

TurkeyPointCEm Resource

From: Lisa Kasenow [kasenow@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:17 PM
To: TurkeyPointCOLEIS Resource
Subject: Support the "No Action" Alternative Re: NRC-2009-0337 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Expansion

In reference to Docket ID: NRC-2009-0337, I oppose FPL's proposal to build two more nuclear reactors at their Turkey Point site in South Florida. I request that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers support the "No Action" alternative. Within six miles of the proposed expansion site, there are two national parks, the Everglades and Biscayne, an aquatic preserve, a national wildlife refuge, and a wetland habitat preserve. This area is also extremely vulnerable to sea level rise and the impacts of climate change. Turkey Point was never a "good" site to develop an expansive power plant; decades later it is only more clear that this is a wholly unacceptable location.

Another reason to support the "No Action" alternative is that there is no need for the proposed ~\$20 billion reactors – the fact that they have been delayed several times and the in-service date pushed back at least ten years is just one indication. The fact that FPL will not commit to actually completing the project is clearly another. Further, the NRC's reliance on Florida Public Service Commission orders and the state's utility resource planning process is badly misplaced. The alleged need for the new reactors is the product of a disjointed state utility planning process that the NRC should not rely on. Instead, the NRC must look more closely at energy efficiency and renewables to meet the projected need.

I am greatly concerned about the large impacts Turkey Point has already had on the quantity and quality of limited freshwater resources, a situation that will only worsen with more reactors. The withdrawal of massive amounts of water from under Biscayne Bay as back-up cooling water could increase salinity levels within the Bay and hasten saltwater intrusion into limited freshwater supplies—the full impacts of which have not been thoroughly analyzed in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. I support the "No Action" alternative given the project's potentially widespread negative environmental and public health and safety impacts. The EIS also fails to analyze impact of particulate drift from the nuclear cooling towers. The impact cannot be known at this time because the chemical content of the drift is unknown.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kasenow
998 Fish Crow Road
Sanibel, FL 33957

Federal Register Notice: 80FR12043
Comment Number: 9017

Mail Envelope Properties (2020829020.10923.1431969394450.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Support the "No Action" Alternative Re: NRC-2009-0337 Turkey Point 6 & 7
Expansion
Sent Date: 5/18/2015 1:16:34 PM
Received Date: 5/18/2015 1:16:36 PM
From: Lisa Kasenow

Created By: kasenow@embarqmail.com

Recipients:
"TurkeyPointCOLEIS Resource" <TurkeyPointCOLEIS.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: vweb45

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2323	5/18/2015 1:16:36 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: