

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2009

6:00 p.m.

Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant

Certificate of Need Extended Power Uprate
PUC Docket Number E002/CN-08-509

Certificate of Need Additional Dry Cask Storage
E002/CN-08-510

Site Permit Extended Power Uprate
E002/GS-08-690

Red Wing Public Library
225 East Avenue
Red Wing, Minnesota

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

WITNESS	PAGE
Joan Marshman	20
Andrew Peters	23
George Crocker	29
Kristen Eide-Tollefson	31
Roger Cuthbertson	40
Michelle Meyer	46
Katie Himanga	48
Michael Childs, Jr.	51
Lea Foushee	53
Mike Childs, Sr.	54
Susan Johnson	57
Andrew Peters	58

1 MR. STORM: Good evening. Thank you for
2 coming.

3 MR. PETERS: Good evening, Bill.

4 MR. STORM: My name is Bill Storm. As
5 many of you know, I am with the Office of Energy
6 Security within the Department of Commerce, Energy
7 Facility Permitting Unit. We're here tonight for a
8 meeting to get public input on the draft
9 environmental impact statement for three dockets
10 that are before the PUC, Public Utilities
11 Commission. Those dockets are the certificate of
12 need docket for the extended power uprate, the
13 certificate of need docket for the request for
14 additional dry cask storage, and the site permit
15 docket for the extended power uprate.

16 MR. CHILDS, SR.: Before we start, could
17 you tell me what uprate means?

18 MR. STORM: Extended power uprate?

19 MR. CHILDS, SR.: Yeah.

20 MR. STORM: For those who don't know,
21 Xcel Energy has applied to the PUC for three
22 applications before the PUC. The first application
23 is for a CON for extended power uprate. The
24 extended power uprate is to ramp the power capacity
25 of Prairie Island from 1,100 megawatts, bring it up

1 164 megawatts, an increase. So that's what the
2 uprate stands for. Okay?

3 They need -- in order to do that, they
4 need to get -- they need to have approval from the
5 PUC to prove need, and that's what the certificate
6 of need for the extended power uprate is about.

7 The site permit for the extended power
8 uprate deals with the same issue, the request by
9 Xcel to increase the capacity of Prairie Island
10 nuclear generating plant by 164 megawatts. They
11 need a site permit to do that from the PUC. That's
12 one of the applications that's before the PUC.

13 The second item there -- the third item
14 there is the certificate of need for additional dry
15 cask storage. Along with the power uprate, Xcel
16 Energy is also requesting to expand the ISFSI to
17 allow for more dry cask storage on the ISFSI.

18 So those are the three dockets before the
19 PUC relative to the Prairie Island nuclear power
20 plant.

21 I'm having equipment failures tonight,
22 folks. Sorry.

23 Before we get into tonight's meeting, I
24 just want to go over a few items on the agenda.
25 One, as with all the meetings that we hold, I have a

1 sign-in sheet, and I encourage you to sign it as you
2 come in. It does a couple of things. It allows me
3 to track the kind of public participation I'm
4 getting in my meetings, and it also gives you an
5 avenue if you want to sign up for my project contact
6 list. There's a check box on the sign-in sheet
7 where you can do that. What that does is those
8 people who have checked that box, I will put their
9 names -- if your names aren't already on the project
10 contact list, I'll put that on my database of people
11 who are interested about this project; and when I
12 need to do mailings or notices for future meetings
13 or hearings, you'll be sure to get one.

14 Okay. In addition to the sign-in sheet,
15 there are these neon-colored cards. Tonight's
16 meeting is so that we can gather input from the
17 public on the draft EIS that the Office of Energy
18 Security has developed. And if you would like to
19 speak, I ask that you fill out one of these cards
20 and give it to either Ray or myself. And when I get
21 through my little talk on the process so far, I will
22 call people up and everybody will get a chance to
23 speak.

24 There is also a copy of my slides there,
25 which you -- which you can have. And if you would

1 like a copy of the draft environmental impact
2 statement, let Ray or I know, and we can provide you
3 with a copy of the draft environmental impact
4 statement.

5 Like I said, my name is Bill Storm with
6 the Office of Energy Security. Ray Kirsch is
7 assisting. He's the public advisor for these three
8 dockets. And so if you ever -- if you have
9 questions as we move through the process, you can
10 contact -- my card's on the table. Ray's card's on
11 the table. You can contact us and ask us questions.

12 What I want to do is, since this is the
13 second meeting that we've had down here in
14 Red Wing -- the first meeting was the initial
15 meeting. It was a public information meeting, and
16 it was a meeting to solicit input from the public on
17 the scope of the environmental document. Tonight's
18 meeting now is to solicit input from the public on
19 that document that we produced. But what I want to
20 do is -- before I get to your comments, I want to
21 just give you a very short synopsis of what the
22 process that we've done to date. And then when I'm
23 done with that, then we will turn it over to the
24 audience, and I will call people from the cards, and
25 we'll allow you to speak. Once we get through the

1 cards, if people still want to speak who haven't
2 filled a card out, we'll do that by raising of
3 hands. And once we've done that, if there's people
4 who want to speak again, we will certainly allow
5 them, if time allows, to speak again.

6 As I said, there are three dockets from
7 the PUC relative to the Prairie Island nuclear
8 generating plant. If you were here at the initial
9 public meeting where I went through what the process
10 would be, you'll remember that those dockets have
11 processes that are common among them. One of those
12 is environmental review. Each docket being reviewed
13 by the PUC has an environmental review component to
14 it. The CON for the uprate requires by rule and law
15 an environmental report, the site permit for the
16 uprate requires an environmental impact statement,
17 and the CON for the request for dry cask storage
18 also requires an environmental impact statement,
19 under a different rule but still an environmental
20 impact statement.

21 What we have done at the Office of Energy
22 Security is we've held -- we've tried to coordinate
23 these processes so we weren't down here every other
24 week having public meetings, and it's hard for the
25 public to track that. So what we did is we held a

1 single public information and scoping meeting where
2 we came down, we allowed Xcel to give a presentation
3 on what the project is that they want to do, the
4 three projects that they want to do, we ran through
5 what the processes would be, and then we also took
6 input on what the public would like to see covered
7 in the environmental document, review document.

8 We then issued one scoping decision. The
9 commissioner of the Department of Commerce is
10 responsible for determining what the scope of the
11 environmental review should be. So we had our
12 scoping meeting.

13 Following that scoping meeting was a
14 comment period. We took those comments into
15 consideration. I made a recommendation to the
16 commissioner on what should be in the scope, and the
17 commissioner released the scoping decision. That
18 scoping decision covered all three dockets.

19 And then the third thing we did was we
20 produced the environmental document. It's an
21 environmental impact statement. And that document
22 fulfills the requirements for environmental review
23 for all three of these dockets before the PUC.

24 As with the environmental review, all
25 three dockets require a public hearing in their

1 process. Since all three dockets require a
2 contested case hearing, we are coordinating that
3 process. The contested case hearing will follow
4 this meeting. I think it's scheduled for May 14th
5 right now. So it's in the future. But the
6 contested case hearing will be another opportunity
7 for the public to speak on this project. When we
8 hold it on May 14th, we will hold an afternoon
9 session here in the library and an evening session
10 at the Prairie Island Indian Community.

11 We decided to coordinate the
12 environmental review processes and the hearing
13 process, the public hearing processes to gain
14 efficiencies so we're not producing twice the amount
15 of paperwork and we're not coming down here three or
16 four times. It's much more efficient, I think, to
17 coordinate the processes.

18 And for those of you who were here during
19 the public meeting, information meeting, you might
20 remember this slide (indicating). I have three
21 slides that are going to be following here. Each
22 slide is a graphic representation of the process.
23 This slide (indicating) is a graphic representation
24 of the certificate of need process for the extended
25 power uprate. And as you can see, an application is

1 submitted, an application is accepted, we hold a
2 public meeting -- that's that one public meeting
3 that we held -- we have a scoping process, the ER is
4 released -- the ER is an environmental report, it's
5 an environmental document -- you go into a contested
6 case hearing, the ALJ's report, and a PUC decision.

