

Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant Certificate of Need  
Application for Additional Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

Public Hearing – March 29, 2023

My name is Jacquelin Gordon. I am a resident of Monticello, and I live about three miles down river from the Monticello nuclear generating plant.

I believe that production of electricity by nuclear generation is an environmentally friendly option that does not produce the harmful greenhouse gases that have impacted our climate. Therefore, I do support the continuation of the plant.

I am attending this hearing because I have some concerns about the storage of spent nuclear fuel. I read the Environmental Impact Statement on file with Minnesota Department of Commerce.

The summary of that impact statement states that the non-radiological and radiological impact of additional spend fuel storage as described would have minimal impact on the human and natural environment, provided that monitoring and maintenance of the spent fuel canisters continues until such time as the spent fuel can be transported to an offsite facility.

At the present, there is no option for storage of spent nuclear fuel at any offsite facility. Yucca Mountain and other storage sites in New Mexico and Texas are not feasible at this time and it does not seem that these storage sites will be opened in the future. So spent nuclear fuel will likely stay at the Monticello plant. According to the EIS, this will be safe as long as on-going monitoring and maintenance of the storage site continues.

Chapter 3 of the EIS describes the canister storage system that is proposed and explains that the exterior of the storage area will be monitored by cameras and other security devices and the radiation levels will be monitored to verify the adequacy of the radiation shielding. The air flow also will be checked to maintain the needed cooling around the canisters. Routine visual inspections will be conducted. Presumably, maintenance and corrections will be made as needed.

Chapter 6 of this EIS summarizes the cumulative impacts of the storage proposal and states, "Without this control, without monitoring and maintenance, off-normal and accident conditions at the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant



**Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation would lead to significant radiological impacts.”**

This monitoring and maintenance are dependent on institutional control. Presumably, this is the responsibility of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant while it is operating. My question is what are the roles and responsibilities of the Minnesota Department of Commerce and the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission while the plant is in operation and after the plant is decommissioned. Who will continue to monitor and maintain the independent spent fuel storage installation and spent fuel pool?