

From: Anthony Eitrem
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 11:36 AM
To: sandykurtz@comcast.net; CIsland@aol.com
Cc: dr_mike@mindspring.com; dave@radfreenm.org; gjocoy@comporium.net; lgorenflo@gmail.com; jcruickshank4@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Telephonic Oral Argument in ASLBP Adjudications

Dear Ms. Kurtz and Mr. Reynolds:

I am Chief Counsel for the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (ASLBP), and I have been asked to respond to your respective e-mails to the members of the Licensing Board presiding over the adjudicatory proceeding regarding Dominion Virginia Power's COL application for North Anna Unit 3.

The concerns you expressed in your e-mails (and those expressed in similar e-mails from Greg Jocoy, Louise Gorenflo, Dave McCoy, Mike Holland and John Cruickshank) appear to be based upon a misunderstanding of statutes and regulations. This telephone conference call is not a public meeting under the Government in the Sunshine Act or the NRC's 10 CFR Part 9 regulations implementing the same. This is a prehearing conference in an administrative adjudicative proceeding. Its purpose is to give the parties to that adjudication an opportunity to answer questions from the judges on legal issues regarding standing and contention admissibility. Consistent with ASLBP policy to provide transparency in its proceedings, the prehearing telephonic conference will be recorded by a court reporter and the transcript will be available to the public on ADAMS within a few days.

By way of background, Licensing Boards frequently hold prehearing conferences for the purpose of hearing oral argument on the admission of contentions, but the holding of such conferences is discretionary with each Licensing Board based on the need of the judges to clarify the issues. Often these prehearing conferences are held in a public place in the vicinity of the facility in question. Sometimes they are held in the ASLBP Hearing Room at NRC Headquarters in Rockville, MD. And sometimes they are conducted via telephonic conference call. Furthermore, it is standard practice for the ASLBP to permit the public to attend all of its prehearing conferences, wherever and however they are held. If a prehearing conference is to be held in the vicinity of the facility in question, the NRC will generally issue a press release to local media outlets to provide notice. If the prehearing conference is to be held in Rockville, notice of that will be posted on the NRC website and often a press release will also be issued. In all of these prehearing conference situations, the public is welcome to attend.

However, attendees may not participate or speak, because they are not parties to the proceeding. Contrary to the assertion in Mr. Reynolds's e-mail, the individuals and organizations who seek to intervene in the North Anna proceeding do not "represent the interests of the general public" and "citizens of our nation." They represent themselves and their organizations. They must have legal standing and at least one admissible contention in order to prosecute their challenge to Dominion Virginia Power Company's application. This is no different than what you would see in any state or federal court in this country. Unless you are a party, you are a silent observer.

With regard to prehearing conferences that are conducted via telephone conference call, it is similarly our policy and practice to permit access to the public -- via telephone. Indeed, the last sentence of the June 11, 2008 North Anna Licensing Board Order scheduling the July 2, 2008 prehearing telephone conference notified participants to the proceeding how to arrange for additional telephone lines to permit non-parties to audit the conference. Had Mr. Zeller requested lines for you, they would have been provided. In the absence of his request, we are arranging for a sufficient number of lines to accommodate all seven of you should any or all of you wish to listen to the prehearing conference. You should receive instructions for connecting to the prehearing telephone conference via e-mail later today.

Sincerely,

Anthony C. Eitrem, Chief Counsel
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
11545 Rockville Pike, MS T-3 F23
Rockville, MD 20852
301-415-7390
Anthony.Eitrem@nrc.gov

From: Judynwtf@aol.com [mailto:Judynwtf@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 2:31 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer; Richard Cole; Alice Mignerey
Subject: Public participation in North Anna Unit 3 Oral arguments

Louis Zeller of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League (BREDL) has written to this Atomic Safety and Licensing Board panel requesting that the North Anna Unit 3 combined license oral argument scheduled for July 2 be held in a courthouse near the North Anna power plant location and be open to the public. As the Executive Director of the Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force, I support Mr. Zeller and BREDL's request.

The oral arguments are scheduled to be held via telephone which makes it more difficult for parties to interact with each other and the proceedings, and is a violation of "Subpart C – Government in the Sunshine Act regulations.

§9.100 Scope of subpart.

This subpart prescribes procedures pursuant to which NRC meetings shall be open to public observation pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552b.