7 Now, if you look at the flowchart for the
8 site permit process, you can see a lot of the
9 milestones are similar or overlap. There's the
10 application is submitted. The application is
11 accepted. There's a public meeting. That's that
12 same public meeting we had down here. There's a
13 scoping decision. The scoping decision outlines
14 what will be in the environmental document. The
15 environmental document is released. The public is
16 given an opportunity to speak to it. That's what
17 we're doing here tonight. Then from there we go
18 into a contested case hearing. Following the
19 hearing the ALJ will submit a report and a
20 recommendation, and then that will be taken to the
21 PUC for a final decision.

22 And, likewise, with the request for dry
23 cask storage, there's a similar process again. You
24 can see application submitted, accepted, public
25 meeting, environmental scoping decision,

1 environmental document, contested case hearing,
2 ALJ's report, final decision by the PUC.

3 Even though those three dockets are under
4 different rules and processes -- the processes are
5 under different rules and statutes, there's so much
6 overlap that combining them just seemed to make
7 sense.

8 And I just want to track the dates and
9 what we did up to this point and maybe lead you a
10 little bit into what's going to happen in the
11 future.

12 Application submittal date. The
13 certificate of need for the uprate and the
14 certificate of need for the request for dry cask
15 storage, they were both submitted to the Public
16 Utilities on May 16th. The application for the site
17 permit was submitted on August 1st. The PUC
18 accepted the CON applications as substantially
19 complete on July 22nd. They accepted the site
20 permit application as substantially complete on
21 August 15th. Following the acceptance of those
22 applications and before the public meeting, I put
23 out a -- the Office of Energy Security developed a
24 scoping -- EAW draft scoping document. That was a
25 draft of what I thought the environmental review

1 document should contain. And I released that to the
2 public a few weeks -- well, August 25th so it would
3 be out there to the public in time for the upcoming
4 meeting. We held the first meeting -- and, again,
5 the meeting was held for all three dockets -- on
6 September 10th. We had a ten-day comment period.
7 We received comments from the public following that
8 meeting on what they thought should be in the scope.

9 Then the next thing that happened was the
10 PUC was petitioned by citizens to have an advisory
11 task force. The PUC agreed that the task force
12 should be formed. They ordered that the OES, Office
13 of Energy Security, form a task force. And that was
14 done on October 10th.

15 The task force was formed. It met three
16 times in October. And when the task force was
17 finished with their work, the scoping decision came
18 out. As I said before, the scoping decision, which
19 defines what will be in the environmental document,
20 that's the responsibility of the commission -- the
21 commissioner of the Department of Commerce. He
22 makes the decision on what should be in the scope.
23 That scoping decision came out on November 14th.
24 And, again, that scoping decision covered all three
25 dockets.

1 The draft EIS, which again covers all
2 three dockets, was developed by OES, the Department
3 of Health had some input into it, and that was
4 released on March 17th, '09. That brings us to
5 tonight. Okay?

6 As I stated, we are here tonight to
7 receive comments from the public on the draft
8 environmental impact statement. If there are areas
9 of the draft environmental impact statement that you
10 think are deficient or areas that you would like to
11 see more information added, that's what we're here
12 to do, to get that input. And what we'll do is
13 we'll have -- we'll have a comment period opened
14 till May 8th. So you have till May 8th to get
15 written comments to me, to my office.

16 Once the comment period closes, I will
17 start working on the final. And basically what the
18 final EIS is, it takes all the comments I receive of
19 the draft EIS and I tabulate them, and then I
20 respond to each one. And if a comment that we
21 receive requires that there's a section of the EIS
22 be beefed up or added to, we will do that. But what
23 you'll get then is you'll get the revised
24 environmental impact statement and attached to it
25 will be a section that has every comment that we

1 received and our response to them. That response
2 may be one sentence that the comment is out of
3 scope, meaning the comment is outside the scope of
4 the document, or it may be the comment resulted in
5 us rewriting a section. It will refer you to that
6 section within the environmental impact statement.
7 So that's how that will be formed. The final
8 environmental impact statement will be entered into
9 the record during the contested case hearing.

10 So we're here tonight, the public
11 meeting. You have until May 8th to submit your
12 written comments on the draft EIS. Following the
13 close of that comment period and as I start working
14 on the final EIS, the public hearings, the contested
15 case hearing will start.

16 The contested case hearing is held before
17 an ALJ, administrative law judge. The
18 administrative law judge assigned to this case is
19 Richard Luis. He's already had two prehearing
20 conferences to get the schedule down and to
21 entertain parties or entities that wanted to become
22 parties, official parties to the proceedings. But
23 the hearing is scheduled for May 14th. And as I
24 said, we'll have an afternoon session here in the
25 library, and we will have an evening session at the

1 Prairie Island Indian Community.

2 Following the public hearing, there will
3 be a comment period; and that's up to the ALJ to
4 specify when that will be, how long that will be.
5 It will be a minimum of ten days. Following that
6 there will be the evidentiary portion of the
7 hearing, contested case hearing. The evidentiary
8 hearing is a hearing in which parties, those people
9 who chose to intervene -- Prairie Island Indian
10 Community, the City of Red Wing, and Xcel is
11 obviously a party -- it's an opportunity for them to
12 present evidence and testimony, just like the public
13 hearing is an opportunity for the public to enter
14 material into the record, question the applicant and
15 their witnesses, and enter their statements into the
16 record.

17 Once the evidentiary hearing closes,
18 there will be a period that will be set by the ALJ
19 for reply for briefs, reply briefs of the parties.
20 And then the hearing will close. And sometime after
21 that, to be determined, the ALJ will issue a report
22 and recommendation. That report and recommendation
23 will come back to staff with the record.

24 Staff -- staff -- OES staff will then
25 write our comments and recommendations, which are

1 basically a history of the process, what we did,
2 what kind of comments we got, the history of the
3 pro -- a review of the record basically, and then
4 our recommendations. And then we will present that
5 in front of the PUC for a final decision, and that
6 date's yet to be determined.

7 That meeting is also open to the public.
8 It is up to the Commission whether they entertain
9 input from the public or not at that meeting. So I
10 can't really speak to that. But that meeting is
11 also open to the public.

12 So that's the process that we've gone
13 through up to this date and where we're headed to in
14 the future.

15 Now, for those of you who are
16 interested -- and you may remember this from our
17 first meeting. If you're interested in what other
18 people's comments are, what other agency comments
19 are, if you're interested in some of the documents,
20 be it the environmental impact statement or the
21 scoping document, all that information is maintained
22 on two websites. The first website up here is a
23 website that OES staff maintains for the PUC. It's
24 a PUC website, but we sort of refer to it as our
25 website. We, the project managers at the OES for

1 their projects manage that website. And what we did
2 do on that website is the projects that are before
3 the PUC in which OES staff has some responsibility
4 for are set up in dockets. The dockets are set up,
5 if you go to the Prairie Island docket of that page,
6 you'll see a little bit of information about what
7 the project is, and then under that you'll see what
8 we call file register. It's basically a table, and
9 it lists all the documents in the record in PDF
10 form. The application, like I say, agency comments,
11 public comments, draft scope, the scoping decision,
12 those things are listed at that site.

13 There's a second site to get information,
14 if you want. It's sort of the formal PUC site.
15 It's often referred to as e-docket. It's where the
16 formal record is kept. And if you go to the URL
17 that's stated there, you'll see a block for
18 e-dockets and e-filing, you select that, and then
19 you'll see another button for search for documents.
20 What you want to do is search for documents. And it
21 will ask you to enter the year and the number. For
22 the uprate CON, the year is 08, the case number is
23 509. For the site permit, 08-690. And for the dry
24 cask, the request for dry cask storage, 08 and the
25 case number is 510.

