the wind is blowing into Washington from that direction.

I looked on the Weather Channel website earlier this week, and I have attached printouts of what was shown. In summary:

Monday, Feb. 14, 6:25 pm:

The wind in Washington at that moment was from the SSW at 11mph. The forecast for the whole night that night was Winds SW at 5 to 10 mph.

Tuesday, Feb. 15, 11 am:

The wind in Washington at that moment was from the SSW at 5 mph. The forecast for the whole day that day was Winds SSW at 5 to 10 mph.

Tuesday, Feb. 15, 11 pm:

The wind in Washington at that moment was from the SSW at 9 mph. The forecast for the whole night that night was Winds S at 5 to 10 mph.

Radioactivity released from Lake Anna by an accident or terrorist attack would likely blow right up to Washington: Try to imagine the chaos, both local and national, if Washington became hazardous to life or uninhabitable due to radioactivity.

And if that happened, what could you possibly say in your defense? You have been warned—by the President; by the 9/11 Commission report; by the CIA; by the department of Homeland Security.

One of the goals of the NRC is to protect the public. Other parts of the government are going all out to defend against terrorism, and you should also. Therefore:

(1) You should not authorize new nuclear reactors near or upwind of major metropolitan areas, especially Washington, which is a prime symbolic target for terrorists.

(2) You should not renew or extend operating permits for current reactors near or upwind of major metropolitan areas, such as the old ones at here at Lake Anna.

(3) You should shut down the Indian Point reactors, which are a mere 35 miles from Times Square in New York City and which have one spent fuel pool that is mostly above ground.

In his State of the Union message, President Bush said,

“Our third responsibility to future generations is to leave them an America that is safe from danger, and protected by peace. We will pass along to our children all the freedoms we enjoy -- and chief among them is freedom from fear.”

Right now, I am afraid. Sometimes the wind blows my way from Lake Anna. If the people of Washington and New York knew what was sitting near them, they would be afraid, also. It is your duty to protect the public by removing these targets from us and by barring new ones.

A comment on the Early Site Permit process: Perhaps I misunderstood, but I thought you said last night that the NRC would discuss security issues with the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, but that there was no place in the Security Review process, at least at any point in the research or formative stage, for public comment. If that is the case, then I object strenuously. Safety is probably the greatest concern for the public out of all of the issues arising in the permitting process. How can you think to shut us out of that discussion? That is wrong, wrong, wrong!

A comment on a statement made by someone else at the meeting: One of the nuclear engineers who spoke in favor of the permit said in a dismissive tone that concerns over the transporting of highly radioactive nuclear waste across the country were a political issue, not a scientific issue. The fact that something is a political issue does not make it less real or less important. A terrorist act is a political act. Its political nature does not diminish its terrible damage.

Sincerely,


Virginia Rovnyak

Virginia Rovnyak

Enclosures:

Map of Virginia

Six pages of Weather Channel website printout



Welcome. [Customize weather.com](#)

[Sign In](#)

[Home](#) | [My Page](#) | [Health](#) | [Travel](#) | [Driving](#) | [Events](#) | [Recreation](#) | [Home & Garden](#) | [World](#) | [Maps](#) | [Mobile](#) | [Weather Tools](#) | [Store](#)

Monday, 6:25 pm

live by it

Enter city or US zip See weather related to ... GO

Get 1 click access to your local weather

Home > Local Forecast for Washington, DC (20500)

[Yesterday](#) [36-Hour](#) [Weekend](#) [10-Day](#) [Month](#)

NEW: On The Spot Weather, Get More Local [Learn More](#)

Right Now for Washington, DC (20500)
[Save this Location](#)

On The Spot Weather
[Choose Location](#)



Light Rain

50°F
Feels Like 46°F

UV Index: 0 Low
Wind: From SSW at 11 mph
Humidity: 95%
Pressure: 29.95 in. ↓
Dew Point: 49°F
Visibility: 9.0 miles



↓ Scroll down to see Doppler radar

Updated Feb 14 06:25 p.m. ET



FREE Custom Screensaver from The Weather Channel



It changes as your weather changes! Get It Now

Today In Washington, DC (20500)


- [Allergy & air quality reports](#)
- [Ski resort conditions & forecast](#)
- [Flu season update](#)
- [Bus stop & schoolday forecast](#)
- [Best times & places to exercise](#)

[Free local video](#)

Your Local Forecast brought to you by [Desktop Weather](#)



FREE Local temperature always on your desktop
Severe weather alerts flash as they occur
Put local temp next to the time on your PC!



Click Here for Free & Easy Install.

[FREE Trial: Faster Radar Maps & No Ads - Learn More](#)

[Advertise Locally In DC! It's Easy!](#)

36-Hour Forecast

[Hourly](#) [Details](#) [Video](#) [Text](#) [Averages](#)

Special Offers in Washington

435

Tonight



Precip: 100%

Rain showers ending this evening with clearing overnight. Low 42F. Winds SW at 5 to 10 mph. Rainfall around a quarter of an inch.

Tomorrow



Precip: 10%

Sunshine along with some passing clouds. High 63F. Winds WSW at 5 to 10 mph.

Tomorrow night



Precip: 10%

Partly to mostly cloudy. Low 46F. Winds S at 5 to 10 mph.

Washington DC Hotels

Stay At Washington DC Hotels Guaranteed Low Hotel Rates. Aff.

Washington DC Guide

News, Attractions, Maps, Hotels, Jobs, Travel, History, Real Estate.

travel columbia

Discount Group Hotel Rates for Charleston, Myrtle Beach, & More!

Feature Finds



Click Here for Washington's News, Traffic & Weather Station




Enhanced Security, Pop-up Blockers & weather.com Click Now.

Get Your 10-Day Forecast

Ski Forecasts and Conditions

National Flu Report

Weather Maps



Great Ways to Make the Most of the Snow

Find Local Ski Areas Near Washington, DC (20500)

OR
Enter a Resort Name

- [Find the Deep Stuff](#)
- [Ultimate Snowmobile Guide](#)
- [Snowboarding Tips & Tricks](#)
- [Top Ski Destinations](#)
- [Snowboarding Hot Spots](#)



Map In Motion

This Week's Features

Welcome. Customize weather.com

[Sign In](#)

[Home](#) | [My Page](#) | [Health](#) | [Travel](#) | [Driving](#) | [Events](#) | [Recreation](#) | [Home & Garden](#) | [World](#) | [Maps](#) | [Mobile](#) | [Weather Tools](#) | [Store](#)

Tuesday; 11 am - (midday)

five by ft

Enter city or US zip See weather related to ...

Get 1 click access to your local weather

[Home](#) > [Local Forecast for Washington, DC \(20500\)](#)

Yesterday	36-Hour	Weekend	10-Day	Month
-----------	---------	---------	--------	-------

NEW: On The Spot Weather, Get More Local [Learn More](#)

Right Now for Washington, DC (20500)
[Save this Location](#)



Cloudy

49°F
Feels Like 47°F

Updated Feb 15 11:00 a.m. ET

On The Spot Weather

Choose Location

UV Index: 1 Low
 Wind: From SSW at 5 mph
 Humidity: 81%
 Pressure: 30.20 in. +
 Dew Point: 43°F
 Visibility: 7.0 miles

↓ Scroll down to see Doppler radar

3 COURSE MENU \$12.99
 SPLURGE ON DINNER WITHOUT BREAKING THE BANK.
 HURRY INTO YOUR FRIDAY'S SEE THE MENU

Today in Washington, DC (20500)

- [Allergy & air quality reports](#)
- [Ski resort conditions & forecast](#)
- [Flu season update](#)
- [Bus stop & schoolday forecast](#)
- [Best times & places to exercise](#)

[Free local video](#)

Your Local Forecast brought to you by 4CAST




NEW: On-Demand 4CAST by Text Message
 Text any city or zip to 4CAST (42278)
 We'll text the forecast to your cell in seconds!

[FREE Trial: Faster Radar Maps & No Ads - Learn More](#)

36-Hour Forecast

Hourly	Details	Video	Text	Averages
--------	---------	-------	------	----------

Sign Up Today to Get FREE local weather always on your desktop!




[Click Here for Free & Easy Install.](#)

[Advertise Locally in DC! It's Easy!](#)

Special Offers in Washington

<p>Today</p>  <p>Partly Cloudy High 58° F</p> <p>Precip: 0%</p> <p>Sunshine along with a few clouds. High 58F. Winds SSW at 5 to 10 mph.</p>	<p>Tonight</p>  <p>Partly Cloudy Low 47° F</p> <p>Precip: 0%</p> <p>Partly cloudy skies early will give way to cloudy skies late. Low 47F. Winds S at 5 to 10 mph.</p>	<p>Tomorrow</p>  <p>PM Showers High 59° F</p> <p>Precip: 50%</p> <p>Mostly cloudy with showers becoming likely in the afternoon. High 59F. S winds shifting to WNW at 15 to 25 mph. Chance of rain 50%.</p>
---	---	--



Washington DC Hotels
Stay At Washington DC Hotels Guaranteed Low Hotel Rates. Aff.

