

WRC Follow-up Questions

1. Provide clearer and more specific employment and tax impact information (e.g. by town within Windham County and individual tax impact).

Response:

Entergy VY has not at this time calculated employment and tax impact by individual town or county. More specific employment and tax impact information will, however, be provided in pre-filed testimony to be filed with Entergy VY's petition. The following raw data regarding residency of current Entergy VY employees may be useful to the Commission in considering the employment and tax-impact questions:

<i>Vermont</i>	<i>198</i>
<i>New Hampshire</i>	<i>150</i>
<i>Massachusetts</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>Other</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>464</i>

Count of NAME		
STATE	CITY	Total
MA	Adams	1
	Amherst	1
	Athol	2
	Barre	1
	Bernardston	7
	Billerica	1
	Bolton	1
	Boylston	1
	Chelmsford	1
	Colrain	3
	Conway	1
	Easthampton	2
	Erving	3
	Florence	1
	Florida	1
	Franklin	1
	Greenfield	20
	Holyoke	3
	Leyden	1
	Marshfield	1
Montague	2	
North Adams	2	
North Reading	1	
Northampton	1	
Northboro	1	

January 28, 2008

	Northfield	8
	Orange	2
	Rowe	3
	Shelburne Falls	1
	Shelburne	1
	Shelburne Falls	6
	Shrewsbury	1
	South Deerfield	3
	South Hadley	1
	Stow	1
	Sutton	1
	Turners Falls	4
	Warwick	1
	Webster	1
	West Springfield	1
	Westhampton	1
	Williamsburg	1
	Winchester	1
MA	Total	98
NH	Alstead	1
	Ashuelot	1
	Brentwood	1
	Center Barnstead	1
	Charlestown	2
	Chesterfield	5
	East Swanzey	2
	Fitzwilliam	2
	Goffstown	1
	Hindsdale	1
	Hinsdale	28
	Jaffrey	2
	Keene	29
	Langdon	1
	Newmarket	1
	North Walpole	1
	Richmond	5
	Sandown	1
	Somersworth	1
	Spofford	14
	Stoddard	1
	Sullivan	1
	Swanzey	15
	W Chesterfield	2
	W Swanzey	1
	W. Chesterfield	3
	Walpole	2
	West Chesterfield	12
	Westmoreland	5
	Winchester	8
NH	Total	150

VT	Addison	1
	Athens	1
	Bellows Falls	4
	Brattleboro	61
	Chester	1
	Dummerston	9
	East Dummerston	2
	Guilford	15
	Jacksonville	1
	Jamaica	1
	Marlboro	1
	Newfane	10
	North Springfield	1
	Putney	8
	Readsboro	1
	South Burlington	1
	South Newfane	2
	Townshend	4
	Vernon	63
	W Brattleboro	2
	W Dummerston	2
	West Brattleboro	2
West Dover	1	
Westminster	1	
Whitingham	1	
Williamsville	1	
Windsor	1	
VT Total		198
Grand Total		464

Based on 2006 data

Property taxes

State- \$4,500,000

Vernon - \$1,241,711

Brattleboro - \$145,901

Income taxes

\$1,935,990

Sales and use tax

\$346,608

Unemployment tax

\$32,017

Gross Vermont Payroll

\$48,152,928 - less withholdings \$1,935,990 counted above in taxes

Contracted staff payroll - non outage year
\$16,120,183

Donations
\$259,032

Power uprate Revenue sharing for 2006 = \$1.6 million
Dry fuel storage payments for 2006 = \$2.7 million

2. **Generally discuss changes (e.g. orderly development impact) if VY is not re-licensed.**

Response:

In general, if the VY Station ceases operations in 2012, employment levels will drop substantially over the long run. As discussed elsewhere, it is likely that the station will be placed in a SAFSTOR mode and remain dormant for a period of years pending decommissioning. While the station is being prepared for SAFSTOR, employment will remain relatively level. When the station is placed in SAFSTOR, permanent staff at the plant will be reduced substantially. Once decommissioning begins, largely short-term contractors will be employed to complete decommissioning activities, which will occur over a period of approximately seven to ten years. After decommissioning is complete, a smaller staff will remain on site until the Department of Energy ("DOE") completes removal of spent-nuclear fuel, site restoration is complete and the site is released by the NRC. Overall, the loss of economic stimulus in local communities will be significant, and the workforce for future site activities is likely to be more transient and less imbedded in local communities with the resulting tax impacts.

In terms of site activity, closure in 2012 will result in less site activity (e.g., less traffic) during the period the station is in SAFSTOR and during the period after completion of decommissioning. During decommissioning activities, however, site activities will increase.

This issue will be discussed in greater detail in the petition and accompanying pre-filed testimony.

3. Provide more detailed information on future dry fuel storage such as location and basic design. Consider that reserving a location for future development may be part of the current CPG.