1 Now what tonight is all about is getting
2 your com -- I haven't said this enough, I'm sure --
3 getting your comments on the draft EIS. I have some
4 logistics that I try to set up, and it depends on
5 the size of the meeting. But what I'd like you to
6 do is, if you want to speak, try to limit yourself
7 to five minutes to speak. The format that I have is
8 not necessarily a Q and A format. You're not going
9 to get answers to your questions tonight. I mean,
10 if you have something -- something minor or
11 something that you need a minor clarification on,
12 you know, we might be able to have a little dialogue
13 about that. But the real purpose is not to have a
14 Q and A forum, to allow the public to make their
15 comments on the draft EIS. In addition -- after we
16 go through the cards and I go through the show of
17 hands, if there are additional people who want to
18 speak, if we have time where people want to
19 reiterate something that they said or hit a new
20 point that they think they missed, we will allow
21 that by a show of hands call.

22 We do have a court reporter here. The
23 main function for the court reporter is so that I
24 don't have to spend my time or Ray doesn't have to
25 spend time taking notes, that we can get exactly

1 what you said down on the record, and we won't have
2 any misunderstanding about what information you're
3 trying to get at.

4 The last point I'd like to make is,
5 again, we're here to take input on the draft
6 environmental impact statement. So to the extent
7 possible, I ask that you make your comments specific
8 to the draft environmental impact statement.

9 And, as I mentioned, you have tonight to
10 make oral comments into the record. There's also a
11 comment period. The comment period closes May 8th.
12 If you want to -- in addition to making oral
13 comments, if want to put it down in writing where
14 you can be a little bit more extensive on it, that's
15 fine. I encourage you to do that. If you're not
16 comfortable talking in front of people, it's fine
17 just to submit me a written comment. You can e-mail
18 your comments to me, you can snail mail your
19 comments to me at the address there, and you can
20 also -- a new feature that we have on that first
21 website that I showed you, the first URL site there,
22 when you go -- when you go to that docket page,
23 which is the docket for the Prairie Island nuclear
24 power plant, you will see that we've added a feature
25 to the website that, for those dockets that have

1 open comment periods, you can make your comments
2 electronically. You can log on and make your
3 comment right there, and the system will send your
4 comment to me via e-mail. So if you -- so if you
5 want to -- you can comment that way, if you want.

6 But, remember, May 8th, close of business
7 May 8th is the date for commenting.

8 And, with that, I'd like to get to the
9 reason we're here tonight, and that's to hear what
10 you have to say. What I'll do is I will -- like I
11 said, I will go by the cards, call you up. Ray will
12 hand you the microphone. Remember to state your
13 name and spell it for the court reporter and then
14 state your comment.

15 First on my card is Joan Marshman. Are
16 you here, Joan?

17 MS. MARSHMAN: Yeah. My name is Joan
18 Marshman, M-A-R-S-H-M-A-N. I am a Florence Township
19 supervisor, and I did serve on the advisory task
20 force. And after reviewing the draft EIS for the
21 Prairie Island request for uprate and additional dry
22 cask storage, I feel there are many unanswered
23 questions and concerns regarding the additional
24 storage request.

25 The issue of permanency has long been a

1 concern for many Minnesota residents and continues
2 to do so. The federal repository at Yucca Mountain,
3 Nevada has been a politically charged issue; and its
4 future regarding acceptance of any nuclear waste is
5 highly doubtful, to say the least.

6 The highest political office in the
7 nation, along with Congressional support, has stated
8 that the Yucca Mountain facility is not an option.
9 Still, the draft EIS continues to assume and depend
10 on the federal repository being the final resting
11 place for Minnesota's high-level nuclear waste. You
12 cannot assume or depend on something that will not
13 happen in any foreseeable future. Minnesota must
14 actively address how to safely and responsibly store
15 the Prairie Island waste. It is unlikely that any
16 federal repository will be available to accept any
17 waste; hence, the Prairie Island ISFSI will become a
18 permanent facility.

19 In 1993 the Minnesota Court of Appeals
20 regarding the dry cask storage at the Prairie Island
21 plant said, quote, The proposed facility is probably
22 classified as one in which waste is permanently
23 stored, unquote. The administrative law judge found
24 it unlikely that the federal facility would be
25 available to take waste from dry cask storage in the

1 predictable future and that the facility is likely
2 permanent in the sense that no -- it has no
3 foreseeable end.

4 Permanent or long-term storage has much
5 different sets of issues and impacts associated with
6 them than does the 20- to 150-year storage term.
7 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not done an
8 EIS for long-term storage at the reactor sites.

9 The actual term of storage at the Prairie
10 Island facility has not been determined, nor has
11 there been any attempts to do so. We must enter
12 into a careful, considered, and honest assessment of
13 the current dry cask storage at the Prairie Island
14 plant.

15 Since no permanent storage has been
16 authorized, nuclear plants all across the country
17 have been running out of spent fuel storage capacity
18 space. Approximately 60 facilities have -- will
19 have no more storage space in their spent fuel pools
20 and will need to develop reactor site storage.

21 In 1994 Minnesota House Research
22 information brief stated, quote, The state cannot
23 prohibit storage from high-level radioactive waste
24 from other states or other power plants at the dry
25 cask facility at Prairie Island. Given the

1 pervasive federal preemption of concerns related to
2 high-level radioactive waste, it is unlikely that
3 the state would be allowed to prohibit entry into
4 the state waste generated elsewhere as long as the
5 NRC has approved the facility and the transport of
6 the waste, unquote.

7 The draft EIS depends on the Department
8 of Energy taking title to the waste to go to the
9 federal repository, whose funding is doubtful nor
10 has it been licensed to accept anyway. There is no
11 assurances that the dry cask storage at Prairie
12 Island will not become permanent -- a permanent
13 facility, so we must consider all possible options
14 and avenues available. The draft EIS must address
15 all the storage issues, along with the fact that
16 there is no federal repository for the waste to go
17 to in the future.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. STORM: Thank you, Joan.

20 Andrew Peters.

21 MR. PETERS: I guess since I'm up front,
22 I'll face the audience. My name is Andrew Peters.
23 I am a council member of the City of Lake City. I
24 also was a member of the advisory task force team
25 and also on the Prairie Island study group.

1 My comments are going to be addressing
2 specifically Chapter 4, Human Environmental Impacts,
3 sub 4.9, Transportation. And I'm going to be citing
4 a couple of Department of Transportation regulations
5 and documents that the report was silent on. And
6 primarily I want to talk about Code of Federal
7 Regulations Title 49, Transportation, part 171,
8 subchapter C, Hazardous Materials Regulations; part
9 172, subpart D, Marking; subpart E, Labeling;
10 subpart F, Placards; part 173, subpart B,
11 Preparation of Hazardous Materials for
12 Transportation; and subpart I, Radioactive
13 Materials.

14 There's been a number of discussions
15 regarding Yucca Mountain. I was living in
16 California, and I was heavily involved in the
17 discussion period of the Yucca Mountain in the early
18 1990s. I'll be honest. I'm surprised the issue is
19 still alive, because in 1995 the state of California
20 and Nevada killed it because the transportation
21 industry would not support it. Primarily, for those
22 that don't realize it, every city, county, and state
23 has to prove their route in all agencies. Emergency
24 services agencies have to be equipped to allow that
25 movement, whether it's by rail or by motor, through

1 the city with the appropriate forces. And that's
2 why -- that's why I'm surprised that it's still an
3 issue today. Maybe it's something that just keeps
4 coming back, and hopefully they put pressure on
5 Nevada and California.

6 At paragraph 172.2, No person may offer
7 or accept hazardous materials for transportation in
8 commerce unless the material is properly classified,
9 described, package, marked, labeled, and in
10 condition for shipping as required or authorized per
11 this subchapter.

