

Welcome to Minnesota





Minnesota State Senator
Amanda Hemmingsen-Jaeger



Prairie Island Nuclear Plant



Monticello Nuclear Plant



100% by 2040

Minnesota's
renewable
energy goal





Minnesota State Representative
Shelley Buck



Minnesota's moratorium

Lift or maintain?

2010 constituent outreach on ending the nuclear moratorium



Dear Friends,

I'm looking for your input. I'm genuinely undecided about whether to consider expanding nuclear power as an energy source in Minnesota. Some people want to lift the current "moratorium" on construction of new nuclear power plants in our state. Others believe that the moratorium is proper. Both sides make some powerful arguments. Ultimately, we all want energy sources that are as clean, safe, and plentiful as possible.

Steve

State Representative
STEVE SIMON

Capitol Office:
375 State Office Building
100 Martin Luther King
St. Paul, MN 55155
(651) 296-9889

Home: (952) 920-1611
rep.steve.simon@house.mn
www.house.mn/44A



Capitol Contact
by State Representative Steve Simon
2010, Volume II

Should We Consider Nuclear Energy?

Nuclear Power in Minnesota

Minnesota has two functioning nuclear power plants—at Monticello and at Prairie Island. In 1994, as part of a deal to allow expanded nuclear waste storage, Minnesota enacted a "moratorium" (a ban) on the construction of new nuclear facilities. Today, some people want to lift the moratorium in order to start a discussion about possibly expanding nuclear power in Minnesota.

Arguments For Lifting the Moratorium

- Nuclear energy is clean. It emits no carbon into the atmosphere.
- Nuclear energy is renewable, so it would reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.
- Nuclear energy is safe and highly regulated. We've never had a "meltdown" at a U.S. nuclear plant.
- Construction of new nuclear facilities will provide jobs.
- Lifting the moratorium would simply allow us to have an honest discussion about nuclear power; it wouldn't mandate construction of any new nuclear plant.

Arguments Against Lifting the Moratorium

- Nuclear energy creates dangerous waste, which stays radioactive for thousands of years.
- There is no comprehensive solution for storing nuclear waste. A national "repository," suggested by some as a solution, would require transporting the waste across the country—at potential risk of an accident or an attack.
- The consequences of a nuclear accident are not worth the risk.
- Nuclear power is expensive to produce, and relies heavily on federal subsidies.
- Construction of new nuclear plants would distract us from the promise of emerging technologies like solar and wind power.

I'm looking for your comments on this issue.

As always, please feel free to contact me about any issue, idea, or concern.



Thank You!