

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**CHAPTER 4: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|             |   |        |
|-------------|---|--------|
| 4.0         | ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION .....   | 4.0-1  |
| 4.1         | LAND USE IMPACTS .....  | 4.1-1  |
| 4.1.1       | THE SITE AND VICINITY .....   | 4.1-1  |
| 4.1.1.1     | The Site .....  | 4.1-1  |
| 4.1.1.2     | The Vicinity .....  | 4.1-4  |
| 4.1.2       | TRANSMISSION CORRIDORS AND OFFSITE FACILITIES AND AREAS .....                               | 4.1-4  |
| 4.1.2.1     | Proposed Transmission Corridors .....   | 4.1-4  |
| 4.1.2.2     | Offsite Substations .....   | 4.1-7  |
| 4.1.2.3     | FPL-Owned Fill Source .....   | 4.1-8  |
| 4.1.2.4     | Makeup and Potable Water Systems .....  | 4.1-9  |
| 4.1.2.5     | Access Roadways .....   | 4.1-10 |
| 4.1.3       | HISTORIC PROPERTIES .....   | 4.1-11 |
| 4.1.3.1     | Onsite Facilities and Construction Areas .....  | 4.1-12 |
| 4.1.3.2     | Offsite Transmission Line Corridors .....   | 4.1-12 |
| 4.1.3.3     | Other Offsite Areas .....   | 4.1-13 |
| 4.1.3.4     | Discovery Provisions .....  | 4.1-13 |
| Section 4.1 | References .....  | 4.1-14 |
| 4.2         | WATER-RELATED IMPACTS .....   | 4.2-1  |
| 4.2.1       | HYDROLOGIC ALTERATIONS .....  | 4.2-1  |
| 4.2.1.1     | Onsite Facilities .....   | 4.2-2  |
| 4.2.1.2     | Offsite Facilities .....  | 4.2-14 |
| 4.2.2       | WATER USE IMPACTS .....   | 4.2-22 |
| 4.2.2.1     | Surface Water .....   | 4.2-22 |
| 4.2.2.2     | Groundwater .....   | 4.2-22 |
| 4.2.3       | WATER-QUALITY IMPACTS .....   | 4.2-24 |
| 4.2.3.1     | Surface Water .....   | 4.2-25 |
| 4.2.3.2     | Groundwater .....   | 4.2-26 |
| Section 4.2 | References .....  | 4.2-26 |
| 4.3         | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS .....  | 4.3-1  |
| 4.3.1       | TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEMS .....  | 4.3-3  |
| 4.3.1.1     | Potential Impacts to the Units 6 & 7 Plant Area and Other Plant Property<br>Areas .....     | 4.3-3  |
| 4.3.1.2     | Potential Impacts of Makeup Water Systems .....   | 4.3-10 |
| 4.3.1.3     | Potential Impacts to Offsite Areas .....  | 4.3-12 |
| 4.3.1.4     | Summary .....   | 4.3-15 |
| 4.3.2       | AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS - CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS .....   | 4.3-16 |
| 4.3.2.1     | General Impacts to Aquatic Resources .....  | 4.3-16 |
| 4.3.2.2     | Potential Impacts to the Units 6 & 7 Plant Area and Other Onsite Aquatic<br>Resources ..... | 4.3-18 |
| 4.3.2.3     | Potential Impacts to Offsite Aquatic Resources .....  | 4.3-22 |
| 4.3.2.4     | Summary .....   | 4.3-27 |
| Section 4.3 | References .....  | 4.3-30 |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**CHAPTER 4 TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)**

|         |   |        |
|---------|---|--------|
| 4.4     | SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS.....  | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.1   | PHYSICAL IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION .....                                      | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.1.1 | Noise .....   | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.1.2 | Air .....   | 4.4-3  |
| 4.4.1.3 | Aesthetics .....  | 4.4-5  |
| 4.4.1.4 | Traffic.....  | 4.4-7  |
| 4.4.1.5 | Conclusion.....   | 4.4-8  |
| 4.4.2   | SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS .....   | 4.4-8  |
| 4.4.2.1 | Demography .....  | 4.4-10 |
| 4.4.2.2 | Impacts to the Community.....   | 4.4-13 |
| 4.4.3   | ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.....  | 4.4-46 |
| 4.4.3.1 | Health and Environmental Impacts.....                                       | 4.4-47 |
| 4.4.3.2 | Socioeconomic Impacts.....  | 4.4-48 |
|         | Section 4.4 References.....   | 4.4-53 |
| 4.5     | RADIATION EXPOSURE TO CONSTRUCTION WORKERS .....                            | 4.5-1  |
| 4.5.1   | SITE LAYOUT .....   | 4.5-1  |
| 4.5.2   | RADIATION SOURCES .....   | 4.5-1  |
| 4.5.3   | CONSTRUCTION WORKER DOSES .....   | 4.5-2  |
| 4.5.3.1 | Gaseous Effluent Doses.....   | 4.5-2  |
| 4.5.3.2 | Direct Radiation Doses.....   | 4.5-3  |
| 4.5.3.3 | Total Doses .....   | 4.5-3  |
|         | Section 4.5 References.....   | 4.5-4  |
| 4.6     | MEASURES AND CONTROLS TO LIMIT ADVERSE IMPACTS DURING<br>CONSTRUCTION ..... | 4.6-1  |
| 4.7     | CUMULATIVE IMPACTS RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.....                  | 4.7-1  |
| 4.7.1   | LAND USE.....   | 4.7-2  |
| 4.7.2   | HYDROLOGY AND WATER USE.....  | 4.7-3  |
| 4.7.2.1 | Surface Water.....  | 4.7-3  |
| 4.7.2.2 | Groundwater.....  | 4.7-4  |
| 4.7.2.3 | Water Use.....  | 4.7-4  |
| 4.7.2.4 | Water Quality.....  | 4.7-4  |
| 4.7.3   | ECOLOGY (TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC) .....                                     | 4.7-5  |
| 4.7.3.1 | Terrestrial .....   | 4.7-5  |
| 4.7.3.2 | Aquatic.....  | 4.7-6  |
| 4.7.4   | SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES.....  | 4.7-7  |
| 4.7.5   | SUMMARY .....   | 4.7-10 |
|         | Section 4.7 References.....   | 4.7-10 |
| 4.8     | NONRADIOLOGICAL HEALTH IMPACTS .....  | 4.8-1  |
| 4.8.1   | PUBLIC HEALTH.....  | 4.8-1  |
| 4.8.2   | OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH .....   | 4.8-1  |
|         | Section 4.8 References.....   | 4.8-1  |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**CHAPTER 4 LIST OF TABLES**

