

TurkeyPointCEm Resource

From: Charles Brexel Sr. [cbrexel@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 4:41 AM
To: TurkeyPointCOLEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Support the "No Action" Alternative Re: NRC-2009-0337 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Expansion

Along with probably more than 225 million Americans (i.e. 9 out of 10 Americans in recent surveys) who want more solar and wind power installed rather than more nuclear power and more than 20.236 million members and supporters of the supporting organizations listed below and more supporting organizations, I very strongly urge both agencies to please, right now, support the "No Action" alternative in reference to Docket ID: NRC-2009-0337.

We have serious concerns that the proposed expansion of FPL's Turkey Point could significantly impact and degrade the health of our national parks, sensitive ecological areas including extensive wetlands, federally listed threatened and endangered wildlife, and the quality and quantity of limited fresh water resources. We request that both agencies support the "No Action" alternative in reference to Docket ID: NRC-2009-0337.

The members and supporters of the supporting organizations for this letter include more than the listed members and supporters for each of the following organizations (more than 20.236 million total):

Credo Action - 3.5 million
Sierra Club - 2.4 million
National Audubon Society - 2 million
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) - 2 million World Wildlife Fund (WWF) - 1.09 million
Earthjustice - 1 million Environment America - 1 million The Nature Conservancy - 1 million
Defenders of Wildlife - 1 million Environmental Defense Fund - 1 million Clean Water Action - 1 million
Center for Biological Diversity - 825,000 League of Conservation Voters - 700,000
The Wilderness Society - 500,000 Public Citizen - 400,000 Greenpeace - 250,000 Friends of the Earth US - 210,200
Union of Concerned Scientists - 200,000 Southern Alliance for Clean Energy - 50,000
Physicians for Social Responsibility - 50,000 Waterkeeper Alliance - 24,000 South Florida Wildlands Association - 17,400
Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS) - 9,130 Beyond Nuclear - 8,990 Florida Consumer Action Network - 1,810

9 out of 10 Americans, including Republicans, Democrats and Independents, want more solar and wind power installed rather than using natural gas, coal, oil and nuclear power.

According to a comprehensive 12-year Harvard survey as of 1/1/15, 90% of all Americans, including Republicans, Democrats and Independents, said that they wanted solar and wind energy to increase and 80% of all Americans said that they wanted solar and wind energy to "increase a lot". It is at <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2015/01/01/americans-want-america-to-run-on-solar-and-wind/>

The Harvard study found that all Americans overwhelmingly prefer solar and wind power, rather than natural gas, coal, oil and nuclear power, because solar and wind power provide the least local pollution and health risk.

In addition, the market price evidence is overwhelmingly clear and compelling - nuclear power is an extremely more expensive energy solution. The US energy market continues to move, faster and faster, toward an extremely better value energy future, reliant on solar and wind, not extremely expensive and risky nuclear power.

On 9/19/14, a UBS report called nuclear power plants the “the DINOSAUR of the future energy system” and Amory Lovins, a physicist and chief scientist at the Rocky Mountain Institute, said that nuclear power was an “OBSOLETE technology”: “Banking giant UBS calls the big, slow, lumpy, expensive coal and nuclear plants “the dinosaur of the future energy system: Too big, too inflexible, not even relevant for backup power in the long run.” Such obsolete technologies are less at risk from regulatory mandates than from market defeat by a swarm of agile competitors that their promoters don’t even recognize.” It is at <http://www.forbes.com/sites/amorylovins/2014/09/19/micropowers-quiet-takeover/2/>

Nuclear power is clearly an obsolete and old technology. Nuclear power is clearly an energy of the past. Nuclear power is not where the overwhelming innovation in new energy technology is occurring.

As of 12/18/14, “It’s hardly surprising then that most of the major power companies and utilities in the European Union (EU) have backed away from nuclear, including SSE, RWE, Siemens and most recently E.ON, in favor of renewables.” It is at <http://ecowatch.com/2014/12/18/renewables-outpace-nuclear-energy/>

Solar and wind power are clearly the most innovative and newest technologies. Solar and wind power are, overwhelmingly, the energies of the present and future. Solar and wind power are where the overwhelming innovations and development are rapidly occurring.

As of 5/29/15, for the year so far, 84.1% of all new power installations at utility companies were solar power, wind power and other renewables. Natural gas power supplied the rest of the new power installations. It is at <http://safeenergy.org/2015/05/29/checking-in-on-the-energy-transition/>

Germany and Sweden continue to very rapidly decommission all of their nuclear power plants and to very rapidly transition to solar and wind power. France is also rapidly cutting down its amount of nuclear power and is also rapidly transitioning to solar and wind power.