By holding oral arguments on the telephone, NRC and the ASLBP are denying the public access for observation. Members of the public near the proposed facility, directly affected by the NRC's decision will not have the opportunity to observe the decision making proceedings.

The NRC has very recently received the license application from the Department of Energy for a construction authorization at Yucca Mountain as well as other applications for various nuclear facilities. The public has an active interest, serious concerns and a statutorily guaranteed right to observe any of these proceedings.

Please do not set an exclusionary precedent as you begin hearing oral arguments on combined operating licenses.

Judy Treichel
Executive Director
Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force
P. O. Box 26177
Las Vegas, NV 89126
Phone: 702-248-1127
Fax: 702-248-1128

From: Sara Barczak [mailto:sara@cleanenergy.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 4:15 PM
To: rsnthl@comcast.net; Alice Mignerey; Richard Cole; Ronald Spritzer
Cc: Sara Barczak
Subject: North Anna COL intervention: 7/2 teleconference hearing

Dear Judges Spritzer, Cole, Mignerey, and Rosenthal:

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE) is a non-profit energy policy organization with offices and members throughout the southeastern United States. We promote responsible energy choices that create global warming solutions and ensure clean, safe and healthy communities in the Southeast. We are concerned about the NRC decision to hold a teleconference tomorrow, July 2, 2008, instead of an in-person hearing, to discuss oral arguments on the petition to intervene in the North Anna, Unit 3, combined operating license (COL).

We do not believe that a teleconference provides the level of public participation or interaction that an in-person, face-to-face courtroom hearing near the proposed reactor location provides. The NRC should encourage, not discourage, public participation. Further, this decision lends the appearance of the NRC wanting to save time, costs, and reduce staff time needed to participate in the process. As more and more COLs are filed by utilities across the country, the NRC needs to be prepared with the manpower and resources to conduct proper hearings that allow for substantive public involvement. Potential intervenors should not be held at fault for possible resource deficiencies within the NRC. The decision also makes it seem that a decision about the admissibility of the contentions has already occurred before the oral arguments have even been made. Though an early site permit (ESP) has been granted for North Anna, that does not mean that a COL challenge should be given less scrutiny by the NRC or be more readily dismissed.

Please support the request to hold an in-person courtroom hearing for the oral arguments. Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,
Sara Barczak

Sara Barczak
Safe Energy Director



Working for a clean energy future

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

428 Bull Street, Suite 202

Savannah, GA 31401

(phone/fax) 912.201.0354

sara@cleanenergy.org

www.cleanenergy.org

From: Michael Mariotte [mailto:nirsnet@nirs.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 4:46 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer; Richard Cole; Alice Mignerey; rsnthl@comcast.net
Subject: concern about North Anna hearing process

July 1, 2008

Honorable Judge Ronald Spritzer, Chairman; Judge Richard Cole, Judge Alice Mignerey, Judge Alan Rosenthal

I am writing to express our concern about the hearing process for the North Anna Combined Operating License. It is our understanding that the ASLB in this proceeding has scheduled a prehearing conference to be held by telephone conference call rather than an in-person proceeding near the reactor site. Further, it is our understanding this proceeding was scheduled with very little advance notice, and no general notice to the public nor ability for the general public to listen to the proceeding.

While we are not a party in this case, and thus are not clear on exactly what issues this prehearing conference is to cover, it is our experience that prehearing conferences generally are important parts of a COL proceeding. I personally have traveled to Shreveport, Louisiana and Hobbs, New Mexico to attend prehearing conferences for two different proceedings on the Louisiana Energy Services uranium enrichment plant—one in which NIRS was a party to the case and one in which we played an advisory role to the organization that brought the intervention. In both cases, the prehearing conferences were critical elements of the overall process and were open to the public and media with substantial advance notice.

Our concern is that the informality of a conference call, the inability for the public to witness the proceeding, and the lack of timely notification portend a lack of seriousness in this proceeding that bodes poorly for the entire COL licensing process for this and all other proposed new reactors.

While we do intend to listen in on this call, we trust that this approach will be the exception, rather than the rule, for all future COL proceedings for all proposed nuclear reactors.

