



To: Vermont Public Service Board
Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee
Cc: Windham Regional Commissioners
Windham Region Legislative Delegation
Vernon Selectboard
Vernon Planning Commission
Vermont Department of Public Service
Vermont Emergency Management Division
From: James P. Matteau, Executive Director *JPM*
Date: January 18, 2008

Re: Petition of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., for its Certificates of Public Good and Approvals required under 10 V.S.A. §§ 6501-6504 and 30 V.S.A. §§ 231(a), 248 and 254, for authority to renew operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, including the storage of spent-nuclear fuel, after March 21, 2012

The Windham Regional Commission (WRC) conducted a hearing on January 7, 2008 in accordance with 30 VSA 248(f)¹, regarding the anticipated petition for a Certificate of Public Good as described above.

Most speakers on January 7 opposed the petition, which was not unexpected given the energetic and articulate nature of the facility's opponents and the nature of past hearings in the area, but we were disappointed to have heard from virtually no local public officials, local businesses, tax payer groups, etc. We hope that those constituencies will be more active as this process unfolds. This is noted here because the general public is extremely interested in this petition and many will review these comments; the WRC has an obligation both to encourage the broadest possible participation and to provide information back to the public.

We also note that a significant number of citizens expressed extremely low confidence in oversight provided by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and some requested that an Independent Safety Assessment be conducted prior to the issuance of a Certificate of

¹ "However, plans for the construction of such a facility within the state must be submitted by the petitioner to the municipal and regional planning commissions no less than 45 days prior to application for a certificate of public good under this section, unless the municipal and regional planning commissions shall waive such requirement. Such municipal or regional planning commission may hold a public hearing on the proposed plans. Such commissions shall make recommendations, if any, to the public service board and to the petitioner at least 7 days prior to filing of the petition with the public service board." [30 VSA §248(f)].

Public Good for extended operation². The recent report from the NRC's Office of the Inspector General³, which was highly critical of the NRC's review process, lends credence to those public concerns. It is our understanding that the question before the Board in this pending docket will be an up or down decision on whether to allow operation beyond March of 2012, and that decision in turn will be informed by whether the reviews done by the NRC are themselves considered reliable. It seems evident to us that significant public mistrust of the NRC, combined with the NRC's internal challenges and concerns that were highlighted by its own Office of the Inspector General's report, make this issue worthy of exceptional consideration and examination by the Board.

The information in this memorandum has been reviewed by the WRC Energy Committee and it will be brought to the attention of all the commissioners from the WRC's 27 member towns. It is forwarded to the Board now in order to comply with the statutory schedule.

This review differs from most WRC and PSB project reviews in that approval of the petition would result in little apparent change on the land—that is, it would be a continuation of “business as usual”—whereas denial of the petition would create significant change. This reversal of the typical situation was discussed with Entergy representatives in depth at a meeting on December 13, 2007 and a specific request was made for Entergy to address potential impacts—including “orderly development of the region”, local and regional economic impacts, environmental changes such as the anticipated return to “greenfield” conditions after shutdown, etc.—from the perspective of what would change if operation of the station did not continue. The validity of such a view was acknowledged but was not responded to effectively in the material received thus far.

BACKGROUND

In anticipation of this petition, several Windham Regional Commissioners attended a tour of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station on October 31, 2007. In the discussion following the tour itself, Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee (“Entergy”) staff requested guidance from the WRC regarding the types of information sought as part of the initial filing to the WRC. That request led to a memorandum on November 15, 2007 and subsequent email communication that outlined the information request.

The WRC recognizes that some of the questions in the November 15 memo (see Appendix C) were beyond the specific requirements of section 248(f), but they were invited by Entergy. We believe they are clearly within the purview of this PSB process, and therefore they should have been more fully addressed. The information received is not considered to be complete or entirely responsive, and we believe Entergy could have provided more complete answers had it chosen to do so. However, because of the special

² Vermont State Senators Peter Shumlin and Jeannette White, who represent 23 of the 27 towns in the Windham Region, have filed S.269 which calls for an Independent Safety Assessment, or alternative documentation of safety.

³ Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. “Audit of the NRC's License Renewal Program”. OIG-07-A-15. September 6, 2007.

circumstance created by Act 260 of 2006, which results in a probable delay of Board action until at least July 2008, it seems most appropriate to allow the filing to go forward without objection and to seek the missing information in subsequent requests. The recommendations listed below, therefore, outline information that the WRC hopes will be fully addressed in the filing to the Board as well in supplemental information that we may receive.

Entergy presented its proposal to the WRC on December 7, 2007 and we understand that the same information was presented to the Vernon Planning Commission at about that time. Recognizing that the statutory 45-day period would have begun on December 7 and would expire on January 21, 2008, necessitating WRC comments to be filed by January 14, 2008, the WRC reached an agreement with Entergy representatives that they would file a petition on or after January 28, thereby establishing January 21 as the deadline for these recommendations; this allowed the WRC to schedule its hearing so as not to conflict with the New Year holiday. We note that Entergy has until March 21, 2008 to file their completed application, and need not feel rushed in their efforts to address the concerns identified in this letter.

The January 7 hearing was attended by approximately 150 people; 43 people provided oral testimony of which very few testified specifically in favor of continued operation, and most of those identified themselves as Entergy employees. That is not to diminish the value of their testimony—we learn a lot from the people who work in the industry and we have high respect and appreciation of the work done by the Vermont Yankee workforce—but the point being made here is that we also need and want to know what others who support continued operation think about it, and we have heard little of that support.

Included below are:

1. The WRC's recommendations to the Public Service Board (hereafter, "Board") at this point in the process; and
2. Appendices:
 - a. A copy of the hearing legal notice;
 - b. A summary of public notice provided prior to January 7
 - c. A copy of the WRC's request for specific information from Entergy prior to the hearing;
 - d. The text of Entergy's December 7 submittal to the WRC;
 - e. Notes from the WRC Energy Committee meeting with Entergy;
 - f. A transcript of comments made at the January 7 hearing;
 - g. Copies of email comments received; and
 - h. Copies of written comments received.⁴

⁴ Entergy's initial submittal and the hearing transcript and public comments (2.d though g above) have been provided to the Board, the DPS, the petitioner and the Town of Vernon electronically. They also are posted on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and are available electronically to any parties upon request. Because the material in these four appendices exceeds 210 pages, paper copies will only be made as required and, for parties other than the State, the Town of Vernon or the petitioner, with a requested fee to cover production cost.

WRC RECOMMENDATIONS

The WRC Energy Committee met with Entergy representatives and discussed the petition at length on December 13, 2007. The Committee met again to review issues and concerns on December 20, conducted an extensive public hearing on January 7, 2008, and met again on January 10, 2008. The Committee has given careful consideration to information from Entergy and to comments received at the January 7 public hearing, many of which are reflected in the following recommendations. In all likelihood, the WRC will continue to hear from people on all sides of this issue and will undoubtedly learn a lot more; these recommendations may be supplemented if and as appropriate. In this regard, we note here that at the December 13 meeting Entergy stated its commitment to answer the questions that were raised as completely as possible prior to the January hearing, but as of this date has not done so; we look forward to learning more. The information received has been posted on the WRC website⁵, and we intend to do the same with supplemental information in order to provide public access to it.

1. Orderly development of the region

a. Effect on local employment:

Entergy frequently and appropriately notes the significant number of jobs at VY, both direct employees (495 stated in the material received on December 7, based on data collected in 2004) and contracted staff, as well as the secondary impact on support organizations and local commerce. Items that have not been fully addressed, however, and that should be addressed in the filing to the Board, include: What would be the change in local employment numbers over time⁶ and how would the nature of those jobs change? What has been the actual job and economic experience in places where decommissioning has taken place, such as in Maine, Massachusetts and Connecticut?

Entergy should provide “snapshot” data at key points in time that compare full-time, part-time and contract employment. A breakdown of current data by state and by town would allow a better assessment of local impacts. Also, data that describe median wage, salary and benefit levels would support comparison to other employers and jobs in the region.

The decommissioning study includes eight different scenarios. In view of the facility’s economic importance to the region, including Entergy’s own statements in that regard, the Board should require specific information about each of those scenarios’ respective likelihood and, to the extent that they are not equally likely, the reasons for that. We assume that such an analysis already exists within Entergy’s business planning process.