California has only one, very old nuclear power plant left in operation and California is continuing to very rapidly transition to solar and wind power.

On 1/7/15, Governor Brown of CA called for increasing the state renewable portfolio standard (RPS) to 50% by 2030, reducing petroleum use in cars and trucks in California by 50%, and doubling building energy efficiency, all by 2030. Legislative bills will be decided on later in 2015. It is at <http://www.lawofrenewableenergy.com/2015/04/articles/renewable/governor-brown-announces-new-2030-greenhouse-gas-reduction-target-for-california/>

Since 2014 and earlier, Southern California Edison, Arizona Public Service, Tucson Electric Power, HECO, NRG Energy, Duke Energy, Southern Company, Georgia Power, and many other US electric power utility companies have all been quickly and massively ramping up their installations of zero carbon emission, clean energy such as solar and wind power. It is at <http://www.utilitydive.com/news/grid-edge-live-2015-the-trends-behind-the-explosion-in-distributed-resourc/401417/>

As of 6/11/15, Vermont has a law for electric utilities to be at 75% renewables by 2032 and at 55% renewables by 2017. It is at <http://www.utilitydive.com/news/new-vermont-law-mandates-75-renewables-by-2032-targets-residential-emissi/400777/> and <http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=21852>

As of 6/29/15, Governor Cuomo of NY presented an energy plan under NY's REV plan to be at 50% renewable energy by 2030. The Assembly has already passed a bill for the plan and the Senate bill is awaiting a vote. It is at <http://www.governorswindenergycoalition.org/?p=13551> and <file:///C:/Users/Charles/Downloads/2015-overview.pdf> and <http://energyplan.ny.gov/Plans/2014.aspx>

Effective 7/1/15, it is the law in Hawaii that 100% of its electricity come from renewables by 2045, with 30% by 2020, 40% by 2030 and 70% by 2040 as interim targets. It is at <http://www.utilitydive.com/news/100-renewables-by-2045-is-now-the-law-in-hawaii/400495/> and <http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=21852>

Nuclear power is clearly in rapid decline in use in the US and throughout the world, while solar and wind power are clearly and compellingly experiencing exponential growth for the next 25 years and longer.

It will be even harder and even more expensive to get parts, operation, maintenance, support and engineering services for nuclear power as the decline in the use of nuclear power plants continues to accelerate over the next couple of decades.

As of 7/5/15, it has already been costing our manufacturing industry, our businesses and our homeowners much less to buy solar power than natural gas, coal, oil, timber, biomass or nuclear power. And, it is expected to continue to cost them typically another 20% less per year for, at the least, the next few years. It is at <http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/markets/2015/07/05/motley-fool-solar-energy/29583021/>

As of 7/5/15, all bids for selling power from solar power utility-scale projects are now in the 4 cents to 5 cents per kWh range – this is much less than what it costs you to build a natural gas, coal, oil, timber, biomass or nuclear power plant. It is at <http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/markets/2015/07/05/motley-fool-solar-energy/29583021/>

As of 7/9/15, two bids for selling power from solar power utility-scale projects have now come in below 4 cents per kWh, with one bid coming in below 3.9 cents per kWh – this is much less than what it costs you to build a natural gas, coal, oil, timber, biomass or nuclear power plant. It is at <http://www.utilitydive.com/news/nv-energy-buys-utility-scale-solar-at-record-low-price-under-4-centskwh/401989/>

As of 6/23/15, the price of wholesale solar power has been forecasted by independent analysts at Bloomberg New Energy Finance to continue to decrease, at the least, for the next 25 years. It is at <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-23/renewables-to-beat-fossil-fuels-with-3-7-trillion-solar-boom>

As of 7/5/15, according to GTM Research, the cost of utility-scale solar projects has fallen 67% in the past five years, and is expected to fall another 44% in the next couple of years.

As of 7/5/15, “Since solar costs are beating those of competing energy sources, there are expectations of a boom in demand -- and it's going to be a global solar boom. GTM Research predicts that solar installations will triple to 135 GW annually by 2020.”

On 7/5/15, financial analyst Travis Hoium of The Motley Fool said: “We're past the point of no return -- solar energy will be the biggest new energy source in the future.”