Washington DC Guide
News, Attractions, Maps, Hotels, Jobs, Travel, History, Real Estate.

All Dupont Circle Hotels
Unique search locates all hotels at Dupont Circle Washington DC

Feature Finds



[Click Here for Washington's News, Traffic & Weather Station](#)



[Enhanced Security, Pop-up Blockers & weather.com Click Now.](#)

Get Your 10-Day Forecast

[Ski Forecasts and Conditions](#)

[National Flu Report](#)

Weather Maps

Student Loan Fact #249

Student loans such as the Stafford loan have variable interest rates until the borrower uses the Federal Student Consolidation Loan. Since student loans are at historic lows, now is the best time to consolidate and fix your student loan interest rate. Your rate may be fixed as low as 1.625% and monthly payments reduced by 54%..




[Click here to learn more](#)

Great Ways to Make the Most of the Snow

Find Local Ski Areas Near Washington, DC (20500) OR

Enter a Resort Name

- [Find the Deep Stuff](#)
- [Ultimate Snowmobile Guide](#)
- [Snowboarding Tips & Tricks](#)
- [Top Ski Destinations](#)
- [Snowboarding Hot Spots](#)



Welcome. [Customize weather.com](#)

[Sign In](#)

[Home](#) | [My Page](#) | [Health](#) | [Travel](#) | [Driving](#) | [Events](#) | [Recreation](#) | [Home & Garden](#) | [World](#) | [Maps](#) | [Mobile](#) | [Weather Tools](#) | [Store](#)

Tuesday eve, 11 pm

live by it

Enter city or US zip: See weather related to:

Get 1 click access to your local weather

[Home](#) > [Local Forecast for Washington, DC \(20500\)](#)

Yesterday	36-Hour	Weekend	10-Day	Month
-----------	---------	---------	--------	-------

NEW: On The Spot Weather, Get More Local [Learn More](#)

Right Now for Washington, DC (20500)
[Save this Location](#)



Mostly Cloudy

49°F
Feels Like 45°F

Updated Feb 15 11:00 p.m. ET

On The Spot Weather

Choose Location

UV Index: 0 Low
 Wind: From SSW at 9 mph
 Humidity: 71%
 Pressure: 30.00 in. ↑
 Dew Point: 40°F
 Visibility: 10.0 miles

↓ Scroll down to see Doppler radar

OUR STAND
 OUT TO SAVE AMERICA SOME MONEY.
 11.101010.101015
 Allstate
 Make it good hands.
 HOW MUCH COULD YOU SAVE? GET A QUOTE >

Today In Washington, DC (20500)


- [Allergy & air quality reports](#)
- [Ski resort conditions & forecast](#)
- [Flu season update](#)
- [Bus stop & schoolday forecast](#)
- [Best times & places to exercise](#)

[Free local video](#)

Your Local Forecast brought to you by



FREE Local temperature always on your desktop
 Severe weather alerts flash as they occur
 Put local temp next to the time on your PC!



[Click Here for Free & Easy Install.](#)

[FREE Trial: Faster Radar Maps & No Ads - Learn More](#)

[Advertise Locally In DCI It's Easy!](#)

36-Hour Forecast

Special Offers in Washington

Hourly	Details	Video	Text	Averages
--------	---------	-------	------	----------

Tonight



Low 47° F

Precip: 0%

Mainly cloudy. Low 47F. Winds S at 5 to 10 mph.

Tomorrow



High 59° F

Precip: 50%

Mostly cloudy with showers becoming likely in the afternoon. High 59F. SSW winds shifting to WNW at 15 to 25 mph. Chance of rain 50%.

Tomorrow Night



Low 32° F

Precip: 20%

A few clouds from time to time. Low 32F. Winds NW at 10 to 20 mph.

Travelodge - Columbia, MO

Get our best rate at our site or your first night is free.

Washington DC Hotels

Stay At Washington DC Hotels Guaranteed Low Hotel Rates. Aff.

travel columbia

Discount Group Hotel Rates for Charleston, Myrtle Beach, & More!

Feature Finds



Click Here for Washington's News, Traffic & Weather Station




Faster web surfing, customized for weather.com. Get it now.

Get Your 10-Day Forecast

Ski Forecasts and Conditions

National Flu Report

Weather Maps




Great Ways to Make the Most of the Snow

Find Local Ski Areas Near Washington, DC (20500) OR

Enter a Resort Name [GO]

- [Find the Deep Stuff](#)
- [Ultimate Snowmobile Guide](#)
- [Snowboarding Tips & Tricks](#)
- [Top Ski Destinations](#)
- [Snowboarding Hot Spots](#)



Map In Motion

This Week's Features

RDB received
2/28/05

5000 Cartersville Rd.
Powhatan, VA 23139

Chief, Rules & Directives Branch
Div. of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 22055-0001

12/10/04
69FR 71854
411

February 17, 2005

Dear Mr. Diaz,

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

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RDS = ADM-03
Jed = J. Cushing (JXC9)
W. Williamson (ARWT)

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 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

Sr. Marion M. McDonald, sfcc

RDB received
2/1/05

Rules and Directives Branch Feb. 20, 2005



Division of Administrative Services

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

12/10/04

69FR 41854

(412)

Chief,

My family is opposed to any new nuclear power plants being built for many, many reasons.

Some are - there are less dangerous ways of obtaining power from wind and sun energy, which is ever abundant.

Containment of nuclear wastes is a major problem and not a proven fact.

Thank you for your considerations

Robert Desaut

SFSR Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

F-2705-ADM-03

cc = J. Cushing (5009)

A. Williamson (ARWI)

443

ADD reviewed 2/17/05
3/1/05

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 2055-0001

12/10/14

69FR 71854

413

RE: Nuclear Reactor/North Anna
To those making this important decision:

In view of the fact that the CIA is positively 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 Washington 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 across 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 Charlottesville and Richmond and these are becoming high density areas.

The addition 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 harnessed. 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 harnessed 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 Sitzer
Sid Sitzer
Shelly and Sid Sitzer
665 Fairgrove Court
Earlysville, VA 22936

SIS REVIEW Complete

Template = ADM-013

F-RFD5 = ADM-03
2 = J. Cushing (JXC9)
444 9. Williamson (ARW)

RDB received
3/1/05

931 Tanbark Drive
Afton, VA 22920
February 22, 2005

12/10/04
69FR 71854
414

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

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my great concern about the possibility of the NRC granting Dominion Power an Early Site Permit to construct new nuclear reactors at Lake Anna in Louisa County, Virginia. I believe that to do so would be exceedingly premature, since one very serious issue was not dealt with in Dominion Power's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The problem of what to do with spent fuel rods has not been adequately addressed in the EIS. Radioactive waste remains radioactive, and thus a threat to the environment and to human health, for thousands of years. Radioactive waste can contaminate the soil, the water, and the air. Studies show higher incidences of cancer among human populations living near radioactive materials.

Nobody wants a nuclear waste dump anywhere near where they live. The people living in Nevada don't want radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain. All of the space in the planned storage facility at Yucca Mountain is essentially filled even before the facility has opened. Nobody wants radioactive waste transported through their area, either. The people living in Virginia don't want radioactive waste at Lake Anna, nor do they want a long-term storage facility anywhere in the Commonwealth. The logical thing to do is to not create any more nuclear waste, since we haven't engineered a means of deactivating its harmful effects. The unsolved problem of how to handle nuclear waste is serious enough, in my estimation, to preclude the building of any new nuclear reactors until we have a genuine solution.

I urge you not to grant Dominion Power an Early Site Permit to add new reactors to the Lake Anna power plant until this crucial problem has been solved.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Amidon

Eleanor Amidon

E-RFDS = ADM-03

led = J. Cushing (JACG)

445 A. Williamson (ARWS)

SFSR Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

DOB received
3/1/05

Comments on the North Anna Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting February 17, 2005

These written comments were provided at the public meeting and will be entered into the transcript for the meeting. The comments will be treated as if the individual actually spoke at the meeting.

Name: Priya Curtis (unaffiliated)

12/10/04
69FR 71854

(415)

Comment: Very recently a report projected that nearby Charlottesville will run out of water by 2055 if current usage rates continue. Given the threat of a very real water shortage, it concerns me that the cooling system for Unit 3 will have a "MODERATE" impact during droughts; what about when there is NO water?