⁵<http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm>

⁶ The term “over time” here and below is intended to include the various timeframes that would be specific to the petition: current status, the 2012 or 2032 shutdown alternatives, the shutdown and decommissioning processes themselves, ongoing activities on the site after decommissioning, and any extensions that would be due to SAFSTOR or other interim measures. It also should include costs and taxes, etc., related to ongoing storage of spent-nuclear fuel.

Employment projections might vary significantly among the scenarios but it is not clear which might be chosen, why or by whom. The Board should require detailed information addressing these concerns, which also apply to the potential effects on taxes, discussed below.

b. Effect on local taxes:

Similarly, Entergy has noted that it “currently pays nearly \$10 million annually in taxes to the State of Vermont and the Towns of Vernon and Brattleboro.”⁷ For that to be meaningful, however, Entergy should provide detailed breakdowns that present the information by type of tax to each entity, and how those would be expected to change over time. The \$10 million figure likely includes payroll taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, special fees related to stored spent nuclear fuel and other facility-specific activities, etc., but is not altogether useful when presented as a lump sum. Detailed information also is needed regarding the tax base differences between a fully operational plant, a facility undergoing decommissioning, a facility placed in SAFSTOR conditions, the site after being returned to final greenfield condition, etc.

For example, Entergy’s website states that it pays \$4.8 million in annual state tax payments of which \$1.9 supports education programs.⁸ In our view these figures (and others related to them) are more meaningful when expressed in human terms. For example, with a state population of about 608,000, that equates to a bit under \$8 per person per year total, and of that about \$3.12 per person per year in education funding. Entergy should provide data for the public in that form whenever possible.

c. Effect on electricity prices:

In the materials provided to the WRC, Entergy notes that past contracts with Vermont utilities have provided a benefit to Vermont electric ratepayers through lower electricity costs. Entergy has not provided any information about whether there will be future low cost contracts available to Vermont utilities, the magnitude of any such discount for Vermont, or the estimated impact on electricity prices of those contracts.

The WRC requested information pertaining to Entergy’s cost of producing power, which was refused because “Entergy VY’s projected production costs constitute proprietary business information that is confidential to Entergy VY.”⁹ The request was made simply because so much of the public information presented by Entergy includes references to the attractive rates currently paid by contract utilities, and those below market rates are indeed a benefit to Vermont ratepayers. However, a guaranteed future price for Vermont utilities, based on the cost of production, would

⁷ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 10

⁸ http://www.safecleanreliable.com/pdf/VY_Econ_Bene.pdf

⁹ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 9.

be far more meaningful and reliable than some projected discount below a volatile market price. It seems reasonable to assert that Entergy already knows its projected cost of operation through March of 2032 in great detail and the Board should consider such an approach if a CPG is awarded.

d. Effect on required emergency response and evacuation planning:

This was requested in regard to three different timeframes: during operation (presumably through March 2032), post shutdown but pre-decommissioning, and related to long-term dry cask facility security post shutdown. Entergy's response was simply that it would comply with NRC requirements and would continue to play an important role with the states and to help fund related state programs. The filing to the Board should include detailed information about what those requirements are and are expected to be, what they are likely to cost, and what if any costs would fall outside Entergy's perceived area of responsibility.

e. Effect on future alternatives:

Entergy's response is that "While it is expected that within the next 20 years...other alternatives will be developed, Entergy VY cannot speculate as to what those alternatives may be."¹⁰ This is a non-response, and the Board should require information from Entergy that addresses its role in generating about 3% of the New England grid's electric power, and what other means may be available to replace it.

This is not to prejudge that the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station is or is not an appropriate way to maintain that portion of the supply, but simply to note that alternatives should be identified and considered. Also, it is important to maintain a distinction between Vermont Yankee's role as the currently contracted source of about one-third of Vermont's electric power consumption, versus the generator of about 3% of the New England grid supply.

2. Alternative sources of energy

In addition to what is discussed above, Entergy also included in its filing to the WRC excerpts from the *2005 Vermont Electric Plan* that it states illustrate "an approaching gap in the supply of Vermont electric power with no current plan to build or construct any new base load power generation in the state."¹¹ We are puzzled by this comment and other comments from Entergy about the lack of base load generation in Vermont. We know, as does Entergy, that Vermont is part of a regional New England bulk power system. Base load generation throughout New England can and does provide power to Vermont. Indeed, this is what occurs every time Entergy shuts down VY for periodic re-fueling or other

¹⁰ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 10

¹¹ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 3

reasons. Moreover, about 60% of the power generated at VY is consumed outside the state. It is our understanding that Title 30 requires that alternatives be evaluated.