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Title</u>   |
|---------------|--|
| 4.3-1         | Turkey Point Property Disturbed Area FLUCCS Summary  |
| 4.4-1         | Assumptions for Workforce Characterization During Peak Construction Period, Units 6 & 7  |
| 4.4-2         | Direct and Indirect Employment, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period   |
| 4.4-3         | Industry Sector Direct and Indirect Employment, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period   |
| 4.4-4         | In-migrating Construction Worker Wages, by Construction Month, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period                                |
| 4.4-5         | In-migrating Construction Worker Wages, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period   |
| 4.4-6         | In-migrating Construction Worker Wages by Year, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period   |
| 4.4-7         | In-Migrating Operations Worker Wages by Month, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period  |
| 4.4-8         | In-migrating Operations Worker Wages, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period   |
| 4.4-9         | In-migrating Operations Worker Wages by Year, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period   |
| 4.4-10        | In-Migrating Construction and Operations Worker Wages, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period  |
| 4.4-11        | In-migrating Construction and Operations Worker Wages by Year, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period                                |
| 4.4-12        | Not Used   |
| 4.4-13        | Estimated Sales Tax Impacts, Miami-Dade County and Florida, Construction Period  |
| 4.4-14        | Potential Sales Tax Impacts, Miami-Dade County and Florida   |
| 4.4-15        | Population Increases Related to In-migrating Workers, Miami-Dade County and the Homestead and Florida City Area, Construction Period |
| 4.4-16a       | FPL Tangible Personal Property Taxes for Turkey Point Plant, Miami-Dade County, School District, and Special Tax Districts, 2010     |
| 4.4-16b       | Existing Traffic Conditions (peak hour) for U.S. Highway 1 and Florida's Turnpike  |
| 4.4-16c       | Construction PM Peak Link Analysis   |
| 4.4-16d       | Level of Service (LOS) Achieved at Affected Intersections During Peak Construction Period, with Improvements                         |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**CHAPTER 4 LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)**

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Title</u>  |
|---------------|---|
| 4.4-17        | Public Water: Change in Use and Capacity with Population Increase and Construction  |
| 4.4-18        | Wastewater Capacity in the Miami-Dade County  |
| 4.4-19        | Law Enforcement Needs, Adjusted for Workforce Related Increases in Population, Miami-Dade County and the Homestead/Florida City Area, Construction Period |
| 4.4-20        | Fire Protection Needs, Adjusted for Workforce Related Increases in Population, Miami-Dade County and the Homestead/Florida City Area, Construction Period |
| 4.5-1         | Units 6 & 7 Construction Area Dose Rates from Units 3 & 4 Gaseous Effluents   |
| 4.5-2         | Unit 6 Gaseous Effluent Pathway Parameters  |
| 4.5-3         | Unit 7 Construction Area Dose Rates from Unit 6 Gaseous Effluents   |
| 4.5-4         | Gaseous Effluent Doses to Unit 7 Construction Workers   |
| 4.5-5         | Total Doses to Unit 7 Construction Workers  |
| 4.5-6         | Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 10 CFR 20.1201 Criteria for Occupational Doses   |
| 4.5-7         | Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 10 CFR 20.1301 Criteria for Members of the Public  |
| 4.5-8         | Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 40 CFR 190.10 Criteria for Members of the Public   |
| 4.5-9         | Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I Criteria for Individuals in an Unrestricted Area                                  |
| 4.6-1         | Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction   |
| 4.6-2         | Separation of Preconstruction and Construction Impacts  |
| 4.7-1         | Geographic Areas Used in Cumulative Analysis  |
| 4.7-2         | Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)  |
| 4.7-3         | Summary of Adverse Cumulative Impacts   |
| 4.8-1         | Estimated Total Recordable Cases (TRCs)   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**CHAPTER 4 LIST OF FIGURES**

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Title</u>                             |
|---------------|--|
| 4.3-1         | Turkey Point Disturbed Area              |
| 4.4-1         | Wage Impact by Year (Multiplier Applied) |
| 4.4-2         | Traffic Study of Construction Entrance   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION

Chapter 4 presents the potential environmental impacts of construction of Units 6 & 7. Impacts are analyzed, and a single significance level of potential impact to each resource (i.e., SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE) is assigned consistent with the criteria that NRC established in 10 CFR 51, Appendix B, Table B-1, Footnote 3 as follows:

SMALL — Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource. For the purposes of assessing radiological impacts, the Commission has concluded that those impacts that do not exceed permissible levels in the Commission's regulations are considered small.

MODERATE — Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, any important attribute of the resource.

LARGE — Environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize any important attributes of the resource.