My second concern is that the potential rise in water temperature could be worse for local ecosystems than currently predicted.

Thirdly, I read recently that nuclear waste generated in the state of Virginia will not be permitted storage space in Yucca Mountain, Nevada (should that site be approved). I don't like the thought of nuclear waste being stored anywhere, because I don't think it's ever 100% safe, but I especially do not like the idea of having it in my backyard.

Thank you very much for considering my comments and concerns.

SFSR Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

E-RFDG = ADM-03
446 = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (AWI)

RDB marked
3/1/05



SAVANNAH RIVER SITE
Aiken, SC 29808 • www.srs.gov

February 15, 2005

12/10/04
69FR 71854
14/6

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.

SIS Review Complete

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

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY

The WSRC Team: Westinghouse Savannah River Company
BWXT Savannah River Company • CH2 Savannah River Corp

447

© Savannah River, Inc. • BNFL Savannah River Corporation
Savannah River Company

Template = ADM-013

J. Williams (ARW)

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	<p>Change the transmission system impacts to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the transmission system impacts to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the impact of construction on terrestrial resources (including threatened and endangered species) to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the impact of operation on threatened and endangered species to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the transportation impacts of the construction workforce to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <p>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.</p>

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
6	8-81	Table 8-6	6	<p>Change the Transmission corridors impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the Terrestrial ecosystems impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the T&E Species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the Community Characteristics impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <p>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.</p>
10	8-82	Table 8-7	14	<p>Change the T&E Species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <p>Also for SRS, offsite impacts would be limited to currently existing transmission right of ways, and the impacts are expected to be small.</p>
12	9-3	Table 9-1	7	<p>Change the Transmission corridors impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Change the Terrestrial ecosystems impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the Threatened and endangered species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Change the Community Characteristics impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <p>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.</p>

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
16	9-4	Table 9-2	16	<p>Change the Threatened and endangered species impacts for the Savannah River Site to "SMALL" (from "SMALL to MODERATE").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>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.</p> <p>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."</p>
18	9-6	9.2.1	19-25	<p>Delete the current paragraph and replace with:</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>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 workforce 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.</p>

No.	Page	Section	Line	Comment
19	9-7	9.2.2	11-16	<p>Delete the current paragraph and replace with:</p> <p>"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."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>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)."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

RDB Kesner
3/1/05

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-001

12/10/04
69FB7854
1417

Subject: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson,

Please add the attached 33 signatures to the 540 signatures supporting the NA-YGN petition that were already provided to NRC staff at the NRC public hearing held last February 17, 2005 in Louisa Co. As stated at the hearing, all these signatures supporting Dominion's proposed new nuclear reactors at North Anna, were obtained in only one day.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Dr. Sama Bilbao y León
Virginia Section of the North American Young Generation in Nuclear (NA-YGN)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

458

F-REDS = ADM-03
ed = J. Cushing (JXC9)
P. Williamson (ARW1)

PETITION SUPPORTING DOMINION'S NEW NUCLEAR REACTORS AT NORTH ANNA

Name	Edward Rivas	Address	5700 Airport Landing Pl Midlothian 23112
Phone Number	804 639 4991	Email	rivasr@comcast.net
Name	ANDREW YAROS	Address	5321 HUNTMASER Rd. MIDLOTHIAN 23112
Phone Number	804-744-6444	Email	andyaros@yahoo.com
Name	Cathy Taylor	Address	5143 Dorin Hill Ct, Glen Allen VA 23059
Phone Number	804 527-070	Email	
Name	DAVID A. CRAYMER	Address	7997 STRAWHORN DR. MECH, VA 23116
Phone Number	804-559-4878	Email	CRAYMERDS@COMCAST.NET
Name	TONY W. BELCHER	Address	2602 STEWELL BLVD, RICHMOND, VA 23236
Phone Number	804 993-2669	Email	
Name	James R. Strohman	Address	12900 Handsforth Way, Richmond, VA 23233
Phone Number	804 364 3771	Email	E Strohman @ Castel.net
Name	James K. Martin	Address	2425 Worchester Rd. Midlothian, VA 23113
Phone Number	804-794-6602	Email	jameskmartin@comcast.net
Name	Ronald D. Hsher	Address	552 Overton Dr. Mineral Va 23117
Phone Number	540 872 2651	Email	RONALDHSHERA@MSN.COM
Name	M. G. DEACON, JR	Address	3012 HEDGEWAY PL, MIDLOTHIAN VA 23113
Phone Number	804 794 0669	Email	CARLAUMAC@COMCAST.NET
Name	John Everhart	Address	8301 Regals Place Chesterfield VA 23838
Phone Number	804 778-7559	Email	
Name	Mark Mitchell	Address	12020 Doswell Rd Doswell VA 23047
Phone Number	804.273.4543	Email	Markpe@aol.com

PETITION SUPPORTING DOMINION'S PROPOSED NEW NUCLEAR REACTORS AT NORTH ANNA

We, the undersigned individuals, many of us being customers and shareholders of Dominion Resources, as well as residents of Louisa County or other areas neighboring the North Anna site, SUPPORT plans by Dominion to secure an Early Site Permit (ESP) to construct new nuclear reactors at its North Anna facility, on the following grounds:

- We concur with the NRC's conclusion that environmental impacts would not prevent issuing an ESP for the North Anna site.
- We believe that nuclear energy is safe, clean, reliable and cost effective, and as such, it should continue to be an important part of a balanced energy mix.
- 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.
- We commend Dominion for being proactive and farsighted when looking for reliable methods of addressing expected increases in energy demand over the coming years, while minimizing the environmental footprint of the selected energy sources, as well as the economic burden to Dominion customers.

Therefore, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to GRANT Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit.

<u>Marc Garland</u>	<u>1136 Autumn Cr, Columbia, SC 29206</u>
Name	Address
<u>803-790-4682</u>	<u>garland@sc.edu</u>
Phone Number	Email
<u>JEFF BRADFUTE</u>	<u>1017 STEEPLE RIDGE RD COLUMBIA, SC 29063</u>
Name	Address
<u>803-647-2080</u>	<u>bradfute@westinghouse.com</u>
Phone Number	Email
<u>Nathaniel Smith</u>	<u>321 Spring Point Dr. Columbia, SC</u>
Name	Address
<u>803 699-9020</u>	<u>NSmith@sc.rr.com</u>
Phone Number	Email
<u>Damon Bruson</u>	<u>1324 FIRE TOWER, PROSPERITY, SC 29127</u>
Name	Address
<u>803-364-2193</u>	<u>DBruson@SCANB.COM</u>
Phone Number	Email
<u>Janaye C. Bryson</u>	<u>1329 Fire Tower Rd, Prosperity, SC 29127</u>
Name	Address
<u>803-364-2193</u>	<u>jbryson1@mindspring.com</u>
Phone Number	Email
<u>Paul Anslow</u>	<u>103 Shamky Green Dr, Columbia SC 29229</u>
Name	Address
<u>803-22-467-6621</u>	<u>anslowp1@asme.org</u>
Phone Number	Email

Please fax a copy to 804.273.3543 ASAP and mail the originals to North American Young Generation in Nuclear, P.O. Box 10014, La Grange, IL 60525

PETITION SUPPORTING DOMINION'S PROPOSED NEW NUCLEAR REACTORS AT NORTH ANNA

<u>JOHN J. BELLEK</u> Name	<u>265 CHARLONN RIDGE DRIVE COLUMBIA SC 29229</u> Address
<u>803 736 4807</u> Phone Number	<u>jjbellek@yahoo.com</u> Email
<u>CHARLIE SIRONEN</u> Name	<u>3751 CACTUS TRAIL MARTINEZ GA 30207</u> Address
<u>206-799-2443</u> Phone Number	<u>CSIRONEN@MAC.COM</u> Email
<u>Gerald A. Loignon, Jr</u> Name	<u>3137 Talapa Rd Kinards SC 29355</u> Address
<u>(803) 276-6316</u> Phone Number	<u>gloignon@earthlink.net</u> Email
<u>MARGARET H. LOIGNON</u> Name	<u>3137 JALAPA RD., KINARDS, SC 29355</u> Address
<u>803-276-6316</u> Phone Number	<u>MHLOIGNON@YAHOO.COM</u> Email
<u>TERESA M. LOIGNON</u> Name	<u>501 PELHAM DR APT B-108 COLUMBIA SC 29209</u> Address
<u>803-312-3531</u> Phone Number	<u>loignon tm @westinghouse.com</u> Email
<u>Freda Ahmed</u> Name	<u>19 landmark Dr Apt. 146 Columbia, SC 29210</u> Address
<u>803-345-4505</u> Phone Number	<u>freda@scana.com</u> Email
<u>Travis W. Knight</u> Name	<u>10 mirch Hawk Lane, Columbia SC 29209</u> Address
<u>803-865-7617</u> Phone Number	<u>knighttw@engr.sc.edu</u> Email
<u>SANDRA K. Williams</u> Name	<u>3522 Boundbrook Ln, Columbia SC 29206</u> Address
<u>803-787-3452</u> Phone Number	<u>scana.com</u> Email
<u>Robert A. Williams</u> Name	<u>3522 Boundbrook Lane, Columbia, SC 29206</u> Address
<u>803-787-3452</u> Phone Number	<u>scana.com</u> Email
<u>William H. Bell</u> Name	<u>232 Piney Grove Rd, Columbia SC 29210</u> Address
<u>803-731-2979</u> Phone Number	<u>whbell@scana.com</u> Email
<u>James A. Cincea</u> Name	<u>721 Perceval Lane, W. Columbia, SC 29170</u> Address
<u>803-957-4344</u> Phone Number	<u>cinceja@westinghouse.com</u> Email
<u>Henry A Lovett</u> Name	<u>835 Ohio St Cola SC 29201</u> Address
<u>803-439-2415</u> Phone Number	<u>hallyovett@hotmail.com</u> Email