Response:

We do not consider the CPG for any future dry-fuel storage to be part of this application. The existing pad, together with the spent-fuel pool, has sufficient space to store all spent-nuclear fuel generated by the VY Station through 2032. Therefore, Entergy VY does not expect to construct a new dry-fuel-storage pad during an extended-license period.

Whether Entergy VY ceases operations in 2012 or continues to operate until 2032, it is likely that additional dry-cask storage capacity will be needed, either to accommodate additional casks because the DOE has not met its schedule to pick up spent fuel or because decommissioning activities will require the movement and storage of casks away from existing buildings. No specific plans are in place for the design or location of future dry-fuel-storage facilities, as technologies will no doubt change over time and detailed engineering, soil and other analyses would be required in completing the siting process.

Vermont Yankee is located on approximately 125 acres of land. While current, conceptual plans call for a dry-fuel-storage pad similar to the existing pad to be designed, constructed and located in the "north 40", this is one of several locations (e.g. "middle and south 40") that could be made available at the time the construction of new dry-fuel-storage facilities is considered.

4. Provide general plans to reduce density of pool as required by the existing DFS Order.

Response:

The DFS Order states that Entergy VY should reconsider reduction in pool density at the time it seeks a CPG for operations after 2012. However, the order also notes that the method of storage of spent fuel falls under the jurisdiction of the NRC. It is Entergy VY's understanding that the NRC is continuing to evaluate the issue of density of spent-fuel pools as noted in the Board order. Entergy VY will comply with all NRC requirements and will continue to evaluate spent-fuel storage options, but has no current plans to accelerate removal of spent-fuel from wet storage.

5. Discuss what liability the state would have, if any, if decommissioning funds were not adequate, and Entergy VY was not able to make up deficit.

Response:

The NRC regulates Vermont Yankee's decommissioning fund to the extent that it requires a filing every two years that demonstrates sufficient funding levels to meet NRC decommissioning standards. If the fund were not sufficient to provide for this requirement, the NRC would require Entergy VY to add additional funds to the decommissioning fund. This concept was discussed in detail during the sale proceedings for the VY Station and addressed to the satisfaction of the Board, which found that it was an unlikely event.

Also note that the NRC has recently reviewed licensee decommissioning fund capabilities and has found that all licensee funds are appropriate. (See <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/commission/secys/2007/secy2007-0200/2007-0200scy.html#discussion>)

In addition, as part of the conditions of the sale, Entergy VY is required to submit to the DPS twice a year a current status report on the funding of the decommissioning fund. This provides a real time look at the level of funding twice a year rather than the once every two years required by the NRC.

6. Discuss environmental impact of the uranium enrichment process. Note whether Entergy VY buys uranium from the Kentucky enrichment facility (that uses COC 114 for separation and has emissions impact) or from vendors that use centrifuge technology.

Response:

Please reference the attached material from the Nuclear Energy Institute which discusses the enrichment process as well as the environmental impact of such. Entergy VY cannot specifically identify the facilities with which it contracts to provide fuel and enrichment services as such is considered highly sensitive commercial information. We do however purchase fuel and enrichment services from several facilities around the world. Facilities such as the Kentucky plant that utilize diffusion technology are planned to be phased out and replaced with new plants which will utilize the centrifuge technology. These plants are expected to be in service in the next few years and will most likely be the dominant technology in use during our license renewal period.

This issue will also be discussed in greater detail in the petition and accompanying pre-filed testimony.

7. Provide a summary of plants that either have shut down before reaching the end of their license or have not pursued re-licensing. Provide this breakdown by BWR and PWR design.

Response:

Please see the attached documents from the Nuclear Energy Institute which identify all reactors that have been shut down, are still operating, have applied for license renewal, and have received license renewal approval.

8. Project green-fielding dates with or without CPG and under various DOE scenarios.

Response:

The projected "green-field" date if the plant were to close in 2012 is difficult to project as it will depend on how long the plant is required to remain in SAFSTOR before funds have accumulated in the decommissioning fund to allow decommissioning activities to start. Given all the assumptions we have described in our presentation, i.e., a shut down in 2012 and SAFSTOR for a period of time, it is expected that green-fielding could be completed within 7 - 10 years of the start of the process. Please reference the TLG 2006 Decommissioning Cost Analysis for additional details on the time and activities associated with decommissioning. Note that this discussion is independent of spent-fuel storage issues. The date for final removal of spent fuel and final site restoration and release is dependant in large part on DOE actions in removing spent fuel.

If the station were to operate an additional 20 years as is being requested, the funding would likely be adequate to immediately begin decommissioning at the end of the licensed life in 2032. In that case, the site would be restored to green-field condition between 2039 and 2042, again with the caveat regarding spent-fuel storage and removal.

In general decommissioning activities are expected to take between 7 -10 years to complete once started.