This chapter is divided into eight sections:

- Land Use Impacts ([Section 4.1](#))
- Water-Related Impacts ([Section 4.2](#))
- Ecological Impacts ([Section 4.3](#))
- Socioeconomic Impacts ([Section 4.4](#))
- Radiation Exposure to Construction Workers ([Section 4.5](#))
- Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts During Construction ([Section 4.6](#))
- Cumulative Impacts Related to Construction Activities ([Section 4.7](#))
- Nonradiological Health Impacts ([Section 4.8](#))

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

## 4.1 LAND USE IMPACTS

The following subsections describe the potential impacts of construction of Units 6 & 7 and associated facilities on land use. Based on NUREG-1555 guidance, the assessment of potential impacts is differentiated according to geographic area: (1) impacts to land use on the Turkey Point plant property (defined as the “site” for this section) and within a six-mile radius of Units 6 & 7 (defined as the “vicinity” of the site) as a result of construction activities ([Subsection 4.1.1](#)) and (2) impacts to land use at the specific area locations of construction activities for the associated transmission line corridors and other project facilities that are outside the Turkey Point plant property (defined as “offsite”) and may or may not be located in whole or in part within the vicinity of the site ([Subsection 4.1.2](#)). The assessment of project land use impacts also includes a separate assessment of potential impacts to historic and cultural resources ([Subsection 4.1.3](#)).

### 4.1.1 THE SITE AND VICINITY

#### 4.1.1.1 The Site

##### 4.1.1.1.1 Site Conditions and Construction Activities

Units 6 & 7 and their associated infrastructure, including the mechanical draft cooling towers, makeup water reservoir, substation, deep injection wells, associated buildings, etc. would be located on the approximately 218-acre Units 6 & 7 plant area. A temporary concrete batch plant would also be constructed on the plant area for use during construction ([Figure 3.9-1](#)).

As described in [Sections 2.2](#) and [2.4](#), the Units 6 & 7 plant area presently consist of hypersaline mudflats (majority of the plant area), open water, dwarf mangroves, uplands and wetlands, man-made remnant canals, mangrove heads, and fill areas/roadways. Specific land use classes include 0.30 acres of streams and waterways/canals, 8.38 acres of ditches, 12.14 acres of mangrove heads, 182.05 acres of non-vegetated wetlands, 6.35 acres of spoils area, and 9.05 acres of wetland spoils area. [Table 4.3-1](#) summarizes the land use for disturbances within the plant area, based on [Table 3.9-2](#). The plant area has been previously disturbed by construction and operational activities associated with the other Turkey Point Units. The plant area has been isolated from tidal water influence as a result of the isolation afforded by the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. Construction plans are for the entire 218-acre plant area to be disturbed, as described in [Section 3.9](#). The plant area would be permanently occupied during Units 6 & 7 operation.

Additional supporting facilities and infrastructure would be constructed on the Turkey Point plant property. These facilities and infrastructure include laydown areas (including transmission and radial collector well areas), parking areas, nuclear and administration buildings, heavy haul road, equipment barge unloading area improvements, radial collector wells and pipelines, FPL reclaimed water treatment facility and pipelines, security buildings, onsite transmission

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

infrastructure improvements, potable water pipelines, bridge improvements/construction, access road improvements, and spoils areas. Most of the construction of the associated facilities and infrastructure necessary for Units 6 & 7 construction and operation would be on previously disturbed land resulting from construction and operation of Units 1 through 5. Major construction related land disturbances are identified in [Section 3.9](#) (See [Table 3.9-2](#)). Permanent above grade facilities would be the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility, nuclear and administration buildings and associated parking lots, spoils areas, laydown areas, heavy haul road, equipment barge unloading area, and the radial collector well area. Temporary construction disturbance includes the below grade installation of potable water, reclaimed water, and radial collector well pipelines.

#### 4.1.1.1.2 Regulatory Requirements

##### **Federal Requirements**

As described in [Section 2.4](#), no farmland exists on the Units 6 & 7 plant area, and, therefore, no prime or unique farmland, as defined in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. Section 4201(b)) occurs on the plant area. Agricultural land comprises 2857.46 acres of land use within the 6-mile vicinity of the Turkey Point plant property ([Figure 2.2-4](#); [Table 2.2-2](#)). The land acreage with use/cover designation of agricultural in the vicinity is concentrated in an area adjacent to the west-northwest corner of the plant property within Miami-Dade County. An assessment of soil types in the area of the plant property indicated that no prime farmland, as defined in the Farmland Protection Act (7 U.S.C. Section 4201(b)) occurs on the Turkey Point plant property or in the 6-mile vicinity. In addition, there is no indication of unique farmland (i.e., used for the production of specific high value foods and fiber crops) in the 6-mile vicinity. Further discussion of agriculture in the four-county region surrounding the Turkey Point plant property is provided in [Subsection 2.2.3](#).

The Florida Coastal Management Act (§380.205-380.27, Florida Statutes) authorizes the Coastal Zone Management Section of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to certify consistency with the Florida Coastal Management Program for all federal licenses, permits, activities, and projects, when such activities affect land or water use.

##### **State of Florida Requirements**

The Florida National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Permitting Program (Rule 62-621.300(5)(a), F.A.C.), the EPA-FDEP (joint) Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Large and Small Construction Activities ([Table 1.2-1](#)) (Rule 62-621-300(4)(a) F.A.C), other regulatory guidance, and standard industry practices would be followed to minimize erosion and sedimentation effects and protect receiving waters and downstream areas.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

### **Miami-Dade County Requirements**

As described in [Section 2.2](#), the Turkey Point plant property is zoned as GU, Interim District. On the Comprehensive Development Master Plan, Future Land Use Plan Map, the plant property has dual land use designations of Institutional, Utilities, and Communications and Environmental Protection Subarea F. Nuclear reactors are a permitted use in the GU zoning district, provided an Unusual Use Variance is obtained. In 2007, FPL submitted an application to Miami-Dade County for an Unusual Use Variance, several Non-Use Variances, and appropriate modifications to preexisting resolutions for two additional nuclear power plants (atomic reactors) and ancillary structures and equipment.