As of 8/22/14, US wind power hit an all-time national average low purchase price of 2.5 cents per kWh – this is much less than what it costs you to build a natural gas, coal, oil, timber, biomass or nuclear power plant. It is at <http://www.theenergycollective.com/eric-wesoff/468266/price-us-wind-power-all-time-low-25-cents-kilowatt-hour>

As of 5/31/15, lawyers for Wal-Mart, a hospital group and a coalition of other ratepayers found that Florida utilities were buying Oklahoma wind power for just 2 cents per kilowatt hour: “Henry and the lawyers for OG&E’s corporate customers formed a kind of tag team, taking turns blasting the company for refusing to even study new wind power. They repeatedly pointed out that in-state competitors as well as Florida and New Mexico utilities were buying

Oklahoma wind for just 2 cents per kilowatt hour, even cheaper than coal without pollution controls, while OG&E hadn't purchased new wind in four years—even though its ads boasted about its commitment to wind. When its witnesses claimed their transmission lines were too congested to add new wind, Henry produced internal documents suggesting the congestion could be fixed for about 3 percent of the cost of the new coal scrubbers.”

<http://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2015/05/inside-war-on-coal-000002>

As of 3/12/15, the price of wholesale wind power will continue to decrease, at the least, for the next 10 years according to a Department of Energy report. It is at

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-03-12/wind-energy-without-subsidy-will-be-cheaper-than-gas-in-a-decade>

On 8/8/14, Amory Lovins, a physicist and chief scientist at the Rocky Mountain Institute, found that “Wind and solar become the most economical options while gas and nuclear become the least economical”. It is at <http://www.theenergycollective.com/eric-wesoff/468266/price-us-wind-power-all-time-low-25-cents-kilowatt-hour>

Further, FPL's proposed power from new nuclear reactors can more cost-effectively be met with demand side management programs. In meeting demand, energy efficiency measures meet demand at less than 3 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh)¹, while the proposed Turkey Point nuclear reactors will meet demand at a cost of more than 15 cents per kWh. It is at

http://www.cleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/F_SACE_CleanenergysolutionstoTurkeyPtreactors_040915.pdf

In addition, South Florida is highly vulnerable to continuing and worsening drought as climate change continues to worsen. New nuclear power requires extreme amounts of precious fresh water supplies. Solar and wind power do not require any use of precious fresh water supplies.

Nuclear power plants in Alabama and Tennessee and other states have been shut down because of drought. More nuclear power plants will be shut down when drought continues to get worse because of worsening climate change.

The proposed new nuclear reactors would also imperil fish larvae and other forms of aquatic life, which are strained from the water as it travels through thousands of metal tubes to become steam that turns the turbines to make electricity. A 2005 study found that one coastal power plant in Southern California destroyed nearly 3-and-a-half million fish in just one year.

The proposed additional, new nuclear reactors at FPL's Turkey Point would produce even more radioactive waste that would not decay for the next 250,000 years or more. Solar and wind power do not produce any radioactive pollution.

There are other energy choices that do not pose such risks, which are not properly studied in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Solar power has dropped in price and improved in quality whereas new nuclear reactors continue to increase in cost and have yet to actually be built. Energy efficiency is the lowest cost resource in meeting electricity demand—many times less expensive than these reactors that are approaching \$20 billion. Yet, FPL is doing almost nothing to expand energy efficiency or renewables, which are viable alternatives, nor is the Florida Public Service Commission making decisions that will expand these safer, more affordable options. Your agencies should not rely on their flawed utility planning process.

Clearly, South Florida is highly vulnerable to sea level rise and the impacts of climate change. This site was never an acceptable location for the Turkey Point facility there today and many decades later it has only become an even more unacceptable location. Complicating all of this, is that with no solution in sight for the long-term management of highly

radioactive nuclear waste, there is no reason to support the licensing of these proposed reactors.

For all of the above and more reasons, the proposed new nuclear reactors at FPL's Turkey Point are not in the interest of Floridians and are not in our national interest.

We strongly oppose the expansion of Turkey Point and strongly urge both agencies to please, right now, support the "No Action" alternative in reference to Docket ID: NRC-2009-0337.

Thank you for taking the time to seriously consider our requests.

Charles Brexel Sr.
12085 Wexford Overlook
Roswell, GA 30075

Federal Register Notice: 80FR12043
Comment Number: 10415

Mail Envelope Properties (422301228.33926.1437036077409.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Support the "No Action" Alternative Re: NRC-2009-0337
Turkey Point 6 & 7 Expansion
Sent Date: 7/16/2015 4:41:17 AM
Received Date: 7/16/2015 4:41:40 AM
From: Charles Brexel Sr.

Created By: cbrexel@aol.com

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

Post Office: vweb212

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	15037	7/16/2015 4:41:40 AM

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