PETITION SUPPORTING DOMINION'S PROPOSED NEW NUCLEAR REACTORS AT NORTH ANNA

Patrick John Heher ^{Apt. G-8} 143 Stoneridge Dr. / Columbia, SC 29210
Name Address
(843) 430-2396 heher@engr.sc.edu
Phone Number Email

David Richardson 2122 Greenplain Rd Clinton SC 29325
Name Address
(704) 807-5808 richard4@engr.sc.edu
Phone Number Email

Name Address
Phone Number Email

PETITION SUPPORTING DOMINION'S PROPOSED NEW NUCLEAR REACTORS AT NORTH ANNA

We, the undersigned individuals, many of us being customers and shareholders of Dominion Resources, as well as residents of Louisa County or other areas neighboring the North Anna site, SUPPORT plans by Dominion to secure an Early Site Permit (ESP) to construct new nuclear reactors at its North Anna facility, on the following grounds:

- We concur with the NRC's conclusion that environmental impacts would not prevent issuing an ESP for the North Anna site.
- We believe that nuclear energy is safe, clean, reliable and cost effective, and as such, it should continue to be an important part of a balanced energy mix.
- 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.
- We commend Dominion for being proactive and farsighted when looking for reliable methods of addressing expected increases in energy demand over the coming years, while minimizing the environmental footprint of the selected energy sources, as well as the economic burden to Dominion customers.

Therefore, we urge the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to GRANT Dominion's application for an Early Site Permit.

GARY L. TROYER 614 COTTONWOOD RICHLAND VA
Name Address
509 946 3425 KG TROYER@CHARTER.NET 99352
Phone Number Email



ADB reserved
3/1/05

12/10/04

69FR71854

418

F-FDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Call =
J. Cochran (SIC)

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Template = ADM-013

A. Williams (SIC)

Ms. Alicia Williamson
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission


Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson:

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,



JOSEPH PIPIK
3753 SLATE MILLS RD
BOSTON VA 22713-1703



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





ADB, *revised*
3/1/05

12/10/04

69FR41854

419

FRDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Call =
J. Cushing (SKC9)

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Complete = ADM-013

A. Williams (SKC9)

Ms. Alicia Williamson
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission


Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson:

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, *Aaron Eichorst*
Aaron Eichorst
750 Belmont Ave
Charlottesville, VA 22902



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

ALWAYS



468



ADB reserved
3/1/05

12/10/04

69FR71854

HAD

F-PDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Call =
J. Cushing (SKS)

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Template = ADM-013

A. Williams (SKS)

Ms. Alicia Williamson
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Re: Comments on Draft NUREG-1811

Dear Ms. Williamson:

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,

Mary Jane Gore

*Ms Gore
3112 Skyline
Charlottesville*



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



ADP received
3/2/05

Feb 24, 2005

10/10/04

69F13 71854

421

Chief, Rules & Directives Branch
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6959
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D. C. 20555-0001

Gentlemen,

I understand that Dominion Power is seeking the first site permit for a new nuclear power plant in the U.S. since the Three Mile Island accident in 1979. This information came from Sierra, as of Jan. Feb. 05, but that 1979 accident I have never forgotten as we lived close enough to the plant to see the steam plume. What was true then, terrifying hundreds of people, is true now. Spend millions of dollars for a plant carrying such a dangerous potential that it has the power to wipe out populations?

Not if I can speak out against it, and I am joined by many others. Today's technology can supply other alternatives, in fact many. Dominion Power and this Bush administration ought to know better. No more nukes! Please consider all these factors in making a decision.

Sincerely,

Virginia B. Jordan
Virginia B. Jordan

1167 Oakland Sq. Blacksburg, Va. 24060

575p Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

471

F-1375-ADM-03
Add = J. Quebing (SKC9)
A. Williams (ARWI)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029

March 1, 2005

*ADB received
2/2/05*

*10/10/04
6917K 71854*

472

Mr. Jack Cushing
OWFN 11 F-1
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

RE: Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site - NUREG-1811 (North Anna ESP project). CEQ # 040569

Dear Mr. Cushing:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 404), and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the above referenced project. Due to the limited information provided as well as limited time available to conduct a comprehensive review, we are unable to provide an inclusive set of comments.

Under EPA's system for rating Environmental Impact Statements, we are rating the environmental impacts associated with the North Anna ESP project as Environmental Concerns 2 ("EC2"). An EC rating means the review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. The numeric rating assesses the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement. The 2 rating indicates that the DEIS does not contain sufficient information to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. The identified additional information, data, analysis, or discussion should be included in the final EIS. The basis for these ratings is reflective in the following comments. A copy of our rating system is attached, and can also be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/Compliance/nepa/comments/ratings.html>.

If you any questions regarding this issue please feel free to contact Kevin Mageri at (215) 814-5724.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
William Arguto,
NEPA Team Leader

Attachments: Technical Comment, EPA Rating System Criteria

Printed on 100% recycled/recyclable paper with 100% post-consumer fiber and process chlorine free.
Customer Service Hotline: 1-800-438-2474

*SESP 13011111 Complete
Template = ARW-013*

472
*E-REFDS = ADM-03
C = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. William (ARW)*

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

GENERAL PROCESS COMMENTS FOR THE NORTH ANNA PROJECT

1. The Purpose and Need of the Draft EIS does not include an assessment of the energy needs for the addition of two nuclear power units at the North Anna facility, nor does it assess other energy alternatives. The focus of the Purpose and Need was restricted to simply the suitability of citing two nuclear power units at the facility. It is EPA's understanding of the NRC's two-step streamlining permitting process would require an energy needs analysis which would include energy alternatives assessment in a second EIS, in accordance with 10CFR Part 50. EPA has concerns with this approach since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development as well as biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power under the second EIS since the NRC would have approved the suitability under the ESP.
2. The Dominion Environmental Report (ER) is referenced extensively (Geology, Hydrology, Surface Water and Groundwater Use, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Quality, Thermal and Chemical Monitoring) in the Draft EIS. Many of the Draft EIS conclusions are based on this document. Further, the Dominion ER is not part of the Draft EIS nor was it submitted to EPA as part of the Draft EIS submittal. EPA believes that a review of the ER is an important element of the evaluation of the Draft EIS and should be included as an attachment.
3. EPA has concerns that there are unresolved Air and Radiological issues in the DEIS. The Air and Radiological Health Impacts are currently being reviewed by EPA at this time and will be forwarded to the NRC upon completion. We request that these comments be considered during the Draft EIS phase of the project.
4. EPA has concern that the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at a minimum a supplemental EIS.
5. The Draft EIS does not provide information on the delineation (in acres) or the type of wetlands impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed facility, nor does it include any mitigation for the loss of wetlands.
6. The Draft EIS does not provide information on the linear feet of streams impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed facility, nor does it include any mitigation for the loss.

*Printed on 100% recycled/recyclable paper with 100% post-consumer fiber and process chlorine free.
Customer Service Hotline: 1-800-438-2474*



7. As stated in the DEIS (2.6.2.1 - Surface Water Use), growth in downstream demands for water withdrawals could result in increase water conflicts. Further, with three downstream counties considering using the North Anna River as a water resource raises the concern over an adequate water budget to accommodate additional power units at the North Anna facility. The DEIS should include a comprehensive water budget.

8. The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality – Game and Inland Fisheries (appendix F-50) have raised issues related to fish impingement and entrainment as well as increase water temperature and circulation flow patterns associated with the water demand of the proposed units during EIS application review. It is unclear under the Draft EIS what was modeled, what were the results of the modeling and what was the mitigation, if any being proposed.