On December 20, 2007, the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners approved FPL's application (Resolution Z-56-07), designating the public hearing subject property as Environmental Protection Subarea F and making the project subject to certain requirements.

### **Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

As stated in [Subsection 2.2.1](#), FPL owns all of the property within the Turkey Point plant property boundary with the exception of certain encumbrances on portions of the property, specifically, certain canal, drainage, reclamation, oil, gas, and mineral rights reservations held by the Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida, and a canal reservation held by Miami-Dade County. Currently, there are no known oil or gas wells nor any sand or rock mining located within the Turkey Point plant property boundaries. Therefore, there would be no known impacts to oil, gas, or mineral resources from project construction activities.

Site preparation and construction activities for Units 6 & 7 would be conducted in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. FPL would acquire the necessary permits and authorizations, and would implement environmental controls such as stormwater management systems, fugitive dust control, and spill containment controls before earth-disturbing activities begin. Site preparation and construction activities affecting land use include clearing, grubbing, grading and excavating, dewatering, and stockpiling soils. Permanently disturbed locations would be stabilized and contoured in accordance with design specifications. When necessary, revegetation would comply with site maintenance and safety requirements. Methods to stabilize areas and prevent erosion or sedimentation would comply with applicable laws, regulations, and permit requirements; good engineering and construction practices; and recognized environmental best management practices.

Mitigation measures, designed to lessen the impact of construction activities, would be specific to erosion control, dust control, controlled plant access for personnel and vehicular traffic, and restricted construction zones. Initial site preparation work would consist of clearing, excavating, grading, and fill. Grading and drainage would be designed to minimize erosion during the

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

construction period. The spoils storage areas would be graded and bermed (e.g., lip berm) to minimize the amount of drainage from the spoils into the industrial wastewater facility. While water quality treatment is not required, sediment control devices such as hay bales or gravel filters may be used to ensure sediment from the spoils does not physically impact the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility.

Because construction activities would only affect the majority of land that has already been disturbed and protective measures are required during construction activities in accordance with the Miami-Dade County Unusual Use Permit, the impacts to land use of the Turkey Point plant property from construction would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

#### 4.1.1.2 The Vicinity

Land within the vicinity of Units 6 & 7 is predominantly wetlands and forestland (Table 2.2-2, Figure 2.2-4), including environmentally protected areas as designated by the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Biscayne National Park is immediately north and east of Turkey Point. Also, a small portion of the state-designated, 75,000-acre Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve lies outside of the national park boundaries. Homestead Bayfront Park is located adjacent to Biscayne National Park. The Model Lands Basin, an SFWMD Save Our Rivers acquisition, is located in the vicinity to the west of the Turkey Point plant property. The FPL-owned Everglades Mitigation Bank is adjacent to most of the western and southern boundaries of the Turkey Point plant property.

No land use impacts would occur to recreational or protected areas in the 6-mile vicinity. Most temporary and permanent facilities associated with Units 6 & 7 would be contained within the Turkey Point plant property boundaries, and construction activities for these facilities are not expected to impact land use in nearby park areas. Additionally, the Miami-Dade Unusual Use Resolution Z-56-07 stipulates several mitigative actions/plans to minimize impacts to the vicinity.

### 4.1.2 TRANSMISSION CORRIDORS AND OFFSITE FACILITIES AND AREAS

This subsection addresses the land use impacts from construction activities associated with the preferred transmission corridors, offsite substations, fill borrow areas, and makeup water systems.

#### 4.1.2.1 Proposed Transmission Corridors

As described in Subsection 3.7.3, FPL has undertaken a route selection process to choose the transmission corridors that will be submitted for approval under the Florida Electrical Power Plant Siting Act (PPSA; §403.501-518, F.S). As part of the selection process, the state approves a corridor and the transmission line right-of-way is determined after state certification. The objective of the corridor selection process is to select a certifiable corridor that balances land use,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

socioeconomic, environmental, engineering, and cost considerations. The siting criteria included land use considerations to minimize potential disruption to such areas as national, state, and county parks; wildlife refuges; estuarine sanctuaries; landmarks; and historical sites. Also, the route selection process minimizes land use impacts by seeking opportunities to collocate with existing linear features (e.g., farm roads, canals, railroads, FPL transmission lines, other transportation rights-of-way, etc.).

New transmission lines for Units 6 & 7 would be built within Miami-Dade County. The proposed corridors for these transmission lines are described in [Sections 2.2](#) and [3.7](#), and are shown in [Figure 2.2-5](#). The land use along these proposed transmission line corridors are identified in [Tables 2.2-3](#) and [2.2-4](#).

Where practicable, new transmission lines would be routed in existing corridors owned by FPL and routed adjacent to existing transmission lines or other existing linear facilities (e.g., access roads, transportation routes) to minimize impacts.

Miami-Dade County Unusual Use Resolution Z-56-07, Condition 20, requires that impacts to any Miami-Dade County-designated natural forest community, as a result of any FPL transmission corridor improvement, are to be minimized and consistent with County natural forest community standards and requirements ([Section 4.3](#)).

As described in [Section 2.2](#), Units 6 & 7 would be connected, via underground facilities, to a new 500/230 kV substation known as Clear Sky, which would be constructed in the Units 6 & 7 plant area. As described in [Subsection 4.1.1.1](#), this connection would be on previously disturbed land and no new construction impacts would be anticipated.

The Clear Sky substation would have two 500 kV transmission lines extending west and then north, approximately 43 miles long, connecting it to the existing Levee 500 kV substation in a planned transmission West Preferred/Secondary Corridor. A new 230 kV line, approximately 52 miles long, would be constructed in the same West Corridor between Clear Sky substation and a new 230 kV bay position at the existing Pennsuko substation; the line would share the same right-of-way with the two new 500 kV lines between Clear Sky and Levee substations.