12 Looking at the Section 4.9, a good
13 overview of the transportation route's but nothing
14 specific as what's happening. As a matter of fact,
15 the one route that was detailed, I think in the
16 second paragraph, has identified Highway 61 coming
17 from Prairie Island/Red Wing down through following
18 the Mississippi River to La Crosse --
19 Winona/La Crosse. That is a contradiction on what
20 DOT has in charts, and I'll talk about that briefly.
21 I did not see any reference complying with DOT
22 standards, guidelines and, as far as that goes,
23 Environmental Protection Agency.

24 Paragraph 171.3, paragraph 3 states,
25 Delivers as designated on the entire manifest of the

1 generator, the entire quantity of the waste received
2 from a generator or transporter. Nothing is said
3 how many casks are going to be moved. There are
4 three nuclear plants in -- on the Mississippi River.
5 Nothing has really been said on either three. Will
6 they be moving dry cask storage into the Prairie
7 Island facility? I've seen nothing on the
8 Monticello or the La Crosse plant on enhancing
9 storage capability. So I suspect the reason they're
10 going for 24 to 35 additional spots is to allow for
11 storage of casks from other sites traveling within
12 the state of Minnesota. And from the position of
13 La Crosse, that will be interstate commerce.

14 Paragraph 171.3, subsection D, states, If
15 a discharge of hazardous waste or other hazardous
16 material occurs during transportation and an
17 official of a state or local government or a federal
18 agency, basically in summary, needs to be notified
19 or protocol -- and I know the county of Wabasha has
20 no emergency service plans for a nuclear or
21 radioactive waste accident, and I don't think
22 Goodhue County has -- or does Goodhue County have
23 something on -- you're probably forced because of
24 the Prairie Island situation. But I know Lake City
25 does not, and I suspect Wabasha, Kellogg, and those

1 cities do not. So we have a hole there.

2 Paragraph 171.12(e) states, Radioactive
3 material being shipped must meet IAEA regulations
4 for safe transport of radioactive materials and as
5 amended. The reason I said that is because my CFR
6 is dated 1990, and I'm sure they have been updated.

7 Part 1034, Routing of Traffic, DOT allows
8 railroads to reroute trains in case of situations.
9 And when you reroute, you're going to have counties
10 and cities who are not on the regular route that
11 you're going to have some issues. So that needs to
12 be addressed.

13 On one of the maps -- let me go through
14 the maps. It's important. Minnesota counties
15 affected by truck transportation. Basically in this
16 case it's Yucca Mountain or just intrastate within
17 the state of Minnesota. This particular map shows
18 no designated route from Hastings to Winona. The
19 route is from La Crosse, Winona, to Highway 30 --
20 it looks like Highway 35 going north into the Twin
21 Cities. That contradicts what's in Chapter 4.9 that
22 you identified Highway 61.

23 Then on a state map that pretty much
24 outlines the major routes, it looks like it was --
25 it looks like it's Interstate 80 for most of the way

1 until you get to Salt Lake City, then it diverts
2 down. But the state/federal highway system is very
3 limited in how you move nuclear waste.

4 The last -- the last map shows the
5 transportation routes, and they identified -- I'll
6 have to attest, I don't know for what period -- but
7 they show coming out of La Crosse, following I-90 to
8 I-35, 37 casks into Albert Lea, down to Monticello
9 263 casks going down to Albert Lea, for a total of
10 300 casks. And that's a tremendous number of casks
11 moving. And I know currently Prairie Island stores
12 24, and they're going to expand to 24 or more. But
13 when you're talking 300 casks there and then for
14 Prairie Island going via rail using Sioux Line
15 going -- or actually now Kennedy Pacific going north
16 to the Twin Cities then going south, they have
17 identified in here 127 casks coming out of Prairie
18 Island. So there's some discrepancy information,
19 and I think they need to take a really good look on
20 the transportation side, because -- and you will
21 have to move nuclear waste, which is hazardous
22 materials, and that type of thing. So I just want
23 to make you aware that you need to take a look at
24 that.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. STORM: Thank you, Andrew.
2 George Crocker.

3 MR. CROCKER: Thank you. My name is
4 George Crocker, C-R-O-C-K-E-R. I'm the executive
5 director of the North American Water Office.

6 I guess for starters I'd like to point
7 out the inadequacy of this EIS in terms of
8 environmental impacts that may result from breaking
9 reactor parts or operator error. There is no
10 discussion that I saw about what the consequences of
11 such incidents might be or discussions of their
12 probability or what mitigation strategies might need
13 to be incorporated if such events were to occur.

14 But, beyond that, this document I think
15 is extraordinarily inadequate in terms of its
16 discussion of the consequences of routine radiation
17 releases. You point out on page 82, I guess it is,
18 that, you know, there will be one person in one and
19 a half million that gets cancer or something like
20 that.

21 I'm going to give you a document that was
22 prepared by Rosalie Bertell, an internationally
23 renowned physicist, nuclear physicist, public health
24 expert. And her information calculates that with
25 the operations prior to the uprate -- and the uprate

1 will expand these impacts by 10 percent or so --
2 why, for every year of nuclear operations at Prairie
3 Island, we are committed to somewhere between 11 and
4 46 cancer fatalities over the next thousand years.

5 Your problem, in significant part, has to
6 do with the term of exposure. The term of exposure
7 has to do with the period of time in which the
8 radionuclides are radioactive. They don't end that
9 at a 70-year period. And because of the
10 insufficient methodology that you use to calculate
11 the public health impacts, you create the impression
12 that the impact is negligible. The fact of the
13 matter is across this country we see rising
14 incidents of a large number of disease symptoms with
15 question marks behind them as to what is the cause.
16 And the reason we have the question marks behind
17 them is because we are very, very purposeful in not
18 finding out. And this document is part of what you
19 could call a conspiracy to continue keeping the
20 public unaware of the causes, the exposures to
21 radionuclides that can cause these disease symptoms.

22 Bear in mind that the National Academies
23 of Science has stated categorically and
24 unequivocally -- there was no discussion of the BEIR
25 reports, the Biological Effects of Ionizing

1 Radiation, that I saw. And I think, Mr. Storm, that
2 not including the BEIR documentations in your
3 document is unacceptable.

4 The National Academies of Science says
5 there is no safe dose. The radionuclides that will
6 be -- that are being and will continue to be
7 released at Prairie Island will continue to be
8 biologically active on into the distant future.
9 Your document has an obligation to take that full
10 impact into account.

11 Are you paying attention?

12 MR. STORM: I hear you, George.

13 MR. CROCKER: Thank you.

14 MR. STORM: Thank you, George.

15 Kristen.

16 MS. EIDE-TOLLEFSON: I'm Kristen
17 Eide-Tollefson. And I followed -- oh, last name --
18 first name K-R-I-S-T-E-N. Last name Eide-Tollefson,
19 E-I-D-E, hyphen, T-O-L-L-E-F-S-O-N.

20 I followed this -- creation of this
21 document closely and the work of the task force very
22 closely, which I -- 15 closely -- closely written
23 charted concerns that were identified by the
24 communities that the OES put together down here, the
25 individuals, the communities who analyzed the issues

1 and sent them on to be included in the environmental
2 impact statement.

3 I've really had quite a bit of trouble
4 just getting a handle on this document. The update
5 is 90 pages long. The environmental review for the
6 increased storage is 56 pages long. When I borrowed
7 the original Prairie Island environmental impact
8 statement to read it when the ISFSI was first cited
9 here, I had to get a box and I had to haul three
10 huge binders to my car, and it took me two weeks to
11 go through all the material and all the details and
12 all the information in it.

13 So I think that what I would like to do
14 here is to just take three of the issues that were
15 raised by the task force and to read aloud the
16 treatments and the conclusions.