Sincerely,

Michael Mariotte
Executive Director
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
6930 Carroll Avenue, #340
Takoma Park, MD 20912
301-270-6477
nirsnet@nirs.org

From: al all [mailto:mayabels@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 5:02 PM

To: Ronald Spritzer; Richard Cole; Alice Mignerey; rsnthl@comcase.net

Subject: Help protect public rights in NRC licensing hearings

Your Honors,

I am shocked that your ruled to allow a telephone a telephone oral argument rather than a more traditional in-person hearing for the proposed reactor in North Anna, Virginia. Such a format is completely inappropriate. You are not allowing the public an opportunity to express their opposition, nor the media a chance to properly cover the proceedings.

A face to face hearing in a courtroom should be help to discuss such an important issue.

Sincerely,

Maya Be

4563 Sunset Hills Rd

Reston, VA 20190

From: Glenn Carroll [mailto:atom.girl@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 5:04 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer; Richard Cole; Alice Mignerey; rsnthl@comcast.net
Cc: Lou Zeller
Subject: Oral Argument re: North Anna Reactor License

Dear Atomic Safety & Licensing Board,

We are aware that the first oral argument about the proposed license for a new reactor at North Anna in Virginia is proposed to be HELD BY TELEPHONE and with only very short notice given to the parties.

This is, to our knowledge, the first oral argument to be held in this country on a proposed new reactor since NRC licensing rules were revised in 1989. To reduce this significant juncture in an intervention by citizen groups to a conference phone call is inappropriate and we feel strongly that citizen rights to due process are being trampled.

Attached is an order dated June 27, 2008, by the ASLB in another case, and your attention is drawn to the concurring opinion of Judge Michael C.

Farrar which begins on Page 44 and highlights "a number of troubling aspects about practices that have developed and are being employed in the operation of the NRC's regulatory and adjudicatory systems."

In addition, another ASLB judge has sounded the alarm for poor NRC practice in an earlier phase of this very North Anna case, to wit: Judge Alex Karlin wrote, in a differing opinion refusing to grant North Anna an Early Site

Permit: "[T]he NRC staff failed to consider and search for (or demand that Dominion search for) the best alternative sites that could reasonably be found,¹ and instead short-circuited the alternatives analysis by fixating on a very small slate of sites¹ proffered by Dominion.² The result, he said, was therefore "predetermined"² and the selection of the North Anna site was, "inconsistent with both the letter and spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act."²

The gross appearance of impropriety in scheduling an important oral argument be conducted by phone would appear to fulfill these conscientious judges' observations. We ask you to fulfill your mission and duty to protect the public, which includes its rights to a fair hearing, and for starters to reschedule tomorrow's teleconference to a real hearing to be held physically at a spot near the proposed reactor site.

Respectfully submitted,
Glenn Carroll

*

--

Glenn Carroll
Coordinator

NUCLEAR WATCH SOUTH
P.O. Box 8574
Atlanta, GA 31106
404-378-4263
atom.girl@mindspring.com
<http://www.nonukesyall.org>

From: Isorensen@bellsouth.net [mailto:Isorensen@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 5:28 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer
Subject: North Anna Nuclear Power telephone argument

Dear Judge Spritzer,

Several months ago I went to an NRC public forum for an Environmental Impact Statement in Gaffney, SC just 60 miles from my home. We were told to keep our comments in relation to the impact a nuclear plant would have on the environment. But the large majority of folks were allowed to ramble on like a political pep rally with no real facts and no true concern for the environment or safety of the proposed nuclear plant. There were people who simply stood up to say they enjoyed working for Duke Power. I am outraged by this waste of time and did not feel the sincerity of the event.

Now I feel the same frustration when I hear the
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has scheduled oral arguments (in accordance with 10 CFR 2.331) to be held via telephone on the lead hearing in the nation for a nuclear power plant construction and operating license at the North Anna Nuclear Power Station Unit #3. This has implications for the licenses to follow in South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Alabama. The SE is my home and we are being bombarded with potential radiation and pollution, not to mention toxic waste for our children to inherit!

A one hour telephone format is inappropriate. Is this a sign that the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board judges are shutting out the public and are not interested in working in good faith with the public, the intervenors or the media.? A face-to-face hearing in a courtroom near the proposed plant site should be held.

An issue so vital to our future should not be put under the carpet. Please Please investigate leukemia and cancer rates around these nuclear facilities.