The December 7 information also listed a variety of renewable electric sources that were characterized as "...generally small scale and not base load. Such sources cannot replace the amount or type of power generated by Vermont Yankee."¹² This is likely true, but perhaps irrelevant. It is in the public's interest for the Board to require from Entergy information that identifies and evaluates alternative sources that would have less environmental impact, or demonstrates that none exist that are reasonably feasible and affordable.

3. Storage of spent-nuclear fuel

a. Dry cask storage:

Entergy noted that it "expects to load five casks during the first half of 2008; the specific schedule for loading additional SNF beyond the first five casks has not been developed. However, future loading campaigns will be developed to maximize operational flexibility (e.g., full core offload capability) as well as compliance with any existing and future NRC requirements."¹³ That statement of intent is appreciated, but we note that Entergy responded to a question at the December 13 meeting and stated that no federal or state requirement exists to ensure that this happens. In the interest of ensuring the ability to make any needed repairs and return to operation, if extended operation is allowed, the Board should require the maintenance of full core offload capability. Entergy has frequently stated its intent to maintain full core offload capability, here and in prior dockets, and so such a requirement should not meet with any opposition.

b. Spent fuel pool:

In the dry cask case, the Public Service Board ordered that Entergy address reducing the density of the pool as part of an amended Spent Fuel Management Plan if they chose to request an extended CPG.

WRC requests that the Board require a detailed projection of how many fuel assemblies and casks will be under management at key points throughout the extension period, including an accounting of how many assemblies will be stored in the pool and how many in casks at each anticipated fuel change.

Entergy also states in its December 7 information that "...with or without operation past 2012 a new dry fuel storage pad will be needed during decommissioning of the station."¹⁴ In discussion on December 13, Entergy

¹² Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 3

¹³ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 4.

¹⁴ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, pages 4 and 5

representatives were asked about the anticipated location of a long-term storage pad for all the casks that would be needed, assuming no removal by the USDOE. That question assumes a worst case scenario in which the fuel is not removed prior to decommissioning, which the WRC considers to be a prudent view, and has been addressed by the PSB in the dry cask case with a requirement that on site storage be considered until at least 2082. The response was that such a storage pad most likely would be in “the north forty”, referring to an area at the northern end of the station property that appears to be about forty acres in area.

But in the VELCO filing in docket # 7373, a new substation is proposed in that approximate location. The WRC therefore will ask that VELCO, in that docket, and Entergy, in this case, demonstrate that future needs and alternatives for long term dry fuel storage, including ultimate decommissioning of that new storage facility, have been fully addressed and assured before either petition could be approved. Comments received at the public hearing on January 7, 2008 included a large number of concerns about the long term storage of spent nuclear fuel within the region, and we strongly support the public call for careful review of all needed actions.

We also note that NRC documentation of the Price-Anderson Act states that while insurance is required for an operating plant, it does not appear to be required for SNF stored at interim facilities¹⁵. Entergy should address the financial risks of long term storage of SNF on the existing pad and on an assumed new dry cask pad that would be needed during and following decommissioning of the facility.

Further, we note that the proposed dry cask pad is planned to be temporary in nature, but if the spent nuclear fuel is not removed by the Department of Energy it may require maintenance on site for a period far beyond what could be reasonably or reliably projected. Entergy should be required to post a bond that ensures perpetual funding of the site, and should also submit a plan for decommissioning the storage site and returning it to greenfield condition when the spent nuclear fuel is removed.