In addition to the planned new transmission line West Corridor, a new 230 kV line, approximately 19 miles long, would be constructed to connect Clear Sky substation to a new 230 kV bay at the existing Davis substation in a planned transmission East Preferred Corridor. In addition, a new 230 kV line, approximately 18 miles long, would be constructed (in a new right-of-way to be selected) to connect the Davis substation to a new 230 kV bay position at Miami substation.

Two access-only corridor laterals would be constructed as part of the West Preferred/Secondary Corridor alignments. These access corridors would be used to access the transmission corridor and eventual right-of-way. No transmission structures would be built in these access corridors,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

although access roads or road improvements may be required. The two access corridors (Figure 2.2-5) are:

- Tamiami Trail Corridor
  
- Krome Avenue Corridor

Current land use for the transmission line access corridor at Tamiami Trail is 2.74 acres of streams and waterways, 3.06 acres of freshwater marshes, and 4.70 acres of roads and highways (Table 2.2-4).

Current land use for the transmission line access corridor at Krome Avenue is 85.33 acres of streams and waterways/canals, 56.81 acres of exotic wetland hardwoods, 143.40 acres of freshwater marshes, and 79.17 acres of roads and highways (Table 2.2-4).

The two new 500 kV lines and two new 230 kV lines for Units 6 & 7 would be located within state-approved corridors that would be narrowed to rights-of-way after state certification and before construction. Rights-of-way would be acquired in fee or easement.

The estimated total acreage where land disturbance could occur from the constructed transmission lines from Clear Sky to Pennsuco is 3334 acres (assuming the preferred corridor route) and 1635 acres from Clear Sky to Miami. These disturbed acreages are based on current proposed corridors. The actual disturbed acreage will be less, based on the actual right-of-way width (Table 2.2-3). It should be noted that included in these areas where new land disturbance could occur is acreage in preexisting FPL-owned corridors (e.g., Clear Sky to Davis). Because plans would be to use existing rights-of-way within the corridors to the extent practicable, the areas of new disturbance and use of previously undeveloped land is expected to be relatively minor compared to the total acreage of the corridors.

Construction activities for new transmission structures, tower pads, conductors, and access roads are described in Section 3.7. These activities could result in vegetation loss and temporary habitat disruption in the land types occurring along the final rights-of-way. Land used for structure pads and access roads would no longer be available for use by others, but land located between towers would only be temporarily impacted and would be restored after construction and available, upon approval by FPL, for joint uses that do not jeopardize the safe and reliable operation of the transmission lines. Subsection 4.1.3.2 describes potential impacts from transmission line construction to historical and cultural resources.

FPL construction programs, plans, and procedures routinely use standard industry construction practices, environmental best management practices, and mitigation measures to ensure adverse environmental effects of construction are avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Specific environmental protection and impact mitigation measures (with the associated construction

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

phase) that potentially would be used within the Units 6 & 7 transmission line rights-of-way include:

- Use of restrictive land-clearing processes in forested wetland areas (right-of-way clearing and preparation)
- Use of turbidity screens and erosion-control devices in areas of wetlands and water resources (access road/structure pad construction)
- Use of existing access roads for ingress and egress to rights-of-way where available (access road/structure pad construction)
- Use of standard industry construction practices for foundation and structure excavation and construction (line construction)

As described in [Section 1.2](#), FPL would comply with applicable laws, regulations, and permit requirements for the Units 6 & 7 project. Standard industry construction practices would be used for the transmission line construction, including use of existing rights-of-way, to the extent practicable, and environmental management, including such things as erosion-control devices, matting to reduce compaction caused by equipment, use of wide-track vehicles when crossing wetlands, and restoration activities after construction.

Although impacts to wetlands could potentially occur, they would be limited by careful siting and construction practices to avoid and minimize adverse effects. Where wetland impacts do occur, compensatory mitigation, as required by state and federal agencies, would be provided. Given the careful consideration of land use in the route selection process ([Subsection 2.2.2](#)) and the availability of a viable method for mitigation, impacts to offsite land use would be SMALL.

#### 4.1.2.2 Offsite Substations

As described in [Subsection 2.2.2](#), several upgrades and/or expansions would be needed to the Turkey Point, Clear Sky, Levee, Pennsuco, Davis, and Miami substations that could impact current land use ([Table 2.2-5](#)). Work at the Pennsuco substation would require acquisition of additional property for expansion on a previously disturbed area.

The existing Turkey Point substation, located on the Turkey Point plant property, would be expanded by 0.9 acre to accommodate a new bay with two new 230 kV line terminals and enlargement of the existing relay vault building. Current land use of the 0.9-acre area of expansion for the onsite Turkey Point substation is electric power facilities ([Table 2.2-5](#)).

The existing Levee substation would be expanded by 2.3 acres to accommodate a new bay with two 500 kV line terminals. The interconnection work at Levee substation would include filling,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

grading, and rocking an expansion area of approximately 130 x 850 feet to the north of the existing 500 kV yard for construction of a new bay and associated equipment. In addition, a new stormwater retention system would be constructed. Current land use of the 2.3 acres area of expansion for the Levee substation is electric power facilities and exotic wetland hardwoods (Table 2.2-5).

The existing Pennsuco substation would be expanded by approximately 2.42 acres to accommodate addition of a stormwater retention system and installation of new equipment. Current land use of the 2.42 acres area of expansion for the Pennsuco substation is rock quarries (Table 2.2-5).

The existing Davis substation would be expanded by approximately 1.12 acres to accommodate addition of two new 230 kV line terminals and installation of equipment to control power flow for the line connecting to the Miami substation. Current land use of the 1.12 acres area of expansion for the Davis substation is tree nurseries (Table 2.2-5).

