

August 8, 2020

Diana Diaz-Toro, Acting Chief  
Environmental Review Materials Branch  
Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

RE: NSP/Excel Energy Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant – Docket Number: 72-10  
Proposed Materials License Amendment for the Prairie Island Independent Spent Fuel Storage  
Installation  
Welch, Goodhue County  
SHPO Number: 2019-0741

Dear Ms. Diaz-Toro,

Thank you for continuing consultation with our office regarding the above federal undertaking. Information received in our office via email on May 28, 2020 has been reviewed pursuant to the responsibilities given the State Historic Preservation Officer under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and implementing federal regulations at 36 CFR Part 800.

We last wrote to your agency on January 24, 2020 requesting additional information and documentation in support of Section 106 determinations and findings. We have now completed a review of your response letter dated May 28, 2020. We appreciate your agency's thorough consideration of our previous comments and your patience as it has taken our office extended time to review the submission while continuing to work remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our comments are provided below.

**Define Federal Undertaking and Area of Potential Effect**

We understand by your May 28<sup>th</sup> letter that the federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 is your agency's approval of an amendment to the current Materials License for the Prairie Island Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation in order to increase to the maximum amount of spent nuclear fuel stored at the site.

Based upon our understanding of the scope and nature of the federal undertaking, we agree that your agency's definition of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), as described and documented in your May 28<sup>th</sup> submission, is appropriate to take into account the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed undertaking.

**Identification of Historic Properties**

We appreciate the extensive narrative provided in your May 28<sup>th</sup> letter as it pertains to agency efforts to identify historic properties within the APE, which included consideration of both previous archaeological

survey results as well as consultation with the Prairie Island Indian Community and other invited American Indian tribes. We agree that these efforts, which resulted in the identification of no historic properties, including any properties of cultural and religious significance to tribes, as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the APE, is appropriate.

**Finding of Effect**

Based upon information provided to our office at this time, we concur with your agency's finding that **no historic properties will be affected** by the federal undertaking, as it is currently defined.

Implementation of the undertaking in accordance with this finding, as documented, fulfills your agency's responsibilities for consultation with our office pursuant to Section 106. If your agency does not approve the undertaking as proposed, including, but not limited to, a situation where design changes to the currently proposed project diverts substantially from what was presented at the time of this review, or design changes involving undisturbed ground are made for the undertaking following completion of this review, then your agency will need to reopen Section 106 consultation with our office and other consulting parties.

Please contact me at 651-201-3290 or [sarah.beimers@state.mn.us](mailto:sarah.beimers@state.mn.us) if you have any questions regarding this comment letter.

Sincerely,



Sarah J. Beimers  
Environmental Review Program Manager

Cc via email:

Jean Trefethen, Nuclear Regulatory Commission