

July 3, 2006

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED  
USNRC

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

July 3, 2006 (11:09am)

In the Matter of )  
)  
Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC )  
and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. )  
)  
(Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station) )

Docket No. 50-271-LR  
ASLBP No. 06-849-03-LR

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

ENTERGY'S ANSWER TO NEC'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A REPLY

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

(hereinafter collectively referred to as "Entergy") hereby answer and oppose "NEC's Motion for Leave to File a Reply to NRC Staff Answer to New England Coalition's Notice and Motion to Adopt Contentions; To Entergy's Answer to New England Coalition's Notice and Motion to Adopt Contentions; and To Entergy's Answer to Vermont Department of Public Service's Notice and Motion to Adopt Contentions," dated June 22, 2006 ("NEC Motion"). A reply to Entergy's answers is neither authorized nor justified.<sup>1</sup>

NEC's request for leave to file a reply to Entergy's Answer to the Vermont Department of Public Service's Notice and Motion to Adopt Contentions is barred. 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c) only allows the "moving party" to request leave to file a reply. Thus, the NRC rules do not allow NEC to file a reply to an answer to another party's motion.

<sup>1</sup> Entergy also believes that NEC's request to reply to the NRC Staff's answer is unjustified, but limits this answer to the requests pertaining to Entergy's pleadings.

NEC's request for leave to file a reply to Entergy's Answer to New England Coalition's Notice and Motion to Adopt Contentions should be denied because NEC has not demonstrated compelling circumstances for this request. 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c) states that permission to file a reply may only be granted where the moving party demonstrates compelling circumstances, such as where the moving party demonstrates that it could not reasonably have anticipated the arguments to which it seeks leave to reply. NEC claims that it could not reasonably have anticipated Entergy's argument concerning the need to demonstrate compliance with the late-filing criteria. However, in opposing a motion by NEC to adopt contentions in the uprate proceeding, Entergy also argued that NEC was obligated to address the late-filing criteria. See Entergy's Response to New England Coalition's Motion to Recognize Incorporation by Reference of the DPS Contentions and NEC's Right to Receive Discovery on DPS Contentions, Docket No. 50-271, ASLBP No. 04-832-02-OLA (Feb. 4, 2005). Further, the provisions in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c) and (f)(2) governing a party's request to add contentions after the initial filing are clear on their face. Thus, NEC's claim is without merit.

For all of the foregoing reasons, NEC's Motion should be denied.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

David R. Lewis  
Matias F. Travieso-Diaz  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-1128  
Tel. (202) 663-8474  
David.Lewis@Pillsburylaw.com

Counsel for Entergy

Dated: July 3, 2006

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC	)	Docket No. 50-271-LR
and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.	)	ASLBP No. 06-849-03-LR
	)	
(Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)	)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "Entergy's Answer to NEC's Motion to File a Reply" dated July 3, 2006, were served on the persons listed below by deposit in the U.S. Mail, first class, postage prepaid, and where indicated by an asterisk by electronic mail, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2006.

\*Administrative Judge  
Alex S. Karlin, Esq., Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
Mail Stop T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
ask2@nrc.gov

\*Administrative Judge  
Dr. Thomas S. Elleman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
5207 Creedmoor Road, #101,  
Raleigh, NC 27612.  
tse@nrc.gov; elleman@eos.ncsu.edu;

Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication  
Mail Stop O-16 C1  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

\*Administrative Judge  
Dr. Richard E. Wardwell  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
Mail Stop T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
rew@nrc.gov

\*Secretary  
Att'n: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff  
Mail Stop O-16 C1  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
secy@nrc.gov; hearingdocket@nrc.gov

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
Mail Stop T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

\*Mitzi A. Young, Esq.  
\*Steven C. Hamrick, Esq.  
Office of the General Counsel  
Mail Stop O-15 D21  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
may@nrc.gov; sch1@nrc.gov

\*Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.  
National Legal Scholars Law Firm  
84 East Thetford Road  
Lyme, NH 03768  
aroisman@nationallegalscholars.com

\*Diane Curran, Esq.  
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg, LLP  
1726 M Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
dcurran@harmoncurran.com


\*Mr. Dan MacArthur  
Director, Emergency Management  
P.O. Box 30  
Marlboro, VY 50344  
dmacarthur@igc.org

\*Sarah Hofmann, Esq.  
Director of Public Advocacy  
Department of Public Service  
112 State Street – Drawer 20  
Montpelier, VT 05620-2601  
Sarah.hofmann@state.vt.us

\*Ronald A. Shems, Esq  
\*Kareb Tyler, Esq.  
Shems, Dunkiel, Kassel & Saunders, PLLC  
9 College Street  
Burlington, VT 05401  
rshems@sdkslaw.com  
ktyler@sdkslaw.com

\*Matthew Brock, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108  
Matthew.brock@ago.state.ma.us

\*Callie B. Newton, Chair  
Gail MacArthur  
Lucy Gratwick  
Town of Marlboro  
Selectboard  
P.O. Box 518  
Marlboro, VT 05344  
marcialynn@ev1.net; cbnewton@sover.net

  
David R. Lewis