RESPONSE OF ENTERGY NUCLEAR VERMONT YANKEE, LLC, AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE’S THIRD SET OF INFORMATION REQUESTS

This is the response of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC (“ENVY”), and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (“ENO”), (ENVY and ENO will be referred to collectively as “Entergy VY”) to the Department of Public Service (“DPS”) Third Set of Information Requests. Entergy VY is filing one complete copy of their responses with the Board, with two copies served on the DPS (plus an electronic copy in Word format) and one copy served on each other party of record.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS:

1. Entergy VY objects to the “Instructions” contained in the DPS’ Third Set of Information Requests to the extent such instructions purport to place greater requirements on Entergy VY or reserve greater rights to the DPS than are permitted by the Vermont Rules of Civil Procedure, as made applicable to Board proceedings by Board Rule 2.214(A).

2. Entergy VY objects to any request for information or production of documents that is or are subject to the attorney-client privilege, constitute work product, are protected under state or federal law or are proprietary or confidential, constitute draft and/or non-final documents and/or communications containing or concerning same. Consistent with the foregoing, Entergy VY has not provided documents from inside or outside counsels’ files.

3. Entergy VY objects to the requests to the extent that they (a) are overbroad or unduly burdensome; (b) are cumulative; (c) call for the production of documents not in the possession, custody or control of Entergy VY; (d) call for the review, compilation, or production of publicly-available documents that could be obtained by the requesting party in a less burdensome manner, including on a public website; (e) call for the review, compilation and/or production of documents already in DPS’s possession, custody, or control; (f) are vague and/or ambiguous; (g)
seek information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; or (h)
call for the review, compilation, or production of a voluminous number of documents at great
expense to Entergy VY.

4. Entergy VY objects to the purported requirement that it identify the person who prepared
each document produced and the date on which the document was prepared as being unduly
burdensome and beyond the requirements of the discovery rules.

5. Entergy VY objects to any requests for documents or information beyond the scope of
this tribunal’s jurisdiction, including without limitation to the extent that (a) primary jurisdiction
rests more properly with, and/or actually has been exercised by, another agency or tribunal, or
(b) the document, legal issue or factual information in question has been otherwise determined
by another agency or tribunal of competent jurisdiction.

6. Entergy VY objects to any request for documents or information relating to matters
within the primary or exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
(“NRC”). Entergy VY will respond to DPS’s requests herein noting its continued objection to
the State of Vermont’s assertion of jurisdiction over matters for which the federal government
and the NRC have exclusive jurisdiction, including such exercise of its jurisdiction under
Section 248 of Title 30, Vermont Statutes Annotated and Chapter 157 of Title 10, Vermont
Statutes Annotated.

7. Each of these General Objections shall be incorporated by reference into the below-
referenced objections and responses as if expressly restated therein. Entergy VY does not hereby
waive any objections and reserves the right to later raise any additional, available objection.
**Discovery Questions**

Q.DPS:EN.3-1: Please produce the term sheets, and any and all supporting or related documents, from the lending institutions being considered in the establishment of the two separate revolving credit facilities totaling approximately $145 million discussed on pages 2-3 of Mr. Twomey’s rebuttal testimony dated May 11, 2015 and pages 11-12 of Exhibit EN-TMT-6.

A.DPS:EN.3-1: OBJECTION. By this reference, Entergy VY incorporates General Objection 6. Specifically, this request seeks information and production of documents related to Entergy VY’s financial soundness and spent nuclear fuel management, which are within the federal government’s and the NRC’s primary or exclusive jurisdiction. Entergy VY further objects to this request as vague, overly broad, and unduly burdensome in that it seeks “all supporting or related documents.” Additionally, Entergy VY objects to the extent that this request seeks the production of confidential or proprietary information without the entry of an appropriate protective order in place in this proceeding.

Without waiving its objections, Entergy VY responds:

Upon the entry of an appropriate Protective Order in this proceeding and subject to and in accordance with the terms of the June 18, 2015 Protective Agreement, Entergy VY will produce under seal, as confidential Attachment A.DPS:EN.3-1.1, a U.S. $60,000,000 Credit Agreement, dated January 9, 2015 among Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, as Borrower, Entergy Corporation, as Guarantor, the Banks Named Herein, as Banks, and Citibank, N.A., as Administrative Agent, and as confidential Attachment A.DPS:EN.3-1.2, a U.S. $85,000,000 Uncommitted Line of Credit Agreement, dated January 9, 2015 among Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, as Borrower, Entergy Corporation, as Guarantor, the Banks Named Herein, as Banks, and Citibank, N.A., as Administrative Agent.

Person Responsible for Response: T. Michael Twomey
Title: Vice President, External Affairs, EWC; Vice President, ENOI
Date: November 24, 2015
Q.DPS:EN.3-2: Please confirm that recoveries from the U.S. Department of Energy (“DOE”) for breach of its contractual obligation to remove spent nuclear fuel from the Vermont Yankee site will be the exclusive source used for repayment of borrowings on the two separate revolving credit facilities totaling approximately $145 million.

a. Please identify any and all credit facility repayment sources if DOE recoveries will not be the exclusive repayment source.