*Printed on 100% recycled/recyclable paper with 100% post-consumer fiber and process chlorine free.
Customer Service Hotline: 1-800-438-2474*





Fax

Name: Jack Cushing
Organization: U.S. NRC
Fax: 301 415 2002
Phone: 301 415 1424
From: Kevin Magerr
Date: 02/28/05
Subject: Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the North Anna ESP Site.

Pages: 4

Comments:

Kevin Magerr
Environmental Engineer
US EPA Region 3
(3EA30)
1650 Arch St
Phila, PA 19103
215 814-5724
cell 302 521-2510
fax 215 814-2783
magerr.kevin@epa.gov

Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC
5000 Dominion Boulevard, Glen Allen, VA 23060

*RDB Incurred
3/3/05*



Dominion®

*12/10/04
697A 71854*

March 1, 2005

1423

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

Serial No. 04-754
ESP/JDH
Docket No. 52-008

DOMINION NUCLEAR NORTH ANNA, LLC
NORTH ANNA EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION
COMMENTS ON NUREG-1811, DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR AN EARLY SITE PERMIT (ESP) AT THE NORTH ANNA ESP SITE

This letter provides Dominion's comments on the NRC staff's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), NUREG-1811, for the Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC's North Anna Early Site Permit (ESP) application. Comments are provided in the enclosed tables. Table 1 addresses technical comments. Table 2 addresses editorial comments.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide our comments on the DEIS. In general, we find the DEIS to be a well-written document that provides a thorough evaluation consistent with the requirements of NEPA and 10 CFR Part 51 concerning environmental impacts associated with the potential construction and operation of new nuclear units at the North Anna ESP site.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Mr. Tony Banks at 804-273-2170.

Very truly yours,

Eugene S. Grecheck
Vice President-Nuclear Support Services

Enclosure: Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"

E-RFDS=ADH-03

*cc = J. Cushing (JXC9)
A. Williamson (ARW1)*

476

*SESP Review Complete
Template = ADH-013*

Commitments made in this letter: None

cc: (with enclosures)

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Suite 23T85
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Mike Scott
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Jack Cushing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. M. S. King
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
North Anna Power Station

Ms. Ellie Irons
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Environmental Impact Review
P.O. Box 10009
Richmond, VA 23240

Serial No. 04-754
Docket No. 52-008

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

Enclosure

**Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811,
"Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an
Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"**

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
1	<p>Page xxi Line 35</p> <p>Other DEIS locations</p>	<p>"However, a CP or COL to construct and operate a nuclear power plant is a major federal action that requires its own environmental review in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51."</p>	<p>The 10 CFR Part 52 framework provides finality for previously resolved issues that is fully consistent with the requirements of NEPA. There is no requirement for NRC to re-review previously resolved issues or to prepare an EIS for a subsequent COL proceeding regarding impacts that were considered at ESP.</p> <p>Under NEPA, ESP and COL are "connected actions" because the EIS prepared for ESP considers the potential environmental impacts of constructing and operating one or more new nuclear plants at the proposed site. The environmental review at the COL stage (when an ESP is referenced) would therefore be limited to a showing that the specific design chosen falls within the parameters specified in the ESP and to consideration of other significant environmental issues, if any, not considered in the previous proceedings. For any issues deferred from ESP to COL, the NRC could issue a supplemental EIS documenting its evaluation. This position is fully discussed in NEI's February 10, 2005 letter to NRC. (ML050530439)</p>
2	<p>Page 1-3 Line 33 1.1</p>	<p>"During the review of any future COL application referencing an ESP, the staff will assess the environmental impacts of the construction and operation</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of construction and operation are evaluated in the DEIS. The environmental review at the COL stage (when an ESP is referenced) would</p>

¹ DEIS page numbers and line numbers are identified for the electronic version of NUREG-1811 from the NRC's website, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1811/sr1811.pdf>.

479

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

480

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
		of a specific plant design. If the environmental impacts addressed in the EIS written at the ESP stage are found to be bounding by the staff, no additional analysis of these impacts is required, even if the ESP applicant employed the PPE approach. However, environmental impacts not considered or not bounded at the ESP stage will be assessed at the CP or COL stage. In addition, measures and controls to limit adverse impacts should be identified and evaluated for feasibility and adequacy in limiting adverse impacts at the ESP stage, where possible, and at the CP or COL stage."	therefore be limited to a showing that the specific design chosen falls within the parameters specified in the ESP and to consideration of other significant environmental issues, if any, not considered in the previous proceedings.
3	Page 2-1 Line 31 2.1	"All site land, subsurface lands, and mineral rights are owned by Virginia Power, a subsidiary of Dominion Resources, Inc."	ODEC's joint ownership should be acknowledged similar to DEIS Page 2-5, Line 34.
4	Page 2-14 Line 8 2.3.1.5	"However, the site area has experienced the impacts of tropical storms that have passed in its vicinity. The one with the largest impact was Tropical Storm Floyd in September 1999. Rainfall at or exceeding 15 cm (6 in.) from this storm was recorded at two locations near the site. This storm produced a maximum 2-minute wind speed of 18 m/s (40 mph), which was recorded at the Richmond Airport."	This wording is inconsistent with ER Section 2.7.3.4 (ESP Application Revision 3). Hurricane Camille, a tropical depression by the time it passed through the area within 100-nautical miles of the North Anna site, resulted in 11.18 inches of rainfall at the nearby Louisa observation station.
5	Page 2-17 Line 38 2.4	"The geotechnical properties of the saprolite beneath the site are unsuitable for use as a fill material for plant construction. Therefore, fill material will need to be imported to the ESP site during construction and excavated material will have to be removed to another location."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The DEIS refers to the saprolite beneath the site as unsuitable for use as a fill material for plant construction. Instead of "fill, this should be "structural fill." ▪ The DEIS indicates that fill material will need to be imported to the ESP site during construction and

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
			<p>excavated material will have to be moved to another location. Again, this should be "structural fill" rather than "fill" since all of the excavated material can be used as general fill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, as stated in SSAR Section 2.5.4.5.3, bedrock excavated for the deeper foundations can be crushed and used as structural fill. Thus, structural fill would only need to be imported to the ESP site as an alternative or supplement to the onsite crushed rock.
6	Page 2-21 Line 13 2.6.1.3	"Nine of the groundwater wells are maintained to detect seepage from the service water reservoir for NAPS Units 1 and 2;..."	This wording is inconsistent with ER Section 6.3.1. Wells around the SWR are monitored every six months to evaluate the reservoir for leakage, assess the effectiveness of horizontal drains beneath the existing units pump house, and determine the flow rate and clarity of the associated discharge water.
7	Page 2-21 Line 31 2.6.1.3	"Because of the limited inflow data, it is not possible to create a reliable water budget for Lake Anna directly from inflow and discharge measurements."	ER Sections 5.2.2.1.1 and 5.2.2.1.2 describe the formulation of the water balance model and the conservative methods used to calculate inflows. The DEIS wording suggests that inflow data was limited in some manner that adversely impacted the hydrological assessment. This implication is not accurate. The current hydrological monitoring program is appropriate and sufficient for its intended purpose. No changes to the hydrological monitoring program regarding inflow data are necessary.
8	Page 2-21 Line 40 2.6.1.3	"No water velocity measurements within the WHTF or Lake Anna have been recorded. When North Anna Dam was constructed, instruments for reliably measuring the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This DEIS wording is inconsistent with ER Sections 5.2 and 6.3 and suggests that the absence of velocity measurements adversely impacts the ability of the

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

Table 1
North Anna Early Site Permit
Technical Comments on NUREG-1811,
"Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"

No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
		<p>relatively low current velocities in lakes, such as Lake Anna, were unavailable. The only practical methods at that time to measure currents were drogue or dye experiments. Velocity measurements are important for both understanding of the hydrodynamics of the lake and to calibrate numerical models of fluid and heat transport process in the lake. Velocity flow measurements will be used in the hydrological evaluation at the CP/COL stage."</p>	<p>cooling lake model developed for North Anna. This is not accurate. The Lake Anna cooling lake model used to predict lake water temperature was satisfactorily calibrated with field data collected during the operation of the two existing units. Extension of the model to include additional units was verified by laboratory experiments conducted by MIT. Also, some limited velocity measurements were made in the 1980s to support development of the MIT model. Velocity monitoring, especially for the period before the additional units come on line, will not improve the prediction capability of the Lake Anna cooling lake model. The current hydrological monitoring program is appropriate, sufficient, and will be continued. No changes to the hydrological monitoring program regarding velocity flow measurements are necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental impacts of construction and operation are evaluated in the DEIS. The environmental review at the COL stage (when an ESP is referenced) would therefore be limited to a showing that the specific design chosen falls within the parameters specified in the ESP and to consideration of other significant environmental issues, if any, not considered in the previous proceedings.
9	Page 2-23 Line 2	"One of the three counties is relying on obtaining water from the North Anna River drainage to satisfy their water	None of the three counties upstream of Lake Anna (Louisa, Spotsylvania, Orange) is relying on the North