The Miami substation would be modified to expand and reconfigure the 230 kV section, add a new 230 kV line terminal for connection of the line from the Davis substation, and replace the autotransformer to match the rating with that of the Miami substation. These modifications would involve no expansion of land area of the substation.

Substation facilities would meet all environmental regulatory requirements for their construction and expansion; accordingly, potential land use impacts from construction would be SMALL and not require additional mitigation.

#### 4.1.2.3 FPL-Owned Fill Source

Borrow material for the Units 6 & 7 plant area and associated non-linear facilities, estimated at 10.7 million cubic yards, and offsite transmission and access roads, with a conceptual range of 2.4 to 3.7 million cubic yards, would be obtained from a combination of an FPL-owned fill source, other regional sources, or reused material. Using existing commercial quarries for borrow materials would have no impact on land use and, therefore, would not require mitigation. Additional borrow material would be obtained from the same sources for other construction activities including the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility, road upgrades, transmission tower pads, etc. Any additional fill material needed during operation and maintenance of Units 6 & 7 would be supplied through a commercial provider. Accordingly, the FPL fill source would be expected to cease operation with the completion of Units 6 & 7 construction activities. Future plans are that the 300-acre area and newly created lake would be maintained as a water management feature, under FPL or other local or regional ownership, management, and control. Using FPL-owned property for borrow material would permanently disturb approximately 300 acres of land classified as tree nurseries, Brazilian pepper, ditches, exotic wetland hardwood,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

wetland scrub, freshwater marshes and roads and highways. However, this land disturbance represents a small portion of the available land in the surrounding area and would, therefore, be a SMALL impact.

#### 4.1.2.4 Makeup and Potable Water Systems

As described in [Sections 3.3](#) and [3.4](#), reclaimed water from the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD) and/or radial collector wells-supplied water would be used as cooling water makeup for Units 6 & 7. Potential impacts of construction activities for these cooling water systems are described below.

As described in [Section 2.2](#), the reclaimed water pipeline corridor would require approximately 9 miles of pipelines between the Turkey Point plant property and the MDWASD South District Wastewater Treatment Plant to the north ([Figure 2.2-5](#)). For about 6.5 miles of their length, the pipelines would be collocated with the existing Clear Sky-to-Davis transmission line right-of-way and adjacent road and canal rights-of-way. For the remaining approximately 2.5 miles, the pipelines would then diverge from the existing right-of-way. The current land use of the 1886 acres within this corridor, some smaller portion of which could be impacted with the construction of the pipelines and right-of-way. Major land use impacts within this area are shown in [Table 2.2-6](#). Construction activities for the pipelines could result in vegetation loss and habitat disruption. As described in [Section 4.3](#), the pipelines would be trenched beneath/along an existing access road on the west side of the corridor and, upon completion, the disturbed portions of the corridor would be graded to the contours of the surrounding landscape and revegetated or returned to previous land uses. Clearing of new corridors and/or expansion of existing corridors would include use of environmental best management practices to minimize impacts to sensitive habitats. Most of the reclaimed water pipelines would follow existing rights-of-way.

Construction of the radial collector wells would not cause new surface land disturbance to any previously undeveloped property. Also, as described in [Subsection 4.1.1.1.2](#), Miami-Dade County has approved the rezoning of the land for development.

Accordingly, land use impacts from construction of the makeup water systems in the six-mile vicinity would be SMALL and would not require mitigation.

As described in [Section 2.2](#), the radial collector wells would include horizontal laterals extending underground from a collection caisson to a depth of approximately 25 to 40 feet below the bottom of Biscayne Bay. Because construction of the radial collector wells would involve surface land disturbance only on the Turkey Point plant property and no surface land disturbance in offsite areas, there would be no new construction impacts associated with the radial collector wells to offsite land use.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

An approximately 9-mile-long pipeline corridor would be constructed to obtain potable water for Units 6 & 7. The new potable water pipelines would deliver potable water from the source facility to a storage tank in the Units 6 & 7 plant area. The route of the pipelines is identified in [Figure 3.9-1](#). Selection of this route was made to minimize environmental impacts from construction of the new pipelines. Other than the north-south section of pipelines along SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road from SW 288th Street to SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive, most of the route is within the area of already planned roadway improvements to avoid additional congestion with the existing and planned new other utilities on the access road to Units 6 & 7. Because of the commonality of the pipeline route with previous disturbance and/or new disturbance already expected to occur resulting from construction of other Units 6 & 7 project facilities (e.g., roadway improvements), construction of the underground pipelines would have minimal additional environmental impacts.

#### 4.1.2.5 Access Roadways

As described in [Section 3.9](#), the Units 6 & 7 project includes roadway improvements to allow access to the site for construction and operations. The improvements include the widening of three existing roadways and the development of existing unpaved roads to four paved roadways ([Figure 3.9-1](#)). The current land use along the roads is summarized in [Table 2.2-7](#).

The improvements for the existing paved roadways consist of the widening from two lanes to four lanes of SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive, SW 344th Street/Palm Drive, and SW 117th Street, for a total roadway length of approximately 3.25 miles.

Development of the four new paved roadways include (with approximate lengths): SW 359th Street at two locations, three lanes between SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road and SW 117th Avenue (2 miles in length) and four lanes between SW 117th Avenue and Units 6 & 7 (3 miles in length), plus construction of a bridge over the L-31 Canal; three lanes at SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road between SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and SW 359th Street (1 mile in length); and four lanes at SW 117th Avenue between SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and 359th Street (1 mile in length). The new paved roadway for SW 359th Street from SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road to the Turkey Point plant property would also serve as the access road for the new transmission lines along its route. There is a South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) canal that crosses the L-31E canal along the SW 359th Street route with FPL-owned property on either side.

