



Minnesota  
Environmental  
Partnership

Minnesota House Energy Finance and Policy Committee  
Chair Chris Swedzinski

February 10, 2025

Dear Chair Swedzinski and members,

On behalf of the Minnesota Environmental Partnership and the organizations signed below, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to share our views on HF 9. Our coalition has serious concerns about provisions in this bill that would needlessly weaken Minnesota's 100% carbon-free electricity law and unnecessarily divert time and resources from a successful energy transition.

First, HF 9 would declare that prioritizing carbon capture and sequestration would be the "policy of the state," at the expense of other carbon-free energy development. Carbon capture and sequestration is already included as an allowed technology under the 100% law, which takes a neutral stance on the value of various methods of getting to carbon-free. The state has no reason to introduce this type of prejudice, which could stunt the development of affordable, Minnesota-grown energy sources, into the 100% law.

Second, HF 9 introduces needless delays into a utility's compliance with the 100% carbon-free standard. It would create a three-year extension for the utility to comply with the standard if its electric rates do not fall below 5% of the national average. This extension could be repeated until that standard is met.

The 100% law already requires the Public Utilities Commission to consider extensions for the sake of affordability. This new provision for extensions is unnecessary and would further weaken the momentum toward affordable, Minnesota-grown clean energy.

Third, HF 9 would prevent retired power plants from being demolished and redeveloped. These sites, especially defunct coal plants, can be useful locations for new energy projects, industry, or other community assets. The decision to redevelop them should be left to site owners and local authorities.

Finally, HF 9 would divert additional momentum from the clean energy transition by lifting Minnesota's moratorium on new nuclear power. Existing nuclear power has its place in Minnesota's carbon-free transition, but new nuclear power plants are extremely costly to develop, and there are no proposals to do so in Minnesota. Additionally, Minnesota's two existing plants still do not have a long-term solution for storing their radioactive waste. This waste is currently placed in concrete casks onsite, including on land adjacent to the Prairie Island Indian Community. For these reasons, Minnesota's resources would be better spent on proven, lower-cost carbon-free solutions including wind, solar, and storage.

We are concerned that the talk and attention focused on resurrecting the outdated nuclear industry amounts to a distraction as we consider how to continue to move our state forward economically sound and just transition.

Thank you for considering these concerns regarding this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,



Steve Morse  
Executive Director

*Submitted on behalf of the organizations listed below.*

Bicycle Alliance of Minnesota

Izaak Walton League Minnesota Division

Lakeville Friends of the Environment\*

League of Women Voters Duluth

League of Women Voters Minnesota

Lutheran Advocacy Minnesota

Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy

Minnesota Well Owners Organization

MN350

Renewing the Countryside

Saint Paul Bird Alliance

Sierra Club North Star Chapter

Vote Climate

WaterLegacy

*\*denotes non-MEP member*