482

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
	2.6.2.1	demands."	Anna River to satisfy their water demands.
10	Page 2-25 Line 2 2.6.3.2	"Pursuant to 10 CFR 100.20(3), site-specific groundwater chemistry data would be required as part of a construction permit (CP) application or in a combined license (COL) application."	Draft Safety Evaluation Report (DSER) Open Item 2.4-11 requests information necessary to demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR 100.20(c)(3). Dominion's response to this DSER Open Item will provide the requested information.
11	Page 2-40 Line 10 2.7.2.2	"However, fish are not stocked in the WHTF, and access to this fishery is restricted to the land owners along this part of the shoreline."	This wording is inconsistent with DEIS Section 2.7.2.1 and ER Section 2.4.2.2. Grass carp were stocked in the WHTF in 1994 to control hydrilla.
12	Page 2-41 Line 31 2.7.2.3	"Since 1987, Virginia Power biologists have gathered data on the abundance and distribution of bass species in the lower North Anna River (VEPCo 2001a)."	Suggest that this DEIS statement reflect that Virginia Power biologists have gathered additional data on the abundance and distribution of black bass species in the lower North Anna River via direct observation techniques.
13	Page 2-42 Line 22 2.7.2.4	"The only aquatic species listed by the FWS as Federally endangered is the dwarf wedgemussel."	Suggest that this DEIS statement reflect that the only listed aquatic species likely to be present in the vicinity of the North Anna ESP site is the dwarf wedgemussel, that none were collected in pre-impoundment surveys of the North Anna River, and none have been collected in more recent years during routine monitoring surveys.
14	Page 2-42 Line 29 2.7.2.4	"While VDGIF ecological databases indicate that there is the potential for one Federally listed mussel species, one State-listed mussel species, and one mussel species that is a candidate for Federal listing that occur in counties that border Lake Anna or the North Anna River, the three Federally or State-listed species – the Commonwealth freshwater mussel species dwarf wedgemussel (<i>Alasmidonta heterodon</i>), the Atlantic pigtoe (<i>Fusconaia masoni</i>), and James River spiny mussel (<i>Pleurobema</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on a review of the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation website, two of the mussel species listed in the DEIS (<i>Fusconaia masoni</i> and <i>Pleurobema collina</i>) are found in the James River drainage, but not the York River drainage (which includes the North Anna River). It appears that the DEIS includes occurrences of protected/rare mussels in counties (such as Albemarle, Fluvanna, and Goochland) that are within 25 or 50 miles of

483

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
		<i>collina</i>) – could occur in local streams, none have been observed or collected in local streams."	<p>NAPS, but do not adjoin Lake Anna or the North Anna River. Although there are inconsistencies in the treatment of protected/rare mussels, the conclusions of the ER and the DEIS are the same: one listed mussel species occurs in the counties of interest (Caroline, Hanover, Louisa, Orange, and Spotsylvania), and this population would not be affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest that this DEIS wording should reflect that none of the Federally or State-listed species have been observed or collected in local streams or the North Anna River.
15	Page 3-2 Figure 3-1	Figure 3-1 points to the location of the "Future Discharge Structure" for Units 3 & 4.	Per ER Figure 3.1-3, this DEIS figure should identify the Unit 3&4 discharge structure as existing.
16	Page 3-2 Figure 3-1	Figure 3-1 points to the location of the "Training Building."	Per ER Figure 3.1-3, this DEIS figure should identify that the existing training building would be expanded.
17	Page 3-6 Line 2 3.2.1.1	"Dominion proposes to use the same ultimate heat sink system for both plants. This system would be composed of a mechanical draft cooling tower with a 71.6 m wide by 107 m long by 15.2 m deep (235 ft wide x 350 ft long by 50 ft deep) engineered underground basin constructed beneath the tower (Dominion 2004b). The basins will be large enough to store 1.2 x 10 ⁹ L (30,600,000 gal), which is adequate to hold a 30-day supply of emergency cooling water. During periods when the ultimate heat sink cooling towers are in operation, the towers are expected to withdraw an average flow of 25.9 L/s (411 gpm) from the basin, with a maximum flow of 53.6 L/s (850 gpm)."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all reactor types require an ultimate heat sink. The size, storage volume, flow rates, heat rejection rates, blowdown rates, etc. identified in the SSAR and ER are maximum values. In the event that the selected reactor design requires an UHS, the UHS would be appropriately sized for the unit as part of detailed engineering and described in the COL application.

484

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
	<p>Page 3-7 Line 16 3.2.2.1</p>	<p>"Based on the PPE, during shutdown the ultimate heat sink systems for each unit will reject 123 MW/hr (4.2 x 10⁸ BTU/hr) of heat to the environment. Make-up water for the mechanical draft ultimate heat sink cooling towers will be withdrawn from an engineered underground basin located beneath the tower. Each basin will maintain an adequate supply of water for 30 days of emergency operation. Based on the PPE, the maximum blowdown discharged to the discharge canal will be 54 L/s (850 gpm)."</p>	
	<p>Page 3-8 Line 28 3.2.2.2</p>	<p>"For safety-related cooling, the ultimate heat sink for each of the proposed Units 3 and 4 would provide water to the reactor cooling systems and safety-related components. As proposed, both plants would use the same ultimate heat sink system, which would be composed of a mechanical draft cooling tower with a 71.6 m wide by 107 m long by 15.2 m deep (235 ft wide by 350 ft long by 50 ft deep) engineered underground basin constructed beneath the tower (Dominion 2004b). The basin would have a storage capacity of 1.2 x 10⁶ L (30,600,000 gal), which is adequate to hold a 30-day supply of emergency cooling water. During periods when the ultimate heat sink cooling towers are operating, the flow rate through the towers is expected to average 27.8 L/s (411 gpm) with a maximum of 53.6 L/s (850 gpm). During normal operating conditions, a negligible volume of water would maintain the pool in the basin beneath the cooling tower."</p>	

485

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
18	Page 3-7 Line 1 3.2.2.1	"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)."	The maximum discharge temperature based on site characteristics would not exceed 113°F (maximum inlet temperature of 95°F plus maximum condenser temperature rise of 18°F from PPE). The PPE value of 127°F is not relevant in this instance.
19	Page 3-7 Line 3-4 3.2.2.1	"Dominion specified in the PPE that the flow rate through the condenser will not exceed 71,900 L/s (1,140,000 gpm)."	This DEIS wording is inconsistent with ER Table 3.1-9 which describes the cooling water withdrawal rate of 1,140,000 gpm as a nominal design coolant flow. Actual maximum circulating water flows would be dependent on the specific design of the circulating water pumps, but would be within a few percent of this value.
20	Page 3-8 Line 15 3.2.2.2	"Dominion estimates, in the PPE, a maximum evaporative loss of a once-through design to be 738 L/s (11,700 gpm) or 0.738 m ³ /s (26 cfs) as compared to 1230 L/s (19,500 gpm) or 1.23 m ³ /s (43 cfs) for wet cooling towers."	This DEIS wording is inconsistent with ER Section 5.2.1.2. The average annual evaporative loss is estimated to be 29 cfs, which assumes Unit 3 operates at a 100% plant capacity factor.
21	Page 4-2 Line 3 4.1.1	"The ESP site is located entirely within the existing NAPS site, which is zoned for industrial use by Louisa County. However, construction of Units 3 and 4 at the site would require a conditional use permit from the county."	According to Louisa County Code of Ordinance, Division 7 - Industrial District, Section 96-162, Permitted Uses, none of the 30 "restricted use" categories include electrical generating units explicitly. A conditional use permit may not be required for construction of new generating units.
22	Page 4-6 Line 37 4.3.3	"If Dominion applies for and receives a CP or a COL or conducts site preparation activities, a VPDES permit will be required from VDEQ before construction activities can commence."	A VPDES permit would not be required for site preparation activities.
23	Page 4-13 Line 14 4.4.2	"The creation of Lake Anna has mitigated most water-quality impacts from Contrary Creek area runoff."	Suggest that this DEIS statement reflect that the creation of Lake Anna has mitigated most adverse water-quality impacts from Contrary Creek area runoff, yielding a