17 The first issue raised by the task force
18 was stranded waste, the high-level nuclear waste
19 that is at this point, because we have no Yucca
20 Mountain, stranded on the banks of the Mississippi.
21 Obviously communities and citizens, even legislators
22 are wondering how long will the waste be here, what
23 will we do if it's not moved, how will we keep it
24 safe? And the storage pad and cask pool are not
25 designed for long-term storage. So what does the

1 EIS have to tell us about this?

2 In the discussion of the impacts on page
3 34 to 37, although there is uncertainty as to the
4 storage alternatives that will be available in 2034,
5 a likely scenario is temporary long-term storage --
6 that's actually a new phrase in my experience -- at
7 the Prairie Island ISFSI until dry storage casks can
8 be transported to a federal repository. Given the
9 uncertainty as to when a federal repository will be
10 available to accept casks, this document assumes for
11 analysis purposes only that the casks will be at the
12 ISFSI for up to 200 years. And assuming that
13 regular monitoring and maintenance continue,
14 radiological impacts will be -- for up to 200 years
15 will be within NRC regulatory limits and would not
16 be significant during normal operations.

17 Then there's a general discussion that
18 time is a consideration for the risks related to the
19 handling of casks. But once they're on the pad, the
20 EIS notes, they won't be handled. Now, perhaps
21 we're looking for statistical analysis of the
22 radiological effects. This is what we have:

23 Current analysis indicates that the risk
24 of radiological impacts from these events is small.
25 If emergency measures, planning measures remain

1 effective into the future -- we're talking 200 years
2 at least -- and if we assume they remain relatively
3 constant over time, then multiplying the risks over
4 an additional 200 years will not make them
5 significant. That's your statistical analysis.

6 And then -- then we go to the NRC's
7 analysis, which proposes that the dry casks can be
8 safely stored until at least 2094, which I will note
9 is not 200 years. NRC -- the EIS says that the NRC
10 notes that there are no technical limitations for
11 safe storage. And perhaps if you're looking for an
12 analysis of what the technical limitations
13 discussion might be, we are out of luck because that
14 is outside -- that's one of the many, many things
15 outside the scope of this environmental review.

16 So the conclusion is -- just a second, I
17 have one more piece on that -- this is the extent of
18 the analysis of the design of the casks. The
19 minimum design life for the TN40 series of
20 transnuclear casks is 25 years. However, due to the
21 passive nature of the dry storage casks and the
22 robustness of the components, it is anticipated that
23 the ISFSI could physically be operated for several
24 hundred years. Now, this is a conclusion that has
25 absolutely no documentation in the -- in the record

1 and is in stark contrast to the conclusions of the
2 draft environmental impact statement for Yucca
3 Mountain, which is fairly extensive. And I think
4 that one of the important things that we need to
5 realize is that if there is no Yucca Mountain, then
6 the storage at Prairie Island is an ad hoc no action
7 alternative.

8 Let me then summarize the position of the
9 EIS on a matter of concern to us all. This is
10 temporary long-term storage. Assuming regulatory
11 monitoring and maintenance, they will be okay up to
12 20 years if you don't touch or move them after 50.
13 And NRC says they can be stored safely at least
14 until 2094.

15 In the EIS for Yucca Mountain, the no
16 action alternative is based upon extensive
17 engineering studies that support the analysis, and
18 these extensive engineering studies outline three
19 major factors that increase or affect the risks of
20 long-term at reactor site storage. One is the
21 amount of and exposure to precipitation. Two, the
22 freeze/thaw cycle. And, three, proximity to human
23 populations and other sensitive biological systems,
24 which I would say the Prairie Island Indian
25 Community, Red Wing, and the Mississippi River rate

1 quite high.

2 The Yucca Mountain DEIS notes that
3 existing storage facilities could begin to be
4 compromised as early as 50 years and should be
5 replaced within the first 100 years and every
6 hundred years thereafter.

7 The second item that I'd like to address
8 is the issues identified in the task force
9 recommendations for the EIS that have to do with the
10 psychological and social and economic impacts of
11 living near a nuclear plant. Of course, the Prairie
12 Island Indian Community has been attempting to
13 communicate to regulators, legislators, and federal
14 agencies for many years the difficulties and effects
15 of living this close. And the cumulative effects of
16 the proposed actions of uprating, extending --
17 relicensing the plant and extending storage are a
18 concern of all neighboring communities. There was a
19 psychologist on the task force who was specifically
20 interested in helping to address these concerns.
21 What does the EIS have to say about psychological
22 impacts?

23 I'm sorry, I'm shaking a little. It
24 makes it harder.

25 Okay. The analysis is 20 lines long in

1 the middle of page 57. OES staff conducted a
2 literary search in an effort to obtain information
3 on the potential psychological impacts associated
4 with living near a nuclear generator plant. The
5 vast majority of articles dealt with post-incident
6 surveys, after Chernobyl or something has happened.
7 Then the EIS briefly states that the phenomenon that
8 there are often higher levels of support for nuclear
9 power near a plant, particularly for those who
10 benefit from it, and -- but it also acknowledges
11 that even where there's support or acceptance, there
12 is sometimes underlying unease.

13 Then the EIS refers the reader to do
14 their own research and gives three studies from a
15 British study that may be of interest, and it
16 concludes: Considering the comments received during
17 the site permitting process for the Monticello
18 nuclear generating uprate versus the public comments
19 expressed during these proceedings, it would appear
20 that assessing the potential psychological impacts
21 of a given facility at its host community would be
22 very specific to each community. Good observation.
23 To adequately assess this impact would require a
24 level of detail, i.e. basic research, that is,
25 again, outside the scope of this study.

1 I have only one more, and that is that
2 one of the things that has been of the greatest
3 ongoing discussion among the task -- people who
4 served on the task force and then those of us who
5 have continued to get together and study these
6 issues is that people are being asked to live with a
7 number of uncertainties and multiple interacting
8 affects of the uprate, extending storage, and
9 extending the term of storage. And I think that the
10 requests that are being made and that have been put
11 on paper in the Prairie -- in the Red Wing
12 Resolution that several of the other communities are
13 also considering are not unreasonable requests.
14 They take into consideration that we're all living
15 here together and we have to live with each other
16 and we will be living with each other and we will
17 very like have a nuclear plant in the community, but
18 the fact that -- but what has been requested is a
19 number of -- is a number of considerations around
20 mitigations that have to do with monitoring, knowing
21 where the plume goes, the plume for the thermal --
22 the thermal discharges, for the emissions
23 discharges.

24 But we're discussing the EIS, and so I'm
25 going to read you the only treatment of mitigation

1 that I could find -- now, I might have missed it --
2 the only treatment of mitigations that I could find
3 in the EIS. It's under 5.0 on page 90.

4 Unavoidable impacts in mitigation. The
5 primary impact of the proposed uprate, I'll use, is
6 an increase in the temperature of the circulating
7 water leaving the main condenser due to an increase
8 in thermal output. Cooling water discharge
9 temperature will be maintained for increased use of
10 cooling towers or other methods. Thermal discharge
11 will remain within the limit. No change in
12 permitted water appropriation is needed. The
13 proposed uprate will also increase gaseous
14 radionuclide emissions but will not measurably
15 change the maximum projected annual offsite
16 radiation dose. In other words, there are no
17 recommendations -- recommended mitigations or even
18 listing of mitigations recommended by the task
19 force.

20 And so I will -- I will conclude my
21 remarks with a request that the -- that a number --
22 and I'll turn that -- this in a written form -- of
23 two things. One, that we recognize that the
24 failure -- that the EIS recognize that as we now
25 have a failure of the only federal storage option

1 that we had, that this constitutes a major change of
2 circumstance for the -- for the Prairie Island
3 reactor and those of us who live near it and that
4 this change of circumstance warrants a different
5 look at the options that -- for storage, for
6 technology before us; and it also warrants another
7 look at the decline in energy demand and the
8 necessity of the uprate, which --

9 So thank you for your great patience.

10 MR. STORM: Thank you, Kristen.

11 Roger Cuthbertson.

12 MR. CUTHBERTSON: I am Roger Cuthbertson,
13 R-O-G-E-R. C-U-T-H-B-E-R-T-S-O-N. I have no
14 official capacity and not been a part of any study
15 group. I'm a citizen and a concerned citizen. I
16 want to say just as an aside, as a concerned
17 citizen, there is another issue being brought before
18 the public by Xcel Energy, and it's the rate
19 increase. And I would just like to say in these
20 hard times, it's troubling to have to face a rate
21 increase. And I would just say to Xcel Energy, if
22 they need to do -- if they absolutely have to do a
23 rate increase during these hard economic times, why
24 not have smaller rates for people that don't use
25 very much electricity because they can't afford to

1 have one of these humongous houses that uses up so
2 much energy. So I would just suggest some kind of
3 sliding scale. But that's -- I know that's a little
4 bit off the topic. I'm sorry.