Improvements to four existing intersections and the development of two new intersections would also be required to accommodate traffic to and from Units 6 & 7. Each of the intersections would require signalization and/or traffic control personnel depending on the peak traffic period and flow.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The locations for the road improvements were selected to use, to the greatest extent practicable, existing roadways and to minimize environmental impacts. Because of the location of the Turkey Point plant property, the majority of the roadway improvements can be located within an existing FPL-owned right-of-way, which extends from the plant property toward the west (SW 359th Street) and along portions of SW 117th Avenue south of SW 344th Street/Palm Drive (approximately 5 miles). The remaining 4 miles of roadway improvements are along existing paved and unpaved roads.

The roadway improvements would be located in unincorporated Miami-Dade County and in the City of Homestead. The roadway corridor would traverse the following zoning designations: Agricultural District (AU), Interim District (GU), and Planned Unit Development (PUD). With the exception of SW 359th Street, all the roadways have been designated as roads by Miami-Dade County. With the expansion of the roadways, certain easements from governmental agencies may be required depending upon the final design. The paved road for SW 359th Street from SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road to the Turkey Point plant property would be located on FPL property, with the exception of the crossing of the L-31E Canal. The canal crossing would require an easement from SFWMD.

Relevant future land use categories of the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan allow for utility uses in the proposed corridor for the roadway improvements.

Roadway design standards and construction would follow the requirements of the Miami-Dade County Public Works Department and the Florida Department of Transportation. Construction activities would include the installation of silt fences, removal of vegetation, construction of drainage, removal of unsuitable soils, placement of road base materials, laying layers of asphalt, and striping. The shoulders would be appropriately sloped and surface water runoff would be managed with the installation of swales and culverts at suitable locations.

With local governmental approval for the planning of the roadway improvements, the granting of easements for the roadway use, and the use of environmental best management practices, land use impacts from the improvements associated with the construction of Units 6 & 7 would be SMALL and not require additional mitigation.

#### 4.1.3 HISTORIC PROPERTIES

FPL has initiated consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding the proposed project and prepared and submitted several reports and work plans, including the following:

- *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Site, Associated Non-Linear Facilities, and Spoils Area on Plant Property (FPL 2009a).*

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

- *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Site and Associated Non-Linear Facilities* (FPL 2009b).
- *Preliminary Cultural Resources Report for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Associated Linear Facilities* (FPL 2009c).
- *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Associated Linear Facilities* (FPL 2009d).

The results contained in these reports and work plans are presented in **Subsection 2.5.3**. A summary of these reports and work plans, specifically in the context of construction impacts, are discussed in the following paragraphs.

#### 4.1.3.1 Onsite Facilities and Construction Areas

Background research and an analysis of aerial photographs from 1938, 1952, and 1963 identified no buildings within one mile of the plant area.

An archaeological field survey, including both pedestrian surveys and archaeological investigations (e.g., shovel testing) was performed at the onsite APEs as documented in the *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Site and Associated Non-Linear Facilities* (FPL 2009b). The survey identified no newly or previously recorded archaeological sites or historic resources within or adjacent to the Site or associated non-linear facilities. The Work Plan recommended that no additional field investigations be performed. The Work Plan was submitted to SHPO and concurrence with the recommendation was received by FPL (FDOS Jul. 2009a).

Based on the above findings and SHPO concurrence, there would be no impacts to historic properties from construction of the onsite permanent facilities and the temporary construction facilities and use areas.

#### 4.1.3.2 Offsite Transmission Line Corridors

A *Preliminary Cultural Resources Report* (FPL 2009c) and *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan* (FPL 2009d) were submitted to the SHPO for their review with the preliminary research and recommendations for further field reconnaissance. Specific recommendations made to SHPO regarding offsite transmission corridors involved the following:

- Archaeological Survey and Identification Plan for the Transmission Line Corridors
- Historic Resource Survey and Identification Plan for the Transmission Line Corridors

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The Work Plan for the transmission line corridors also included an APE for direct physical effects and an APE for indirect or visual effects. Field assessments within the APEs have been recommended for the corridors. Testing in low potential areas would be judgmental. The Work Plan was submitted to SHPO, and concurrence on the recommendation was received by FPL (FDOS Jul. 2009b). The results of the field assessments and FPL's recommendations on effect to historic properties will be submitted to the SHPO.

#### 4.1.3.3 Other Offsite Areas

*A Preliminary Cultural Resources Report* (FPL 2009c) and *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan* (FPL 2009d) were submitted to the SHPO for their review with the preliminary research and recommendations for further field reconnaissance. The work plan for the reclaimed and potable water pipelines, borrow areas, and access roads included an APE for direct physical effects only. An APE for indirect or visual effects is not needed for this infrastructure because they are at or below the ground surface. Specific recommendations made to SHPO regarding other offsite areas involved the following:

- Archaeological and Historic Survey and Identification Plan for Access Roads and Bridges
- Archaeological Survey and Identification Plan for the Reclaimed Water Pipeline(s) and the Potable Water Pipeline(s)
- Historic Resource Survey and Identification Plan for the Reclaimed Water Pipeline(s) and Potable Water Pipeline(s)

The Work Plan was submitted to SHPO, and concurrence on the recommendations was received by FPL (FDOS Jul. 2009b). The results of the field assessments and FPL's recommendations on effect to historic properties will be submitted to the SHPO.