486

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
			beneficial effect in the drainage basin.
24	Page 4-13 Line 28 4.4.2	"Dominion states that the design and operation of the intake bay for Units 3 and 4 would require that a barrier (e.g., a turbidity curtain or sheet piling) or some form of protection be installed between Units 3 and 4 and the lake to reduce the potential for silt and soil entrainment through the existing units to the Waste Heat Treatment Facility (WHTF) (Dominion 2004a)."	This DEIS wording is inconsistent with DEIS Sections 5.4.2.6 and 5.4.2.7 and ER Sections 5.3 and 5.10, which do not specify the need for a barrier (e.g., a turbidity curtain or sheet piling) or some form of protection during operation.
25	Page 4-19 Line 6 4.5.1.3	"However, the staff evaluation found that State Route (SR) 700 leading into NAPS from SR 618 is very narrow and paved. It is unlikely that this road could accept heavy construction traffic and the transportation of construction materials without substantial upgrading."	This DEIS wording suggests that accessibility to the site would be restricted for heavy loads unless Route 700 is substantially upgraded. The condition of Route 700 between Route 652 and the site was discussed with the VDOT (Fluvanna and Louisa District) representative. This road has been upgraded with a fairly thick layer of asphalt that is capable of handling a number of heavy vehicles such as cement trucks, if needed. That is, it is not the same thin layer of asphalt/chips that is typical of local roads and that would easily be torn up with passage of a number of such trucks. Route 652 also has been upgraded with the heavier layer of asphalt. (Note that Route 700 west of the intersection with Route 652 is a typical local road.)
26	Page 4-33 Line 9 4.5.3.7	"At issue is how to accommodate any increased enrollment resulting from construction laborers locating to the county – whether through permanent construction or the use of modular trailer units (Baker 2003)."	This DEIS section assumes a worst case of a large number of workers relocating with their families even if they were in trailers. ER Section 4.4 implies that there would be little likelihood that most construction workers would relocate with their families for this effort, that is, this would be unusual.

487

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
27	Page 4-45 Lines 19-21, 38 4.11	<p>"When these prerequisites have been achieved, planned site preparation and preliminary construction activities may proceed and may include none, some, or all of the activities discussed below pursuant to 10 CFR 52.25 and 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1)."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Drill sample/monitoring wells or additional geophysical borings" 	This DEIS wording is inconsistent with 10 CFR 50.10(c)(1) which allows "changes desirable for the temporary use of the land for public recreational uses, necessary borings to determine foundation conditions or other preconstruction monitoring to establish background information related to the suitability of the site or to the protection of environmental values." Drilling for samples/monitoring wells or additional geophysical borings is not listed in Part 4, Section 1.1, of Dominion's ESP application or in DEIS Section 10.1.
28	Page 5-5 Line 7 5.3	"The outflow from Lake Anna Dam was estimated by Dominion from the US Geological Survey (USGS) gauge downstream from the dam at Doswell, Virginia, after adjusting for the additional contributing area downstream between the dam and the Doswell gauge."	The stream gauge data at Parlow, Virginia, was used to estimate outflow from Lake Anna Dam.
29	Page 5-6 Line 32 5.3.1 Other locations in this section.	"The staff's bounding analysis used the applicant's PPE estimates of induced evaporation for a once-through system 0.738 m ³ /s (11,700 gpm), and evaporation for a wet cooling tower 1.23 m ³ /s (19,500 gpm)."	This DEIS wording is inconsistent with ER Section 5.2.1.2. The average annual evaporative loss is estimated to be 29 cfs, which assumes Unit 3 operates at a 100% plant capacity factor. As a result, the predicted minimum water surface elevation of 243.4 ft msl on DEIS Page 5-9 (line 24) for Units 1 and 2 plus Unit 3 using once through cooling is higher than the corresponding 242.6 ft msl minimum water level estimated in ER Section 5.2.2.1.
30	Page 5-7 Line 19 5.3.1	"However, at the CP/COL stage, the applicant will provide sufficient temperature and velocity monitoring data and modeling results to ensure that the hydrological impact of the actual discharge design is bounded by this EIS."	The environmental impacts of operation are evaluated in the DEIS. The environmental review at the COL stage (when an ESP is referenced) would therefore be limited to a showing that the specific design chosen falls within

488

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
			the parameters specified in the ESP and to consideration of other significant environmental issues, if any, not considered in the previous proceedings.
31	Page 5-7 Line 34 5.3.2	"The impacts on water use are related to the water budget. Discharge of the additional condenser cooling heat from Unit 3 to the lake would increase the heat in the lake and increase evaporation. This additional volume of discharged cooling water would also change the hydrodynamic circulation of Lake Anna. The increased evaporation from Lake Anna from a third unit's once-through cooling system would increase the duration that the flow rate from the Lake Anna Dam would be 0.57 m ³ /s (20 cfs) or less from 5.8 percent to 11.8 percent of the time..."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The minimum dam release required by the VPDES permit is normally 40 cfs. During a severe drought, a Lake Level Contingency Plan in effect allows a decrease in the release in increments of 5 cfs down to a minimum rate of 20 cfs. ▪ The percent of time at 20 cfs is 5.3 percent.
32	Page 5-9 Line 26 5.3.2	"These numbers are similar to results provided in the ER, in which Dominion estimated that during the critical period, the water surface elevation would drop an additional 0.6 m (2 ft), from below 75.0 m (246 ft) to below 74.4 m (244 ft), with the addition of Unit 3 (using wet cooling tower cooling)."	ER Revision 3 does not address the water use impact due to the use of a new wet cooling tower unit.
33	Page 5-10 Line 28 5.3.3	"Therefore, based on the review of the current VPDES permit for Units 1 and 2, the required VPDES permit for Units 3 and 4, Dominion's ER, the environmental monitoring report, and its independent review, the staff concludes that the impact to water quality would be SMALL, and mitigation is not warranted. However, this will have to be verified at the CP/COL stage when a design has been selected."	The environmental impacts of operation are evaluated in the DEIS. The environmental review at the COL stage (when an ESP is referenced) would therefore be limited to a showing that the specific design chosen falls within the parameters specified in the ESP and to consideration of other significant environmental issues, if any, not considered in the previous proceedings.

489

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

490

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
34	Page 5-37 Line 32 5.5.1.4	"Additionally, the results from screening hourly meteorological data collected at Richmond, Virginia, from 1996 to 2000 indicate that there were no hours concurrently having relative humidity greater than 90 percent and ambient temperatures below 0° C (32 F), the precursor conditions needed for steam fog formation."	A relative humidity of greater than 90 percent and ambient temperature less than 32 F are conditions required for the formation of ice from steam fog.
35	Page 5-44 Line 6 5.5.3.4	"...would exacerbate conditions at the lake during times of drought."	Suggest that this DEIS statement describe the concern as during times of severe drought.
36	Page 5-44 Line 27 5.5.3.4	"In addition, during drought years the impact to recreation could be moderate due to short term low lake level."	Suggest that this DEIS statement describe the impact as during multiple drought years like 2001-2002.
37	Page 5-53 Line 35 5.8.3	"Construction noise at 3 m (10 ft) is listed as 110 decibels, and the human pain threshold is 120 decibels."	Discussion of the impulse noise level from construction activities may not be an appropriate comparative measure for operational noise impacts.
38	Page 5-54 Line 24 5.8.4	"And verify the NESC limits at the COL stage for transmission of electricity from Units 3 and 4. At the CP/COL Dominion will have to verify that the transmission lines meet the NESC criteria."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sentence fragment. ▪ This wording is inconsistent with ER Section 5.6.3 that describes the analysis results, which have already been confirmed by field verification.
39	Page 5-62 Line 22 Table 5-10	Table 5-10 indicates that the maximum organ dose from liquid effluents is "0.017 mSv/yr teen liver"	Maximum organ dose from liquid effluents is to the liver of a child.
40	Page 5-63 Line 22 5.9.3	"A collective dose of 0.18 person-Sv/yr (18 person-rem/yr) was calculated for the liquid effluent pathway using the GASPAR II computer code."	The dose of 18 person-rem/yr calculated using GASPAR II is for the gaseous effluent pathway.
41	Page 5-64 Line 15	"Dominion reported annual occupational dose estimates of 1.5 person-Sv (150 person-rem) for the AP1000, IRIS, and	The ABWR should be included in this DEIS statement.