When biologist find a cancer ridden fish, they know the water is polluted. It is time for us to look at the millions of humans we are finding with cancer and own up to the pollution we are creating for ourselves and our children. Please don't look the other way.

Sincerely,
Laura Sorensen
828-665-3668
Asheville, NC

From: Robert R. Holt [mailto:capebobholt@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 5:42 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer
Subject: tomorrow's scheduled hearing via telephone

Dear Sir,

I have learned that, in an unprecedented (and, I hope, not a precedent-setting) move, the NRC has scheduled a public hearing tomorrow, July 2, concerning the first application for a new nuclear electrical generating plant in several decades. That is NRC's substitute for the usual oral arguments (in accordance with 10 CFR 2.331), but one that greatly limit's the public's right to participate in a very important process. I wish to protest in the strongest terms, and call upon you to reschedule the hearing in the traditional way, face to face in a courtroom near the proposed reactor site, where the Commissioners and the representatives of the public may look one another in the eye. I know the hour is late, but this unusual procedure was not well publicized in a timely manner.

Robert R. Holt, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
New York University

From: Barbara Bowers [mailto:BarbaraBowers@sc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 7:11 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer
Cc: Barbara Bowers
Subject: Concern

Judge Ronald Spritzer, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

As a concerned American citizen residing in Columbia, South Carolina, I do not understand why the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has scheduled oral arguments to be held via telephone in the matter of Dominion-Virginia Power's proposed North Anna Unit 3.

Because this is apparently the lead hearing process in the nation for a nuclear power plant construction and operating license since the rules were rewritten in 1989, the North Anna Unit 3 hearing process can set a bad precedent of oral arguments by teleconference. With only one additional phone line for auditing, the public's knowledge of the content of these hearings will be greatly limited. Furthermore, teleconferenced oral arguments will compromise the integrity of the hearings, because the Representative of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League at oral argument will be Louis A. Zeller who is hearing impaired.

Face-to-face oral argument in a courthouse in the vicinity of the North Anna Power Station at the convenience of all parties is much more appropriate to the NRC's mission. The NRC's own Public Affairs Office states, "Building and maintaining public trust is critical to carrying out NRC's mission." The NRC can earn the public trust by ensuring that the public can participate effectively in the NRC's regulatory process. The precedent of oral arguments by teleconference would undermine public confidence in the NRC's regulatory process and any ensuing licensing decisions.

Thank you for your consideration of my concern in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Bowers

From: Dianne Biggs [mailto:diannebiggs@bellsouth.net]

Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 9:36 PM

To: Ronald Spritzer

Cc: 'bredl'

Subject: North Anna #3

In the Matter of: Va. Electric & Power Co., d/b/a Dominion Va. Power & Old Dominion Electric Co-Operative North Anna Unit #3 Combined License, Docket Nos 52-017 and ASLBP No. 08- 863-01-COL

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am stunned to be trying to convince you to do your job. In regard to the oral arguments versus a face to face hearing in the vicinity of the proposed nuclear plant I cannot imagine what you were thinking? What is next? You would probably be happy if we just left you a voicemail. You have forgotten whom (who) you work for.

Mr. Lou Zeller, the spokesman for Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, who happens to have a hearing problem has trouble with conference calls, I know, because I have participated in conference calls with him. Maybe this needs to be decided under the American Disabilities Act.

Please do not cave in to the power companies, they want nuclear power as their first choice because they can charge more for it. Can we not give green choices a chance?

Something else to think about is the technology of the telephone companies involved. As a former telephone company employee: Southern Bell, Spartanburg, S.C. 1973-1986, it is always possible for lines to be out in the case of land lines, as well as dead spots in the case of cell phones. Although, I would not discount sabotage by parties standing to lose or gain huge sums of money.

Sincerely,
J. Dianne Biggs

From: Pete MacDowell [mailto:petemacdowell@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 8:06 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer; Ronald Spritzer; Ronald Spritzer; Ronald Spritzer
Subject: A telephone conference call does not substitute for a public hearing

Dear Members of the Atomic Safety Licensing Board:

As a person long familiar with public involvement, and with the NRC, I think it should be obvious to all concerned that a telephone conference call on an important oral argument in a reactor licensing case should never be made by conference call alone. I will be on the call tomorrow on the North Anna case, but conference calls should only supplement – never substitute for – on site public involvement processes.

