

TurkeyPointCEm Resource

From: Jim Hunt [Jameshunt@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 5:26 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.

If any nuclear power generation of electricity is approved, then please approve breeder reactors for their small waste footprint, and require the use of closed steam systems, like a USN nuc sub, where no steam is wasted, steam is cooled and recycled. If land nuc plants did that then less water would be wasted for cooling. And for fossil fuel burning plants with recycled steam, no Mercury or nox, sox, or COx would be contributing to poor air quality, health and global environmental health of the climate.

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.

Sincerely,

Jim Hunt
11659 Wakefield Drive
Pensacola, FL 32514

Federal Register Notice: 80FR12043
Comment Number: 9420

Mail Envelope Properties (511790728.13120.1432070770566.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Support the "No Action" Alternative Re: NRC-2009-0337 Turkey Point 6 & 7
Expansion
Sent Date: 5/19/2015 5:26:10 PM
Received Date: 5/19/2015 5:26:40 PM
From: Jim Hunt

Created By: Jameschunt@cox.net

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

Post Office: vweb59.salsalabs.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2647	5/19/2015 5:26:40 PM

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