5 My hat says stop -- stop nuclear power.
6 And I really -- that's where I come from. I don't
7 think we should even have to be here today because
8 it was about 15 years ago when there was quite a
9 public outcry about the idea of having casks in the
10 first place. It wasn't that casks weren't better
11 than the storage pools, which are just an accident
12 waiting to happen, but we -- we somehow knew that
13 these casks would not be the answer. And even at
14 that time they were talking about Yucca Mountain
15 that's going to be this permanent repository for
16 nuclear waste. And this has been the promise ever
17 since nuclear -- the nuclear industry forced it upon
18 us, that science was going to come up with an answer
19 to the waste problem, and it still hasn't. And
20 shamelessly they're before us again asking for help
21 when the legislature in 1994 or shortly thereafter
22 said, okay, we'll give you the casks but only --
23 this is -- this is just a one-time deal; you can't
24 have any more; and if -- and this is -- and that's
25 it. And even the legislature got into the act.

1 And, of course, they've already violated their
2 promise. That's another promise not kept.

3 Nuclear energy seems like such a good
4 deal. I mean, you don't see any smoke coming out of
5 stack and it seems cheap. But it's a false-end deal
6 because it's extremely dangerous. And it's
7 extremely immoral, in my opinion, because what it
8 does is it let's us have our electricity and party
9 up and let's use it up now and we don't have to pay
10 the price; but the people that follow us, our
11 children and our children's children and our
12 children's children's children, on and on, for
13 thousands of generations pay the price for our use
14 of electricity today and our refusal to con -- our
15 refusal to conserve or to find -- or to follow -- or
16 to investigate other methods of producing electrical
17 power like wind generation, which is my -- would be
18 my favorite.

19 Nuclear, the -- the lady before me that
20 spoke -- I can't remember your name. But the matter
21 of asking for more power generation, this is
22 dangerous. More heat, more fuel, higher
23 temperatures, more threat to the wildlife and the
24 rivers, more chance for accidents. And we know that
25 accidents will happen. More routine emissions of

1 the radioactive substances that are causing cancer
2 and causing birth defects in human beings and
3 affecting the wildlife too.

4 What's in those casks is very dangerous.
5 We're talking about stuff that has to be kept
6 completely out of the environment and out of reach
7 of animals and people for thousands and thousands of
8 years. In those casks are such things as amounts of
9 even plutonium with a half-life of 24,000 years. I
10 mean, think about it. Are we going to -- I mean,
11 we're going to enjoy this electricity today and then
12 have people for not just 24,000 years, multiply it
13 times 10, two hundred -- 240,000 years taking care
14 of our waste? I mean, it's like having a party on
15 Saturday night, having people clean up after your
16 party for 35 years. It's crazy. It's -- it's just
17 immoral, in my opinion.

18 Like let's go back to plutonium. I've
19 heard it said that it's like 2 million times more
20 deadly than cobra venom. So after 24,000 years --
21 and, mind you, human history is only 8,000 years.
22 After 24,000 years, oh, boy, it's only going to be
23 1 million times more deadly than cobra venom. This
24 is not the route we should be taking. And the casks
25 and these substances aren't just dangerous and

1 aren't just dangerous in a long lasting way, these
2 substances are corrosive and hot and chemically
3 toxic. And these casks -- these casks are not going
4 to Yucca Mountain because Yucca Mountain is not
5 ready. It probably never will be. Somebody's going
6 to have to change those casks, take the material out
7 of those casks and put them in a new cask. You want
8 to be a part of the labor force doing that, working
9 in these kind of conditions? I wouldn't want that
10 job. You couldn't pay me enough to do this. And
11 how many times do they have to change the casks?
12 How many times is this going to happen? Hundred
13 times? Thousand times? What do you think the
14 workers donning their outfits to try to keep them --
15 keep their health halfway safe are going to be
16 saying -- in the year 11,000 are going to be saying
17 about their job of cleaning up casks so that
18 people -- you know, that -- they can't even read
19 about it anymore in history books because it's so
20 long ago -- enjoy their cheaper electricity?

21 I don't know. Maybe I'm rambling here,
22 but I just -- I just think we should -- we should
23 not be doing this. What we should be doing is
24 thinking about these casks. Let's take a good look
25 at them. They might need changing already. Start

1 thinking about that. Start thinking about
2 alternatives. Put our money into wind power,
3 biomass, other things. I -- I know it's very
4 tempting to -- especially with global warming --
5 warming, to go nuclear; but at least with global
6 warming, you -- at least with coal, using coal from
7 coal plants, the effects that are produced are
8 witnessed by the people that create -- that use the
9 electricity, and they can see the changes happening
10 before their eyes, and they can do something about
11 it to turn around their actions. But with nuclear
12 power it's so easy to use this power today and not
13 worry because the effects are -- the deleterious
14 effects to humans and animals is put off to the far
15 distant future, on and on and on. And it's just --
16 it's -- it's not a -- it's like a deficit spending
17 of the worst order is what I think, using nuclear
18 power. And I just hope we don't -- I hope we don't
19 do this. We should not.

20 I thought we had a deal before. I was
21 protesting against the casks in 1994. Like I say, I
22 did agree that the casks were better than the
23 storage pools. I mean, the water goes out of the
24 storage pools, it's volatile, you've contaminated
25 hundreds and thousands of square miles. It just

1 takes one little thing, you know. But -- the casks
2 are better than that, but the casks are not a
3 solution either. They were never meant to be a
4 permanent solution. And we're going to end up with
5 a permanent mess, I'm afraid, if we go this route.

6 MR. STORM: Thank you, Roger.

7 Okay. That's everybody who's
8 preregistered to speak.

9 Is there anyone who would like to take
10 the opportunity to speak now?

11 Please state your name and spell it for
12 the court reporter.

13 MS. MEYER: My name is Michelle Meyer,
14 M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E, M-E-Y-E-R. I am a new member of
15 the Red Wing Sustainability Commission. And I've
16 just received this EIS report tonight, so I haven't
17 had a long opportunity to go over it. I do have
18 some immediate questions, though, that I would like
19 to see further explored.

20 I'm not clear on who created this report.
21 So initially when I'm reading it, it seems to me
22 that what I'm seeing is a report about why nothing
23 else is possible except nuclear, and to me that's
24 completely unacceptable.

25 One thing that I do see in the report on

1 page 34 under Alternative Energies, there is
2 conversation about wind turbines. And it says that
3 if wind turbines can help meet overall system energy
4 needs. It seems to me that that's really all we're
5 asking for or you're asking for. You're asking to
6 increase your output. I'm unclear as to why that
7 needs to happen as well. Maybe that's stated
8 somewhere within here, and I haven't seen it yet.
9 But I'm completely unclear as to why we need to
10 increase our energy output. But if wind turbines
11 can help meet our overall system needs, I would like
12 to see further exploration as to how that can
13 happen.

14 Some years ago there was a wind energy
15 test done near the high school, and the land near
16 the high school is noted as being a perfect spot for
17 wind generation. And so, again, we have a spot. I
18 think we need to explore that.

19 Also, it says wind generation must be
20 coupled with other technologies or resources. We
21 already have that. You are already here. I don't
22 see the need to expand.

23 So I think it's important, before moving
24 forward with expansion of a system that is highly
25 flawed, that we look to something or explore

1 something that has no consequences, that has no
2 toxic waste and no emissions. No need to pour hot
3 water into our river that is already flowing during
4 the winter unnaturally.

5 So I guess I -- the other -- the other
6 point I'd like to make is it's my understanding that
7 Xcel Energy receives money from the government to
8 explore these technologies. And I'd like to see
9 that money put to use, you know, in order -- if we
10 need to increase our energy capacities, isn't that
11 where it's supposed to be going towards? Aren't we
12 supposed to be looking at our alternatives? Why are
13 we even looking at a third generator and looking at
14 further storage? The licensure was supposed to end.
15 This is stuff that's supposed to have been taken
16 care of already. And I want to know why -- why we
17 even -- why we have this and why we're not exploring
18 those alternatives.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. STORM: Thank you.

21 Anyone else?

22 Please state and spell your name for the
23 court reporter.

24 MS. HIMANGA: My name is Katie Himanga.
25 Katie is spelled K-A-T-I-E. Himanga, H-I-M-A-N-G-A.

1 Resident of Lake City and the former mayor of Lake
2 City. Many of the speakers who preceded me shared
3 comments. I would second their comments, especially
4 concerns about the storages of nuclear waste on
5 Prairie Island for what appears to be an indefinite
6 period of time.

7 But I want to make just a few comments
8 very specific to the EIS, some things that I offer
9 for your consideration. In Chapter 1, page 36 and
10 on Table 3.2, you discuss carbon emissions from a
11 variety of different electricity-generating plants.
12 And unless it is not already, it is my opinion that
13 that should reflect life cycle carbon dioxide
14 emissions and not just emissions at the plant site.

15 Then for Chapter 4.2, on page 47, in
16 discussing fish population, the remark is included
17 that it looks -- that it looks like fish
18 populations -- the current fish populations look
19 much like they did in the 1970s. And I would offer
20 that the 1970s might not be an appropriate baseline
21 or benchmark for fish populations. As I recall, in
22 the 1970s the river was still very much polluted
23 by -- from a number of factors. And I would offer
24 that a pre-World War II benchmark is more likely
25 appropriate.

1 In Chapter 4.2 on page 47 it mentions
2 chlorination as being an identified problem
3 associated with the plant, but it doesn't offer any
4 solution.

5 And then two things that are a
6 particular -- particular interest to me, in Chapter
7 4.6 on page 64 it describes the locations of various
8 parks and so on. It mentions play grounds in the
9 city of Red Wing, but it does not make mention of
10 play grounds or ceremonial grounds that are on
11 Prairie Island and part of the Prairie Island Indian
12 Community, and I would ask that they be included so
13 that it is more complete.

14 And then also in -- I apologize, I don't
15 have the chapter reference here. But in talking
16 about cultural resources and so on, you have
17 included some maps and some inventories and so on,
18 but nothing is offered for mitigation of the impact
19 of disturbance of burial grounds or other sacred
20 grounds. And I would offer that religious
21 traditions, including my own, have strategies for
22 the blessing and restoration of desecrated sacred
23 places. And can't we bring some of this to the
24 Prairie Island nuclear generating plant?

25 Thank you.

1 MR. STORM: Thank you, Katie.

2 Anybody who hasn't spoken want to speak?

3 Yes, sir.

4 Again, state your name and spell it for
5 the court reporter.

6 MR. CHILDS, JR.: Michael Childs, Jr.
7 M-I-C-H-A-E-L. C-H-I-L-D-S. Junior. There's a
8 couple things I think were omitted in this draft EIS
9 pertaining to both parts, the cultural,
10 archeological, and historic resources. It came to
11 my light last October that -- well, I'll give you a
12 history so you know who I am. I worked at Prairie
13 Island for 12 years as an Xcel employee. Also I'm a
14 tribal member, just so you know. So when I found
15 out about some desecration of burial mounds, which
16 doesn't seem to be added since -- since the, you
17 know, last fall when we went through this stuff. I
18 guess I kind of wonder why it wasn't added. Xcel
19 Energy knows. I have a piece of paper here that
20 I'll give to you that shows the fact that during
21 construction of the plant that burial mounds were
22 desecrated. And being an employee at the time of
23 this discovery process -- this is 40 years ago
24 during construction of the plant when some
25 ancestral, you know, burial artifacts were removed,

1 that basically Xcel violated some of their own
2 procedures, diversity and code of conduct
3 procedures. So, you know, as far as -- that kind of
4 ties into health and safety, when you go to the
5 psychological impacts and socioeconomic impacts of
6 both the ISFSI and the extended power uprate
7 because, okay, they lied to their employee, which
8 was me -- and I had uncles and brothers and sisters
9 that worked there -- that, you know, this lack of
10 trust -- there's tribe -- tribal members already
11 have a lack of trust of NSP and Xcel, whereas this
12 ties into that socio -- sociology and the psych --
13 you know, the psychology because -- because after
14 this was brought up during a tribal council
15 quarterly meeting that this happened, the trust
16 level of Xcel Energy is even less now. Now, that
17 wasn't mentioned anywhere in your psychological
18 impacts associated with either one of these, you
19 know. And it kind of goes back again to the
20 socio -- social aspect of it, which is when the
21 plant was built, the Prairie Island Indian Community
22 didn't have any money. And even though it's not
23 said anywhere, it is rather implied that the
24 placement of the plant and along with this
25 desecration that was found out last fall, there's no

1 mention of it. There's no mention of, you know, the
2 betray of trust between NSP/Xcel and the tribal
3 community and, like me, former employee.

4 So I just thought -- I thought both
5 sections needed -- needed that to show that. And I
6 got some stuff I'll give to you, Bill.

7 Thanks.

8 MR. STORM: Thank you.

9 Anyone else who hasn't spoken?

10 Okay. Andrew, you want to --

11 Lea. Sorry. Lea, you want to speak?

12 MS. FOUSHEE: Yes, please.

13 MR. STORM: Please state your name and
14 spell it for the court reporter.

15 MS. FOUSHEE: My name is Lea Foushee.
16 L-E-A. Foushee is F, like Frank, O-U-S-H-E-E. I
17 would just like to support the statement of
18 Mr. Childs because during the monitored retrievable
19 storage contract, my organization worked for the
20 Prairie Island Tribal Council. And I contacted the
21 Minnesota Historical Society, and they provided me
22 with a map and a diagram, and they circled the
23 burial mounds that NSP destroyed. And so I as well
24 have a copy of a map that shows those desecrations,
25 and I provided it to the tribe at that time, which

1 was before the 1994 process began.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. STORM: Thank you, Lea.

4 Sure.

5 MR. CHILDS, SR.: I'm Mike Childs, Sr.
6 M-I-C-H-A-E-L. C-H-I-L-D-S. Senior. I'm the proud
7 father of Mike, Jr.

8 Anyway, I was -- I served two terms on
9 the Prairie Island Tribal Council. It was during
10 the 1994 dry cask storage debate. It was my
11 pleasure to serve with George Crocker in his
12 position then, too. But, yeah, I just wanted to
13 bring to light that it was the purpose of our event
14 to create the alternative energy sources such as
15 wind power and that -- what difficulties that we had
16 met as opposition from then Northern States Power.
17 And they said that -- stated the impossibilities of
18 sustainable energy from wind energy, as this young
19 lady brought up in the statements she outlined.
20 And -- and it was so unusual and comical how someone
21 stood up and said that at that time in the nuclear
22 power industry there had been no death in building
23 or operating nuclear power plants and how at that
24 time someone constructing a wind generator had been
25 killed because there was ice buildup on the

1 that's what we're dealing with. And they're such a
2 powerful force that I don't know how we can defeat
3 them. But that's just the way it is. I mean, like
4 Mike had mentioned, we were a very poor community.
5 You know, it's unusual that at that time Red Wing
6 annexed us. We were Burnside Township at the time,
7 and Red Wing included us in their border. Between
8 the time that they had this property and it was --
9 it had high value and they were supplying taxes to
10 the city of Red Wing, there were no schools built.
11 Once the plant was devalued and taxes that they were
12 subject to were gone, we built Burnside School,
13 elementary school and high school. And then, of
14 course, the burden comes on to the taxpayer. And I
15 especially notice in mine, because I built my
16 original house in 1978 and I moved in in 1980. And
17 every year subsequent to 1980 I had a 22 percent
18 increase in property tax. And I don't know, it
19 just -- it's sickening. I think these kind of
20 things have to do with the psychological impact on
21 people.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. STORM: Thank you.