A conference call makes local people, who are most affected, essentially invisible. It also robs them of the opportunity to see and understand first hand what is going on. This call sets a bad precedent which we hope will not be repeated.

Peter MacDowell

Program Director

NC Waste Awareness and Reduction Network

Durham, NC

From: Ecoserve1@aol.com [mailto:Ecoserve1@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 8:20 PM
To: rsnthl@comcast.net; Alice Mignerey; Richard Cole; Ronald Spritzer
Subject: Telephone judicial proceedings are not good for democratic process

Please reconsider the decision to hold oral arguments in the North Anna nuclear plant proceeding that is scheduled for tomorrow, July 2.

As a veteran of a protracted legal proceeding surrounding the doomed construction of the Marble Hill nuclear plant in Indiana during the 1970s and early 1980s. I cannot emphasize enough. The importance to have proceedings such as this held in total public view.

Many of the deciding factors that resulted in the Marble Hill plant being shuttered came to light in public meetings where not only words but body language could be read and heard.

To take away the ability to see people, under oath or not, make claims that too often turn out to be false, is fundamental to complete understanding of important issues like the development of new, very expensive nuclear plants.

Please stop this new form of proceeding and allow it to be held in complete public view.

Sincerely,

**John Blair, president
Valley Watch, Inc.**

800 Adams Avenue
Evansville, IN 47713
812-464-5663

In accordance with title 17 U. S. Code, Section 107, this material is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior general interest in receiving similar information for research and educational purposes.

From: Phil Rutledge [mailto:prutledge@carolina.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 9:59 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer
Subject: oral arguments by telephone?

Judge Spritzer,

It is absurd to schedule oral arguments by telephone for such an important and publically sensitive issue as whether to build a new nuclear power plant. It clearly suggests an absence of good faith in the process of public involvement. Could you imagine, for example, the absurdity of a criminal trial being done over the phone? Don't cheapen the process, and please show more respect for precedent. Hearings should be held face to face in the vicinity of the proposed location of the new power plant.

Sincerely
Philip Rutledge
American citizen

From: Leslie Minernd [mailto:hipwazee@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 10:26 AM
To: Ronald Spritzer; Richard Cole; Alice Mignerey; rsnthl@comcast.net
Subject: telephone format

Dear Judge Ronald Spritzer, Chairman, Judge Richard Cole, Judge Alice Mignerey and Judge Alan Rosenthal,

Having a hearing over the phone concerning the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League's intervention against a third reactor at North Anna doesn't seem the best way to go. Democracy is being eroded away in this country and this is just another straw in the proverbial camel's back. Matters such as building a very expensive and potential Al-Quaeda target nuclear facility should be held in a public venue so that the public can actually find out what is happening in their nation and what is happening in their own back yard.

Leslie Minernd
27161 Blossom St.
Columbia, SC 29205

From: Janet Greenwald [mailto:contactus@cardnm.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 11:42 AM
To: Ronald Spritzer
Subject: Nuclear Power

Dear Sir,

Phone conferences shut the public out of the process ! Please consider open hearings when making important decisions about nuclear power. These decisions affect all of us. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Janet Greenwald
for Citizens for Alternatives
to Radioactive Dumping

From: Solarsklar@aol.com [mailto:Solarsklar@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 9:14 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer; Richard Cole; Alice Mignerey; rsnthl@comcast.net
Subject: NRC - Protest one day notice conf call hearing - Sklar

The North Anna case is the first new reactor proceeding that has reached the point of an oral argument. I am very disturbed that the NRC's Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB), has scheduled a telephone oral argument—with one day's notice!—rather than a more traditional in-person hearing.

This does not allow appropriate preparation by public parties. This kind of practise undercuts the dilligent review process these licensing decisions require.

I am contacting Members of Congress as well as national groups to insure normal hearing procedures are followed.

Sincerely,

Scott Sklar

Scott Sklar
President
The Stella Group, Ltd.
1616 H Street, N.W., 10th floor
Washington, D.C. 20006
Phone: 202-347-2214 Fax: 347-2215
E-mail: solarsklar@aol.com
Web site: www.TheStellaGroupLtd.com or www.CleanEnergyFirst.com

The Stella Group, Ltd.. is a strategic marketing and policy firm for clean distributed energy users and companies. Scott Sklar is Chair of the Steering Committee of the Sustainable Energy Coalition and serves on the (non-profit) Boards of Directors of, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, and the Renewable Energy Policy Project, and CoChairs the Policy Committee of the Sustainable Buildings Industry Council.

