

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

SUNSI Review Complete
Template=ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03

ADD: Jessica Umana,
Antoinette Walker-Smith,
Mary Neely
Comment (1)
Publication Date: 3/3/2023
Citation: 88 FR 15103

As of: 4/20/23, 1:43 PM
Received: March 23, 2023
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1fl-ig01-dadl
Comments Due: April 10, 2023
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2023-0031

Northern States Power Company - Minnesota; Xcel Energy; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1

Comment On: NRC-2023-0031-0003

Notice of Intent To Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; Northern States Power Company—Minnesota; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1

Document: NRC-2023-0031-DRAFT-0001

Comment on FR Doc # 2023-04963

Submitter Information

Name: Bret Collier

Address:

Big Lake, MN, 55309

Email: rcbret@aol.com

Phone: 612-868-9714

General Comment

I graduated in 1985 with a degree in nuclear engineering. For the past 38 years I have worked at nuclear plants as either a full time employee or a consultant. My duties have ranged from overseeing Inservice Testing Programs, Parts Classification, Commercial Grade Dedication, Underground Piping, 50.59 screenings and evaluations, Temporary Modification evaluations, Inservice Testing management, procedure writer, Improved Technical Specifications implementation, etc. My primary goal through all of these and other responsibilities has been the safe operation of the plant so as to protect the general public from the potential release of radioactive material. This is done strictly through science and engineering.

I attended the March 22, 2023, Environmental Scoping Meeting related to the Monticello Nuclear Plant license renewal, to listen to the presentation. All was informative as expected and agreeable until we got to slide 15 of the presentation which listed a number of scoping topics/areas to be considered. Air Quality, Human Health, Water Resources, Geological Resources, Terrestrial Resources, and Land Use are all valid areas of interest when determining the environmental impact of operating this plant for an additional 20 years. However neither, "Historic and Cultural Resources" nor "Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice", have anything to do with the determination of the continued safe operation of a nuclear power facility. Safety is based upon engineering and science, not feelings or compassion. The ability to continue to produce electricity in a safe and effective manner has nothing to do with race or color or sex of the individuals working at the plant or in the community around the plant. The addition of these last two scoping buckets appears to be a result of the same "woke" bureaucratic influences that have led to Sam Brinton being appointed as the DOE deputy assistant secretary for spent fuel and waste disposition.

Therefore, my scoping comment is to simply concentrate on those scoping categories which have an impact on Nuclear Safety, and don't waste any time on superfluous topics. Thanks you.