24 Gentleman in the back who hasn't spoken
25 before, you --

1 MS. JOHNSON: I am a female.

2 MR. STORM: Yes.

3 MS. JOHNSON: My name is Susan. Of
4 course there is a boy named Sue, I guess. Susan,
5 S-U-S-A-N. Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And I just have
6 to say I really appreciate seeing all these people
7 here tonight. As a local, it's nice to see a lot of
8 new faces on this issue as well as the old ones that
9 have been working on it for a long time.

10 Back in the early '90s I had that EIS for
11 that dry cask storage proposal probably memorized.
12 But this is new to me, just receiving it tonight.
13 I'm surprised at the request for additional dry cask
14 storage, being the president of the United States
15 has kind of condemned Yucca Mountain. And as
16 Ms. Eide-Tollefson said, that term temporary long
17 permanent -- what was it, permanent long-term
18 storage is interesting to think about for our
19 community to have in the backyard.

20 I have concerns also, as Mr. Crocker
21 here, with the BEIR reports, the BEIR reports not
22 being included, and would like to see those looked
23 at closely.

24 Ms. Meyer points out things such as why
25 are they asking for increase in power? I've never

1 heard that explained. And why is it necessary? I
2 don't quite understand that. And as well as the
3 need for looking at more alternative energies rather
4 than increasing that.

5 I do have a fear that when you allow more
6 dry casks, we all know the health issues concerned
7 with that and the issue of the nuclear power plant
8 becoming older as it's looking for relicensure.

9 And I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

10 MR. STORM: Thank you.

11 Anyone else who hasn't spoken?

12 Okay. Andrew, you can have your second
13 shot.

14 MR. PETERS: Thank you, Bill. I would
15 like to expand on Mayor Himanga's remarks on
16 benchmarking data. And I want to address Section
17 4.11, Water Resources, specifically the section on
18 Lake Pepin. I think Mayor Himanga is right, you
19 should be -- on Table 4-5, you show ice sectors from
20 1999 through 2008, which is good. And I concur with
21 Mayor Himanga, let's go back to 1940 to 1955 and
22 look at ice thickness. And the reason I'm concerned
23 about ice thickness, I think if you remember from
24 the task force, I was very vocal on it. Lake City
25 dies during the winter months, and back in the '40s

1 and '50s we depended on the lake for economic
2 vitality. And I will give you a compare and
3 contrast.

4 I can remember the 1940s. I was amazed
5 the state of Minnesota, MnDOT, another sister
6 agency, created a temporary road sign, temporary
7 three -- I think it was 395 across Lake City to
8 Stockholm, Wisconsin. Lake City would furnish a
9 dump truck loaded with sand and gravel with a
10 snowplow and plow the road out after every
11 snowstorm. I defy you to see a snowplow going
12 across the lake in the last couple of years. I can
13 remember as a kid, I marveled at 25 to 45 headlights
14 going across the lake. This last year we had three
15 to five vehicles that went through the ice on Almere
16 Shore. I can remember ice fishing villages off of
17 Sandy Point, which is the Villa Maria area, 50-plus
18 icehouses. Central Point, 50 to 75 icehouses. City
19 Point, 50 to 75 icehouses. Russian Park, 50 to 70
20 icehouses. Breeze Landing, 50 to 75 icehouses.
21 Today in all those areas, I'd be willing to bet
22 you'd find ten. We used to have an ice fishing
23 contest which would average anywhere from 400 to a
24 thousand people on the ice. They can never do that.
25 So Lake City has been impacted significantly

1 economically in the winter months because of water
2 discharge. I think in the IS task force, I think
3 they did come out -- Xcel did come out and say yes,
4 we were given authority to raise the water
5 temperature of water discharge on the river, and
6 that has never changed. And I think the
7 discussion -- and on the task force we indicated
8 with more storage charges it's going to take more
9 water, and there will be additional, you know,
10 water. But, again, I think you need to look at data
11 and compare contrast. I know the Corps of Engineers
12 probably back then kept the data. I don't think DNR
13 was even an entity back then. But I think you need
14 to look at compare and contrast, because I know
15 especially the City of Lake City, we've been
16 economically impacted after the nuclear plant went
17 up, because before that we've had no problems. So
18 I'd just like to add that.

19 I'll put that in writing and also get it
20 in your hands too, Bill.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. STORM: Thank you, Andrew.

23 Would anyone else like to speak tonight
24 before we adjourn?

25 Kristen, you want a second?

1 MS. EIDE-TOLLEFSON: Thanks. One of the
2 alternatives that was raised in the course of the
3 study -- or the task force was the hydrokinetic
4 power project that is the first one that has been
5 permitted up in Hastings. You pretty much dismissed
6 those at some point, and I would like to see that
7 brought back in. I've been doing a little more
8 research. Those are all being -- in the permitting
9 process. It's not like they're ten years out. And
10 Xcel is the utility that would be purchasing power
11 from that alternative. So I would like to request
12 that that not be scoped -- or not -- that that be
13 included in the alternatives. I don't know if
14 that's possible technically.

15 I -- I have to say I have tremendous
16 admiration for the level of efficiency with which
17 OES has amalgamated, conducted, and executed its
18 duties so far. But I think that there is also
19 something missing in that I think the fact that we
20 have, you know, three meetings totally to discuss
21 this and be part of this as a community on all three
22 of these dockets is really challenging. It's very
23 challenging. And I think that it would be
24 important -- I'm going to spare everybody reading
25 it. But under our environmental policy statute, the

1 direction to the state agencies is -- no, I'm going
2 read a couple of them. The direction of the state
3 agencies is really much more than to just be
4 efficient with its own resources. It's to protect
5 the resources of the state through utilizing a
6 systematic interdisciplinary approach that ensures
7 the integrated use of the natural and social
8 sciences in planning and decision making,
9 identifying and developing methods and procedures
10 that will ensure that all values environmental,
11 whether quantified or not, will be given equal
12 consideration, to study and develop and describe
13 appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of
14 action, to initiate the gathering and utilization of
15 ecological information, and to undertaking
16 contractor funds research as is needed in order to
17 determine and clarify effects.

18 So I think that the -- that given the
19 fact that this plant is likely to be with us at some
20 time, there is a great need for this environmental
21 impact statement to do more justice to the kind of
22 concerns that the community has and the
23 psychological, sociological, and long-terms affect
24 of the uncertainties. And I don't know how you
25 would do that. That's really a huge challenge.

1 It's been a challenge at thinking about it. It's
2 been a challenge all this time. And I respect how
3 challenging that is. But I would suggest that it's
4 essential, given the changed circumstances, the fact
5 that we no longer have any kind of permanent
6 repository.

7 Thanks.

8 MR. STORM: Thank you, Kristen.

9 Anyone else who hasn't -- anyone, I
10 guess?

11 Okay. I want to remind you that written
12 comments need to be submitted to my attention by the
13 close of business day on May 8th. And, again, you
14 can mail them to me, e-mail them to me, or use our
15 electronic commenting feature that we've added to
16 the website.

17 Other than that, I'd like to thank you
18 for coming. And my cards are on the table if you
19 need to chat with me. Please feel free to give me a
20 call. Thank you.

21 (Public comments concluded.)
22
23
24
25