A.DPS:EN.3-2: OBJECTION. By this reference, Entergy VY incorporates General Objection 6. Specifically, this request seeks information and production of documents related to Entergy VY’s financial soundness and spent nuclear fuel management, which are within the federal government’s and the NRC’s primary or exclusive jurisdiction. Entergy VY further objects to this request to the extent that it asks Entergy VY to speculate about actions it might take and/or the potential sources of funds that might be available if unexpected future developments and circumstances were to require a change from its current plans.

Without waiving its objections, Entergy VY responds:

Entergy VY expects to use recoveries from the U.S. Department of Energy (“DOE”) for breach of its contractual obligation to remove spent fuel from the VY Station site as the exclusive source of funds to repay borrowings, as that term is defined under the credit facility agreements identified and produced in A.DPS:EN.3-1, under those agreements. Repayment of these borrowings is therefore not included in the nuclear decommissioning trust withdrawals reflected in the site specific decommissioning cost estimate and cash flow analysis that Entergy VY submitted to the NRC as the basis for its commingled-funds exemption request that the NRC approved (http://vydecommissioning.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/ML15128A219.pdf) and its Update to Irradiated Fuel Management Plan that the NRC Staff approved on a preliminary basis (http://vydecommissioning.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ML15292A256.pdf).

Entergy VY expects to recover other costs related to spent nuclear fuel management from the nuclear decommissioning trust.

Person Responsible for Response: T. Michael Twomey
Title: Vice President, External Affairs, EWC; Vice President, ENOI
Date: November 24, 2015
Q.DPS:EN.3-3: Please identify and detail when Entergy expects to receive DOE recoveries as a result of its “Round 2” complaint, filed on April 24, 2014, to recover damages incurred after April 30, 2008.

A.DPS:EN.3-3: OBJECTION. By this reference, Entergy VY incorporates General Objection 6. Specifically, this request seeks information and production of documents related to Entergy VY’s financial soundness and spent nuclear fuel management, which are within the federal government’s and the NRC’s primary or exclusive jurisdiction. Entergy VY further objects to this request as calling for speculation.

Without waiving its objections, Entergy VY responds:

Entergy VY expects to receive payment on its claims in its complaint filed on April 24, 2014, against the DOE for breach of DOE’s contractual obligation to remove spent nuclear fuel from the VY Station site by the first half of 2017 if there are no appeals filed from the trial court’s judgment.

Person Responsible for Response: T. Michael Twomey
Title: Vice President, External Affairs, EWC; Vice President, ENOI
Date: November 24, 2015
Q.DPS:EN.3-4: Please identify any and all funding sources Entergy will utilize, prior to anticipated DOE recovery, to make up for any difference in the approximately $145 million available for second ISFSI pad construction, procurement of dry storage systems, and/or transfer of spent fuel to the ISFSI though the two above-identified credit facilities if the uncommitted facility with a capacity of $85 million, or any portion thereof, is suspended or canceled.

A.DPS:EN.3-4: OBJECTION. By this reference, Entergy VY incorporates General Objection 6. Specifically, this request seeks information and production of documents related to Entergy VY’s financial soundness and spent nuclear fuel management, which are within the federal government’s and the NRC’s primary or exclusive jurisdiction. Entergy VY further objects to this request as calling for speculation. Additionally, Entergy VY objects to the extent that this request seeks the production of confidential or proprietary information without the entry of an appropriate protective order and protective agreement in place in this proceeding.

Without waiving its objections, Entergy VY responds:

There is no reason to expect that any or all of the $85 million uncommitted credit facility will be suspended or canceled. Entergy VY also notes that Section 2(d) of the $60 million committed credit agreement provides Entergy VY the option to increase the aggregate amount that it can borrow above $60 million.

Person Responsible for Response:    T. Michael Twomey
Title: Vice President, External Affairs, EWC; Vice President, ENOI
Date: November 24, 2015
Q.DPS:EN.3-5: Page 11 of Mr. Thomas’ rebuttal testimony dated October 21, 2015 states that locating an ISFSI west of the Vernon Substation would “create problems complying with the radiation dose limits for members of the public, 10 C.F.R. 72.104, and . . . the Vermont Department of Health’s more stringent requirement in its Radiological Health Rule, Section 5-305(D)(1)(e).” Please produce the radiological dose engineering calculations made to support this conclusion, and any and all documents related to or in support of the calculations.

A.DPS:EN.3-5: OBJECTION. The request seeks the production of confidential and propriety information of Entergy VY’s vendor, Holtec International. Upon the entry of an appropriate protective order in this proceeding and subject to and in accordance with the terms of the June 18, 2015 Protective Agreement, Entergy VY will make the report of Holtec International’s radiological dose engineering calculations available for inspection, subject to the consent of Holtec International and the restrictions and procedures required by Holtec International.

Without waiving its objections, Entergy VY responds:

At the time that the location of the second ISFSI pad was selected, there were concerns that locating an ISFSI along the west edge of the VY Station site would result in elevated radiation levels (as compared to the chosen location) at the residential properties located along Governor Hunt Road. Subsequent to site selection, Holtec International provided a report of the radiation dose rates as a function of distance from the chosen location of the ISFSI pad that confirmed that locating an ISFSI west of the Vernon Substation would result in unacceptable radiation dose rates at those properties.

Person Responsible for Response: George Thomas
Title: Senior Project Manager
Date: November 24, 2015
As to objections where responsive information was provided over stated objections:
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