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

491

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
	5.9.4	GT-MHR reactor designs (Dominion 2002)."	
42	Page 5-69 Line 37 5.10.1	"Dominion has provided the staff with meteorological data for 1996, 1997, and 1998 for the North Anna ESP site. These data have been reviewed by the staff and found to be representative of the meteorological conditions at the site. The meteorological conditions will need to be updated at the CP/COL stage to ensure that meteorological data reflect site conditions for the plant during operation."	The environmental impacts of construction and operation are evaluated in the DEIS. The environmental review at the COL stage (when an ESP is referenced) would therefore be limited to a showing that the specific design chosen falls within the parameters specified in the ESP and to consideration of other significant environmental issues, if any, not considered in the previous proceedings. As discussed in NEI's February 10, 2005 letter (ML050530439), updated meteorological data may not be needed.
43	Page 5-70 Line 5-6 5.10 Page 5-70 Line 11 Table 5-14	"The second column lists the /Q values calculated by the applicant using the site meteorological information discussed in ER Section 2.7.2 (Dominion 2004a) and the EAB and LPZ distances from Section 2.7.5 of the ER." Table 5-14 lists the following time-dependent atmospheric dispersion factors (s/m ³) for the exclusion area boundary (EAB) and the low population zone (LPZ): EAB (0 to 2 hr) - 3.34E-5 LPZ (0 to 8 hr) - 2.17E-6 LPZ (8 to 24 hr) - 1.5E-6 LPZ (1 to 4 day) - 1.2E-6 LPZ (4 to 30 day) - 9.0E-7	Time-dependent X/Q values are not included in ER Section 2.7.2 and the DEIS Table 5-14 values were not provided by Dominion. The ER accident analysis is based on a single 50-percentile X/Q value for each location (EAB and LPZ). There is no time-dependency associated with 50-percentile X/Q values.
44	Page 5-71 Line 7 5.10.1	"In addition, the ABWR doses have been scaled to a power level of 4386 MW(t), 102 percent of the power proposed for an ABWR unit at the North Anna ESP site (Dominion 2004A). However, the scaling was performed	It is not clear what is meant by "the scaling was performed on doses and not on the source term." If this implies that the activity releases in the ER are not scaled to 4386 MWt, then that is not correct.

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
		on doses and not on the source term."	
45	Page 8-1 Line 42 8.1 Page 9-8 Line 14 9.4	...since Part 52 does not require an ER or EIS for an ESP to include consideration of energy alternatives or the benefits of construction and operation of a reactor or reactors at the ESP site, this draft EIS does not consider such matters. Accordingly, should the NRC ultimately determine to issue an ESP for the North Anna ESP site, these matters will be considered in the EIS for any CP or COL application that references such an ESP.	As described in NEI's February 10, 2005 letter (ML050530439), for any issues deferred from ESP to COL, the NRC could issue a supplemental EIS documenting its evaluation.
46	Page 8-2 Line 32 8.2.1	"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."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DEIS phrase "WHTF conditions" is non-specific and should be further defined. • The "approximately 19 percent" is non-specific and should be further defined as to where and what (i.e., surface area, volume, temperature, etc.)
47	Page 8-2 8.2	None.	The DEIS conclusions are consistent with ER Section 9. However, the DEIS comparison of two alternative heat dissipation systems (wet and dry cooling towers) with the base case once-through cooling system is inconsistent with ER Section 9.4.2, which evaluates alternative intake locations, discharge systems, discharge locations, water supplies, and water treatment processes. The ER evaluation addresses land use requirements, aesthetics, operating experience, generating efficiency, and capital and operating costs.
48	Page 9-8	"Accordingly, should the NRC ultimately determine to	As described in NEI's February 10, 2005 letter

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 1 North Anna Early Site Permit Technical Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section¹	DEIS Wording	Comment
	Line 17 9.4	issue an ESP for the North Anna ESP site, these matters will be considered in the EIS for any CP or COL application that reference such an ESP."	(ML050530439), for any issues deferred from ESP to COL, the NRC could issue a supplemental EIS documenting its evaluation.
49	Page 10-5 Line 16 Table 10-1	Impact Category: "Hydrological and Water Use" Actions to Mitigate Impacts: "Use best construction management practices" Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: "Fill, and grading operations at the North Anna ESP site will alter two ephemeral streams"	Suggest that this DEIS wording reflect the description in Part 4, Section 1.2.2.3.2 of Dominion's ESP application. The site drainage system would be designed to incorporate the flow currently conveyed by these streams to the lake. By providing alternate drainage facilities to convey the stream flows, no short-term or long-term adverse hydrologic impacts on site drainage would result.
50	Page 10-5 Line 19 Table 10-1 Page 10-6 Line 5 10.1	Impact Category: "Ecological, a. Terrestrial." Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: "a. Removal of trees and vegetation and habitat." "The construction impacts on the terrestrial ecology of the site would be short-term."	The wording in Table 10-1 and Page 10-6 appear to be inconsistent regarding terrestrial ecology impacts.
51	Page 10-6 Line 35 10.1 Page 10-7 Line 4 Table 10-2	"The unavoidable adverse impacts from operation for land use are small and further mitigation is not warranted." Impact Category: "Land Use" Actions to Mitigate Impacts: "Local land management plans" Unavoidable Adverse Impact: "Possible new housing and retail space added in vicinity due to potential growth"	The wording in Table 10-2 and Page 10-6 appear to be inconsistent regarding land use impacts. ER Section 5.8.2 concludes that there would be no unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. The Comprehensive Plans for the nearby counties already incorporate projected growth in population and the demand for public services, regardless of whether part of this increase in population growth consists of new operations personnel for new units at the ESP site.

493

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

494

<p align="center">Table 2 North Anna Early Site Permit Editorial Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ²	DEIS Wording	Comment
1	Page 2-11 Line 27 2.3.1	"The maximum monthly snowfall was 71.9 cm (28.3 in.), which occurred in January 1940."	The correct monthly snowfall is 28.5 inches.
2	Page 2-15 Line 16 2.3.1.6	"Data recovery rates for the period from January 1, 1996, to December 31, 2001, for the primary monitoring system, including reliable atmospheric stability information, ranged from 99.30 percent for the upper-level wind data in 1996 to 90.9 percent for the same data set in 1997."	The correct percentage is 90.09.
3	Page 2-15 Line 23 2.3.1.6 Other DEIS locations	"The meteorological data for the period of January 1, 1996 to December 31, 1998, were used to generate atmospheric dispersion factor (/Q values) used to ..."	The dispersion factor should be shown as X/Q.
4	Page 2-19 Lines 15 2.6.1.1	"An additional 3.02x10 ⁸ m ³ (2.45 10 ⁵ acre-ft) are available for flood control storage up to crest of the dam at elevation 80.8 m (265 ft) above MSL."	Correct value is 2.45x10 ⁵ acre-ft.
5	Page 2-21 Lines 21-22 & 29-31 2.6.1.3	"This gauge reflects the release from Lake Anna and runoff from an additional 250 km ² (97 mi ²) of watershed downstream of the Lake Anna Dam...The two upstream gauges on Contrary Creek and Pamunkey Creek, record flows representative of 120 km ² (46 mi ²) or approximately 13 percent of the total upstream area contributing flow to Lake Anna."	DSEI page 2-61 states 251 km ² and 119 km ² , respectively.

² DEIS page numbers and line numbers are identified for the electronic version of NUREG-1811 from the NRC's website, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-m/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1811/sr1811.pdf>.

Dominion Comments on NUREG-1811, DEIS for North Anna ESP Site

<p align="center">Table 2 North Anna Early Site Permit Editorial Comments on NUREG-1811, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site"</p>			
No.	DEIS Page, Location, Section ²	DEIS Wording	Comment
6	Page 2-35 Lines 33 & 38 2.7.2.1	White catfish listed twice, with a different scientific name in each case.	<i>Amelurus catus</i> is the correct scientific name.
7	Page 2-36 Lines 10-12 2.7.2.1	Perclhthydae, Morone americana and N. saxatillis	Perclhthydae, Morone americana, and Morone saxatillis are the correct scientific names. Morone americana and Morone saxatillis are correct in accompanying DEIS text.
8	Page 2-43 Line 9 2.7.2.4	Alasmidonta heterdon	Alasmidonta heterodon is the correct scientific name.
9	Page 5-6 Line 21 5.3.1	During normal operation at full power, based on the PPE, the primary cooling system for each unit is required to reject 2800 MW (9.7 BTU/hr) to the environment.	The correct value is 9.7×10^9 Btu/hr.
10	Page 5-78 Lines 10 & 12 Table 5-19	Early Fatalities per Reactor-year for: ▪ ABWR at North Anna ESP Site is $2.3E-11$ ▪ AP1000 at North Anna ESP Site is $1.1E-10$	ABWR value is $2.4E-11$; AP1000 value is $1.2E-10$.
11	Page 5-80 Line 12 Table 5-20	Core Damage Frequency (per year) for AP1000 at North Anna ESP Site is $2.7E-07$.	AP1000 value is $2.4E-07$.
12	Page 7-2 Line 15 7.3	"Cumulative thermal effects are discussed in section 7.4."	Reference should be to section 7.5.

495