4. Decommissioning plans

In the December 7 material, Entergy notes that “The timing of the decommissioning will depend on the status of the decommissioning trust funds as compared to the projected costs of decommissioning. For a 2012 shutdown, if the decommissioning trust funds are sufficient, Entergy can start immediate decommissioning. If the funds are not sufficient, the station will be placed in a SAFSTOR condition for a period of time to

¹⁵ <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/funds-fs.pdf>

allow the decommissioning trust funds to grow to a level sufficient to fund the entire decommissioning project.”¹⁶

This does not state what Entergy actually intends to do, or what it perceives to be the best path to follow. The Board should require from Entergy a clear statement of what it perceives to be the preferred decommissioning options for (1) a shutdown in 2012 and (2) a shutdown in 2032. The responsibility to provide any funds needed above and beyond the amount available in the decommissioning trust fund should be entirely paid by Entergy and that should be firmly committed. It should be noted that at the December 13, 2007 meeting Entergy representatives asserted that any decommissioning cost overruns would be absorbed by Entergy, and not passed along to power purchasers or to the public. They were unsure how this assurance would be kept if the proposed subsidiary holding Vermont Yankee is not financially solvent at that time, but promised to research the topic and provide a reasoned answer; none has yet been received. WRC is concerned that if Entergy is not capable of providing full funding for decommissioning and site restoration, the liability could fall to the State of Vermont or the Town of Vernon. The Board should require financial assurances that this will not be the case.

The concerns outlined immediately above are exacerbated by Entergy’s stated intent to transfer ownership of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, along with several others, to a yet-to-be-formed subsidiary. The WRC’s concerns include the possibility that such a transfer of assets within the corporate structure might not be subject to PSB review. Vermont must establish absolute certainty that no such restructuring or transfer of assets would in any way jeopardize or diminish financial or environmental protections for the Windham Region, the State of Vermont, and the tri-state area related to the station’s decommissioning or the long-term management of spent nuclear fuel. Board oversight of any proposed corporate restructuring or transfer of the facility to any other legal entity, subsidiaries included, should be required and assured.

5. Decommissioning fund

Entergy has stated that the decommissioning trust fund total is expected to be inadequate to support immediate decommissioning at the end of the currently permitted operating period, in 2012, and asserts that allowing the fund to grow for all or part of the following twenty years will result in it being adequate to meet anticipated costs. Entergy has not contributed to the fund since acquiring Vermont Yankee and stated to us that it has no plans to do so. On that basis, the WRC questions the assumption that the fund will grow faster than costs will increase between now and any projected decommissioning dates. Entergy should be required to share with the Board and the public the details supporting their assumptions on

¹⁶ Entergy filing to WRC, December 7, 2007, page 6

this vital issue. Actual experience at decommissioned facilities seems to indicate that cost projections might be low, and recent news contributes to this concern¹⁷. The Board should require additional contributions, if and as needed, by Entergy, by its parent corporation, and by any future subsidiaries, in order to ensure that all decommissioning and site recovery costs are borne entirely by the facility's owners.

6. Other issues

a. Groundwater issues

Some comments at the January 7 public hearing called on the State to monitor groundwater and surface water runoff at the Vermont Yankee site, implying that it is not now monitored for radioactivity and suggesting that several unmonitored outfalls exist to the Connecticut River. The Board should require complete information on this issue if it is not already available.

b. Ownership of SNF generated after 2012

It is not clear to the WRC that USDOE ownership and responsibility for spent-nuclear fuel generated during an extended operating period is the same as its responsibility for spent fuel generated during the initially licensed period. The Board should require documentation that no related protections or assurances are in any way diminished.

c. Power use after shutdown

Entergy makes a strong case that the production of electricity using nuclear fuel does not require the burning of fossil fuels, or release carbon byproducts. While we understand the carbon benefits of generating electricity with nuclear fuel, the plant relies on market power when it is not generating electricity. It is likely that placing the plant in SAFSTOR will add a significant load to the local grid for an extended period. Entergy should be expected to quantify the electrical demand of the plant through the full decommissioning process, should calculate the electrical demands of maintaining and securing the new dry cask pad, and should identify efficiencies where possible. We believe that the choice of a decommissioning option will be informed by long term energy demands, along with many other factors.

d. Greenhouse gas emissions related to fuel manufacturing

Finally, we note that the use of CFC 114 in the fuel manufacturing process, which relates to greenhouse gases and global climate change, was discussed with Entergy representatives at the December 13 meeting. Committee members asked about alternative centrifuge means of manufacturing fuel and what Entergy's plans regarding future fuel supplies were in this regard. The request was based on a desire to

¹⁷ Brattleboro Reformer, January 16, 2008. *VY closing could cost \$1 billion*
http://www.reformer.com/headlines/ci_7984000

minimize greenhouse gas emissions whenever possible. Entergy representatives stated their intent to respond but to date have not; the Board should require information about the environmental impacts of fuel to be manufactured in the future.

