

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
600 North Robert Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

FOR THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
121 7<sup>th</sup> Place East, Suite 350  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY D/B/A XCEL  
ENERGY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF NEED FOR  
ADDITIONAL DRY CASK STORAGE AT THE  
MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT  
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE  
INSTALLATION

MPUC Docket No. E002/CN-21-668  
OAH Docket No. 8-2500-38129

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND ATTACHMENTS OF DANIELLE WINNER**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
DIVISION OF ENERGY RESOURCES**

**APRIL 14, 2023**

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DANIELLE WINNER  
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY D/B/A XCEL  
ENERGY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF NEED FOR ADDITIONAL DRY CASK STORAGE AT THE  
MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE  
INSTALLATION

DOCKET NO. E002/CN-21-668  
OAH DOCKET NO. 8-2500-38129

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <b>Section</b>                       | <b>Page</b> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....                | 1           |
| II. PURPOSE .....                    | 1           |
| III. ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS .....       | 1           |
| IV. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS ..... | 3           |

1     **I.     INTRODUCTION**

2     **Q.    Please state your name, occupation and business address.**

3     A.    My name is Danielle Winner. I am employed as a Public Utilities Analyst by the  
4           Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources (Department or  
5           DOC). My business address is 85 7th Place East, Suite 280, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-  
6           2198.

7  
8     **Q.    Are you the same Danielle Winner who submitted Direct Testimony earlier in this  
9           proceeding?**

10    A.    Yes.

11  
12    **II.    PURPOSE**

13    **Q.    What is the purpose of your testimony?**

14    A.    The purpose of my Surrebuttal Testimony is to update the record regarding the status of  
15           the issues I raised in my Direct Testimony. Specifically, I address the Rebuttal  
16           Testimony of Ms. Pamela Prochaska on behalf of Northern States Power Company,  
17           d/b/a Xcel Energy (Xcel).

18  
19    **III.   ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS**

20    **Q.    What did you conclude in direct testimony?**

1 A. I concluded, in part, that Xcel may have met the requirements of Minn. Stat. § 216B.243,  
2 subd. 3(12), but I requested clarification from Xcel.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, I understand that the  
3 statute requires the applicant to assess how likely it is that environmental costs related  
4 to the proposed facility could be imposed by a governmental body, and, if they do  
5 occur, how those costs should be allocated.

6

7 **Q. Did Xcel provide clarification on the statutory requirement?**

8 A. Yes. Ms. Prochaska stated the following:

9 I am not aware of any current legislative or regulatory  
10 proposals to assess any sort of fee or cost related to spent  
11 nuclear fuel or radiation, nor am I aware of any externality  
12 costs that have been assigned to either spent nuclear fuel  
13 or radiation to date. Therefore, I do not believe that it is  
14 likely that either the ISFSI or the Plant will be subject to an  
15 assessment of externality costs going forward.<sup>2</sup>  
16

17 **Q. Did Xcel offer clarification on how any potential environmental costs would be**  
18 **allocated?**

19 A. No. However, cost allocation is a component of a utility's Class Cost of Service Study  
20 within a rate case proceeding. One foundational principle of a CCROSS is that costs  
21 should be allocated to cost causers. There is no reason for me to believe that these  
22 costs would be treated differently and become exempt from CCROSS analysis. Therefore,  
23 it is reasonable for me to assume that any potential environmental costs, should they be  
24 imposed, will be allocated based upon cost causation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Ex. DOC-\_\_\_ at 36-37 (Winner Direct).

<sup>2</sup> Ex. Xcel-\_\_\_ at 3 (Prochaska Rebuttal).

1 **Q. Did Xcel offer any other clarifications?**

2 A. Yes. Ms. Prochaska referred to a footnote from my Direct Testimony that refers to fees  
3 assessed by the Department of Energy on nuclear generating plants for permanent  
4 storage in Yucca Mountain, which stated:

5 In a sense, Xcel is already subject to a radioactive waste  
6 internalized externality cost; like all nuclear-generating  
7 facilities, it must pay the Department of Energy  
8 \$0.0001/kWh generated, to be used for the eventual  
9 permanent storage of spent fuel at Yucca Mountain.  
10 However, since the DOE failed to uphold its contracts with  
11 Xcel to remove spent nuclear fuel from Monticello and  
12 Prairie Island in 1998, some if not all of that money is  
13 refunded to Xcel as "DOE Settlement funds."<sup>3</sup>  
14

15 Ms. Prochaska clarified that the mechanism behind the DOE Settlements funds is  
16 that the fees are simply not collected, as opposed to my misunderstanding that the fees  
17 were collected and later refunded.<sup>4</sup> I appreciate Ms. Prochaska's clarification.  
18

19 **Q. Do you have anything further on the issue of conditions?**

20 A. No. I consider this issue to be resolved.  
21

#### 22 **IV. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

23 **Q. Based on your investigation, what do you recommend?**

24 A. I recommend that the Commission approve Xcel's certificate of need application.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Ex. DOC-\_\_\_ at 37, footnote 67 (Winner Direct).

<sup>4</sup> Ex. Xcel-\_\_\_ at 3 (Prochaska Rebuttal).

1 | **Q. Have you completed your Surrebuttal Testimony?**

2 | A. Yes.