

ENCLOSURE 2

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE ALTERNATIVE SITES SELECTION ANALYSIS FOR
FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT'S TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 & 7 COMBINED LICENSE
APPLICATION
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2013
1:30 PM – 4:00 PM

COMMENTS AT PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE ALTERNATIVE SITES SELECTION ANALYSIS FOR FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT'S TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 AND 7 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2013 IN HOMESTEAD, FLORIDA

1) FPL did not consider the decentralized, distributed production of energy on homes and business using solar, wind, geothermal or any other emerging technologies. The cost of solar is one third of what it was only five or six years ago; you can put solar on a home in Florida for as little as \$15,000. The economic potential of such a course of action is in excess of \$100 Billion in Florida alone, \$1 Trillion nationally. Distributed production will reduce demand on the grid, a good thing considering all of its negative attributes: subject to solar storms, hurricanes, terrorism; unsightly, expensive, linked to Alzheimer's and childhood leukemia. The grid is 19th century technology in the 21st century. Local residents and municipalities in South Florida are engaged in protracted and expensive law suits opposing the placement of power lines along major thoroughfares and in and near Everglades National Park.

2) There does not seem to be a provision in the EIS for the impact of the environment on the production facility. At Turkey Point, hurricanes, storm surge and sea level rise can wipeout the entire site. Turkey Point has never, repeat never, experienced a storm higher than Category 3, despite FPL'S obfuscation to the contrary. Hurricane Andrew's maximum winds passed 15 to 20 miles to the north; storm surge at Turkey Point was about 4 feet; to the north it was 12 to 15 feet with sustained winds of 140 MPH. A direct hit by a real Florida hurricane will wipe Turkey Point out.

3) Respected authorities predict that Turkey Point will be under water by the end of the century, if not before. Turkey Point should be totally abandoned as a place to produce energy. Here is a current report:

<http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/03/09/3277234/deep-trouble-how-sea-rise-could.html>

3) FPL's statement that local residents are in support of Turkey Point 6 & 7 is presented without documentation or methodology. How do they define "local". It should include the entire 50 mile Potential Contamination Zone. A survey of residents in that entire area should be required before the EIS is accepted. When they take into account that timely evacuation from Homestead is impossible (*all residents will be toast in one hour*) because there are only two roads out and the shadow evacuation to the north will block any timely exit. Even FPL's emergency evacuation review says it will take residents 2 to 6 hours to get ready and up to 11 hours for a full evacuation. Putting two more reactors at Turkey Point could be construed as, best, irresponsible, and, at worst, criminal. Does anyone ever wonder why FPL moved its offices from Turkey Point to Jupiter years ago?

4) Demand for energy is dropping in South Florida. The economy (for five successive years) and the permanent, not-visitor population are declining. Current estimates of need are based on pre-2007 figures which are woefully out of date, and wrong., South Florida is still clawing its way back from the 2009 recession, and very slowly.

5) FPL has said that Turkey Point 6 & 7 will cost \$18 Billion. We have to assume that that is the over night cost: actual cost will be at least 50% higher, about \$27 Billion or \$6500 on average for every one of FPL's 4.4 million homes or about 3% of the value of each home. And, if demand is not here, who will pay for these White Elephants. or their disorderly decommissioning; there is not enough money for doing so for 6 & 7. The customers and/or the government will have to foot the bill. And a new \$27 Billion facility, paid for by the rate payers, would become the property of NextEra Energy, more than doubling its market cap.

6) Turkey Point sits on ecologically sensitive wetland above the Florida Aquifer, between two national parks, on the edge of the largest fish hatchery in the nation, above the entire water supply for the Florida Keys and all of south Miami-Dade County. How prudent is it to place energy production in such an environmentally sensitive area? It is not; it is madness.

7) The tenor and quality of the FPL EIS statements and conclusions are perfunctory, dismissive and unsupported by hard research. In every case, alternative energies or sites are found to be lacking as to technology or favorable physical characteristics. Only Turkey Point is acceptable to FPL.

8) Fukushima was not an accident. It was an actuarial event waiting to happen occasioned by the collusion of the regulators and the regulated. How else can one explain placing six nuclear reactors in a seismically active area subject to tsunamis at sea level? About as hard to understand as placing nuclear, or any power source, at sea level on Biscayne Bay. It is time to stop FPL as an economic juggernaut. They are charged with bringing affordable and safe energy to our homes, businesses and institutions. While FPL rates are, for now, low, seeking to place two more reactors at Turkey Point in harm's way is not in keeping with their charged functions.

9) Water. 95 to 125 MGD! How does one withdraw that much water from an ecosystem where 5.5 million people are on permanent water rationing? And how can we authorize anyone to force the used water into the boulder zone when we really do not know where it will go especially when we do know that the aquifer is interconnected and the water re-introduced to it could go anywhere. Can anyone assure that putting reactors 6 & 7 at Turkey Point will not destroy the water supply for the entire area? And what would be the impact of withdrawing that much water from beneath Biscayne Bay where it is also connected to the aquifer? Given these concerns, can anyone say that Turkey Point is an appropriate site for new reactors?

CONCLUSION: THE BEST SITE FOR REACTORS 6 & 7 IS NOT TURKEY POINT.

They really are not needed, Turkey Point is too dangerous and environmentally sensitive; they are too expensive; sustainable alternative energy is available and feasible. Producing energy at one point and sending it over wires is what Edison did 130 years ago; long past time for a change. Put energy production at the point of use. Nuclear energy is not the only answer; the other forms of sustainable energy should be considered more fully than FPL did in this study.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry J. White

President, CASE, Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc.

10001 SW 129 Terrace, Miami, FL 33176 305-251-1960 bwtamia@bellsouth.net

Turkey Point...the future **Atlantis**



CASE Citizens Allied for Safe Energy | CASE-FL.org

I'm a student at FIU and I'm concerned about the expansion of nuclear power at Turkey point, as the area is at elevation zero when sea level rise is imminent. At a Nuclear Regulatory Commission hearing regarding nuclear waste last week, an industry representative cited Fukushima as an example of why we shouldn't build nuclear reactors at sea level. Also, I believe that the proposed site is between two natural parks, and they would be at risk of being polluted.

-Bianca Polini