The WRC appreciates the opportunity to comment on this proposed Certificate of Public Good, and is especially appreciative of the chance to provide direction to Entergy prior to the filing of their application. The WRC represents a large population with a diverse view of nuclear power, and does not seek to directly support or oppose the application for a CPG. Yet even many of those who support nuclear power desire a thorough review of plans to extend the operation of the 35 year old Vermont Yankee plant. We note too that issuing a CPG for the period from 2012 to 2032 does not assure the continued operation of the plant through that time period, and that no matter what decision is made in this case, the eventual discontinuance of operation and decommissioning of the facility is inevitable. We seek a full review of all issues related to safety and reliability as they affect continued operation of the facility, and a complete analysis of decommissioning plans to include the storage and management of spent nuclear fuel. We understand that closing the plant will have a significant impact on Vermont's electric energy profile as well as on the economy of the state and the region, and seek a full understanding of all known issues so that the State of Vermont and all municipalities can anticipate and plan for the eventual and inevitable loss of Vermont Yankee from the New England electric power grid.

Appendix A

Hearing advertisement

Published in the Brattleboro Reformer December 26, 2007

Public Hearing

Petition of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee to Extend Operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Beyond March of 2012, Including the Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

In accordance with Section 248(f) of Title 30 of the Vermont Statutes, the Windham Regional Commission (WRC) will hold a public hearing on a proposal to continue the operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in Vernon, for an additional twenty years beyond its currently permitted operating period. Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee (Entergy) presented initial information to the WRC on December 7, 2007 thereby beginning a review period during which the WRC may conduct a hearing and submit comments to the Vermont Public Service Board (PSB).

The petition is for the continuation of operations from the current expiration date of March 21, 2012 through March 21, 2032. The petition to the PSB is separate from and in addition to Entergy's application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a federal license renewal, which also is required and is currently pending. The purpose of this hearing will be for the WRC to receive comments and concerns from the general public, which in turn will help to inform and guide the WRC's participation in the subsequent state permit process. Public comments will be included in the WRC's anticipated report to the PSB. Material submitted by Entergy is available for review on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and at the WRC office, 139 Main Street, Suite 505, Brattleboro.

The hearing will take place on Monday, January 7, 2008, at 6:30 PM at the Quality Inn on Putney Road in Brattleboro. Individual comment time may be limited, depending on attendance and time available. Written comments also will be received at the WRC office or at wrc@sover.net until the close of business on January 10, 2008.

Appendix B

Summary of Public Notice Provided

1. WRC Energy Committee meeting with Entergy December 13, 2007
 - a. Meeting warned and noticed on website
 - b. Low public attendance due to snowstorm
2. Information from Entergy and from WRC Energy Committee, including meeting notes, posted on WRC website December 21
3. Legal notice of January 7 hearing
 - a. Brattleboro Reformer
 - i. December 26, 2007
4. Press releases distributed regarding January 7 hearing
 - a. Brattleboro Reformer
 - b. Rutland Herald
 - c. Greenfield Recorder
 - d. Keene Sentinel
5. News story regarding January 7 hearing
 - a. Brattleboro Reformer
 - i. December 27, 2007
6. Letter to the editor from WRC regarding January 7 hearing
 - a. Brattleboro Reformer
 - i. December , 2007
 - ii. Corrected name of location, noted meeting time
7. Display advertisement regarding January 7 hearing
 - a. Brattleboro Reformer
 - i. January 5, 2008

Appendix C

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee Petition For A Certificate Of Public Good To Operate Beyond March 21, 2012

Information Requested from Entergy:

A. November 15, 2007 memo from the WRC to Entergy:

Issues that we have identified thus far and that we request be addressed:

1. Spent fuel management
 - a. Fuel pool
 - i. Planned changes in current volume
 - ii. Plans for return to “full core offload capacity”
 - b. Dry cask storage
 - i. Currently permitted casks and fuel assemblies
 1. Anticipated loading schedule
 - ii. Additional casks required 2012 – 2032 (please assume worst case scenario of no transfer to DOE or any other storage facilities)
 1. Anticipated loading schedule
 2. Changes or additions to pad
 - iii. Dry cask plans beyond 2032 (please assume worst case scenario of no transfer to DOE or any other storage facilities)
 - c. Status of all spent fuel and pool contents after shutdown
 - i. In 2012
 - ii. In 2032
2. Any information regarding plans to file for a second 20 year NRC renewal and PSB extension after March 2012
3. Decommissioning plans
 - a. Anticipated schedule following a 2012 shutdown
 - b. Anticipated schedule following a 2032 shutdown
 - c. Additional radiation absorbed by components between 2012 and 2032, and its effect on SAFSTOR
 - d. Options for DECON at 2012 and at 2032
4. Need for VY power
 - a. As part of Vermont contracted power mix
 - b. As part of New England regional supply
 - c. In relation to alternative sources
5. Cost of power
 - a. Projected production costs (per MWe)
 - b. Projected New England market rates
6. “Orderly development of the region”

- a. Effect on local employment
 - b. Effect on local taxes
 - c. Effect on required emergency response and evacuation planning
 - i. During operation
 - ii. Post shutdown
 - iii. Security for dry cask facility post shutdown
 - d. Effect on future alternatives
 - i. If this extension is needed for lack of alternatives, eg, how does it bridge to a different situation in 2032
7. Please note that any Title 30 required items not listed above should also be included.
 8. Also, please interpret this list to mean “included but not necessarily limited to” in all cases.
 9. If Entergy is unable or unwilling to provide any of the requested information, please state that.

B. Additional follow-up email to Entergy on November 21, 2007:

We'd like to receive information about:

- (1) the decommissioning fund status now and projected for 2012, 2032 and 2052;
- (2) estimated decommissioning cost in 2012, for a decon scenario;
- (3) estimated decommissioning cost in 2032, following Safstor since a 2012 shutdown;
- (4) estimated decommissioning cost in 2032, for decon after 2032 shutdown; and
- (5) estimated decommissioning cost in 2052, following Safstor since a 2032 shutdown.

Appendix D

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee Petition For A Certificate Of Public Good To Operate Beyond March 21, 2012

Text of Entergy's December 7 Submittal to the WRC

This section been provided to the Board, the DPS, the petitioner and the Town of Vernon electronically. It also is available for review at the WRC office, is posted on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and is available electronically to any parties upon request. Paper copies will only be made as required and, for parties other than the State, the Town of Vernon or the petitioner, with a requested fee to cover production cost.

Appendix E

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee Petition For A Certificate Of Public Good To Operate Beyond March 21, 2012

Transcript of Comments Made at the January 7 Hearing

This section been provided to the Board, the DPS, the petitioner and the Town of Vernon electronically. It also is available for review at the WRC office, is posted on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and is available electronically to any parties upon request. Paper copies will only be made as required and, for parties other than the State, the Town of Vernon or the petitioner, with a requested fee to cover production cost.

Appendix F

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee Petition For A Certificate Of Public Good To Operate Beyond March 21, 2012

Notes from the December 13 WRC Energy Committee Meeting with Entergy

This section been provided to the Board, the DPS, the petitioner and the Town of Vernon electronically. It also is available for review at the WRC office, is posted on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and is available electronically to any parties upon request. Paper copies will only be made as required and, for parties other than the State, the Town of Vernon or the petitioner, with a requested fee to cover production cost.

Appendix G

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee Petition For A Certificate Of Public Good To Operate Beyond March 21, 2012

Copies of Email Comments Received

This section been provided to the Board, the DPS, the petitioner and the Town of Vernon electronically. It also is available for review at the WRC office, is posted on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and is available electronically to any parties upon request. Paper copies will only be made as required and, for parties other than the State, the Town of Vernon or the petitioner, with a requested fee to cover production cost.

Appendix H

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee Petition For A Certificate Of Public Good To Operate Beyond March 21, 2012

Copies of Written Comments Received

This section been provided to the Board, the DPS, the petitioner and the Town of Vernon electronically. It also is available for review at the WRC office, is posted on the WRC website at <http://www.rpc.windham.vt.us/energy/index.htm> and is available electronically to any parties upon request. Paper copies will only be made as required and, for parties other than the State, the Town of Vernon or the petitioner, with a requested fee to cover production cost.