Scott Sklar was selected as the Renewable Energy Industry Representative onto REEEP No Am Adv CommitStee of UN Int'l RE Activity in August 2006. REEEP is a Public-Private partnership and was launched by the United Kingdom along with UN agencies UNIDO and UNDP, 30 other governments, and Sklar was also appointed in April 2007 onto National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy & Technology (NACEPT) of USEPA.

From: Dot Sulock [mailto:dotsulock@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 04, 2008 12:10 PM
To: Ronald Spritzer
Subject: telephone arguments

Hi Judge Spritzer,

Nuclear power plants are serious business and I think changing the rules of licensing to include only oral input is not taking the matter seriously enough. Can you picture a trial by telephone? Please live up to your responsibilities. The public is trusting you.
Dot Sulock, University of North Carolina at Asheville

From: **Schmitz, Gladys** [mailto:gschmitz@ssndmankato.org]
Sent: **Thursday, July 03, 2008 10:21 PM**
To: **Ronald Spritzer**
Subject: **NRC hearings**

Dear Judge Ronald Spritzer,

I was horrified to learn that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has scheduled oral arguments (as stipulated by 10 CFR 2.331) on the hearing process for a nuclear power plant construction and operating license to be done by telephone instead of using a face-to-face in public in a court room.

People who live near the plant should have a chance to participate and they should be able to hear what others are saying. These hearings are very important. Changing them to a telephone report is not acceptable to me. This can set a very dangerous precedent . Were there a new plant coming near me, I would absolutely want face to face hearings in a public court room open to every citizen able to attend.

Thank you for giving this your serious consideration.

**Sincerely,
Sister Gladys Schmitz**

Gladys Schmitz, SSND
170 Good Counsel Drive
Mankato, MN 56001-3138

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
)
Virginia Electric and Power Company d/b/a)
Dominion Virginia Power (DVP or Dominion)) Docket No. 52-017-COL
and Old Dominion Electric Cooperative (ODEC))
)
(North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3))

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing EX PARTE E-MAILS REGARDING TELECONFERENCE PART 2, have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange.

Office of Commission Appellate
Adjudication
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E-mail: ocaamail@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge
Ronald Spritzer, Chair
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E-mail: rms4@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge
Richard F. Cole
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E-mail: rfc1@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge
Alice C. Mignerey
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E-mail: acm3@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge
Alan S. Rosenthal
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E-mail: rsnthl@comcast.net

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the General Counsel
Mail Stop - O-15 D21
Washington, DC 20555-0001
Kathryn L. Winsberg, Esq.
Robert W. Weisman, Esq.
Renee V. Holmes, Esq.
Joseph Gillman, Esq.
Sara E. Brock, Esq.
E-mail: Kathryn.winsberg@nrc.gov;
Robert.weisman@nrc.gov; renee.holmes@nrc.gov;
jsq1@nrc.gov; sara.brock@nrc.gov

DOCKET NO. 52-017-COL
EX PARTE E-MAILS REGARDING TELECONFERENCE PART 2

Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
120 Tredgar Street, RS-2
Richmond, VA 23219
Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel
E-mail: Lillian.Cuoco@dom.com

North Carolina Utilities Commission
Louis S. Watson, Jr.
Senior Staff Attorney
Kim Jones, Analyst
4325 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4325
swatson@ncuc.net
kjones@ncuc.net

Old Dominion Electric Cooperative (ODEC)
4201 Dominion Boulevard, Suite 200
Glen Allen, Virginia 23060
James Patrick Guy II, Esq.
E-mail: james.guy@leclairryan.com

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania, Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Stephen J. Burdick, Esq.
E-mail: sburdick@morganlewis.com

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP
2300 N. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-1128
David R. Lewis, Esq.
Counsel for Dominion
Robert B. Haemer, Esq.
Maria Webb, Paralegal
E-mail: David.Lewis@pillsbury.com;
robert.haemer@pillsburylaw.com;
Maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com

Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League
P.O. Box 88
Glendale Springs, NC 28629
Louis A. Zeller
E-mail: BREDL@skybest.com

[Original signed by Christine M. Pierpoint]
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this 7th day of July 2008