#### 4.1.3.4 Discovery Provisions

FPL prepared work plans for the onsite and offsite areas, and consulted with the SHPO regarding these plans. The work plans will contain recommendations for development of an Unanticipated Finds Plan and a Contractor Training Program. The plan will outline procedures and identify responsible personnel to be contacted if significant archaeological materials or human remains are encountered during construction. The plan will be included in a contractor training program prior to construction. The goal of the training will be to inform construction personnel, inspectors, and managers of the possibility for human remains and archaeological materials in a given area, and to develop clear understanding of what procedures should be followed if human remains or archaeological materials are identified during earth-disturbing activities.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Section 4.1 References**

FPL 2009a. *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Site, Associated Non-Linear Facilities, and Spoils Area on Plant Property*, June 2009.

FPL 2009b. *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Site and Associated Non-Linear Facilities*, June 2009.

FPL 2009c. *Preliminary Cultural Resources Report for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Associated Linear Facilities*, June 2009.

FPL 2009d. *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Associated Linear Facilities*, June 2009.

FDOS Jul. 2009a. Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Letter from Laura Kammerer, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer to Matthew Raffenberg re: *Cultural Resources Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Site and Associated Non-Linear Facilities*, July 13, 2009.

FDOS Jul. 2009b. Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Letter from Laura Kammerer, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer to Matthew Raffenberg re: *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Work Plan for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 Associated Linear Facilities*, July 13, 2009.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

## 4.2 WATER-RELATED IMPACTS

Water-related impacts from the construction of Units 6 & 7 could result from (1) hydrologic alteration of local surface water bodies, including streams and wetlands, and groundwater because of diversions, (2) surface elevation changes, and (3) groundwater elevation changes because of local pumping/dewatering. Impacts could also occur to downstream water quality as a result of erosion and sedimentation and to surface water and groundwater resulting from spills of fuels, lubricants, and other construction-related pollutants. Because of this potential for impacting surface water and groundwater resources, applicants are required to obtain a number of permits before initiating construction. [Table 1.2-1](#) lists the consultations, authorizations, and permits required for initiating the construction activities. In addition, FPL is required to comply with Conditions of the Miami-Dade County Resolution Z-56-07.

A description of Preconstruction activities and Construction activities is provided in [Section 3.9](#).

Water bodies and areas that would be affected by construction activities in the Units 6 & 7 plant area are the mudflats (consisting of wet organic soil material) and the remnant canals. Water bodies that could be affected by other construction activities on the Turkey Point plant property include Biscayne Bay, the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility (which is not a water of the state or the United States), the truncated portion of the industrial wastewater facility lying to the northwest of the plant area, and numerous named and unnamed surface water drainage canals. As described in [Subsections 2.3.1.2](#) and [2.3.2.2](#), the surficial aquifer at the Turkey Point plant property is the Biscayne aquifer. Although the Biscayne aquifer is the sole-source aquifer for Miami Dade County, the Biscayne aquifer at is not used as a source of potable water for the existing units.

### 4.2.1 HYDROLOGIC ALTERATIONS

This subsection identifies onsite and offsite construction activities that could result in impacts to the hydrology on the Turkey Point plant property and offsite areas. Activities include construction of the new units and associated facilities, heavy haul road, equipment barge unloading area modification, transmission facility construction and modification, reclaimed water pipelines, FPL reclaimed water treatment facility, improvements to access roads, potable water pipelines, radial collector wells and pipelines, borrow and spoil areas, nuclear administration and training buildings, security facilities, and laydown/parking areas. [Section 3.9](#) provides a complete summary of land disturbances.

Impacts resulting from the disturbance of surface soils are-regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) pursuant Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) is the NPDES permitting authority for Florida. Implementing its EPA-approved NPDES stormwater program, FDEP has adopted its

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Large and Small Construction Activities (CGP) which is incorporated by reference under Rule 62-621.300(4), F.A.C. The NPDES CGP applies to construction activities which disturb one or more acres of total land area. Disturbance includes clearing, grading and excavating. The CGP may apply to the disturbance of less than one acre of land if part of a larger common plan of development.

NPDES permit coverage is obtained under the CGP by preparing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) to utilize the CGP along with a filing fee. FDEP now allows the NOI to be filed electronically. Permitting coverage is limited to 5 years. The SWPPP must be prepared prior to filing the NOI but is not filed with FDEP. However, the plan must be kept on-site and available for FDEP inspection at all times. The SWPPP must include, among other items: a site plan for managing stormwater runoff; identification of appropriate erosion and sedimentation controls and best management practices (BMPs) that will be employed to minimize the discharge of pollutants off-site during storm events; a schedule for inspection and maintenance of BMPs; and a record keeping process documenting any maintenance or repairs performed and any modifications made to the plan. The SWPPP may include structural or non-structural controls. Structural controls may include retention ponds, silt fencing or berms while non-structural controls might include soil stabilization by sodding, seeding or mulching or scheduling construction during the dry season. Once construction is complete and any disturbed areas are stabilized (usually through sodding, seeding or other means), a Notice of Termination may be filed terminating NPDES permit coverage. If construction exceeds the initial 5-year period, a new Notice of Intent must be filed to reapply for coverage.

#### 4.2.1.1 Onsite Facilities

##### 4.2.1.1.1 Construction and Laydown Areas

### **Surface Water**

Surface water that could be impacted during construction activities at the Units 6 & 7 plant area consists of the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility.

Flooding that could occur in the proximity of the plant area would be the result of major storm precipitation events. Overland flow in the proximity of the plant area and Units 3 & 4 currently discharges to the industrial wastewater facility that surrounds the plant area and not to surface water drainage features that drain to Biscayne Bay. During construction, surface water from the plant area would be directed to the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. FPL would seek to modify the existing industrial wastewater facility permit to include Units 6 & 7.

Two remnant canals of the industrial wastewater facility are located in the Units 6 & 7 plant area which would be excavated to remove the muck. The dead-end canal located northwest of the plant area would be permanently backfilled for use as an additional laydown area. The material

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

excavated from approximately the upper 5 feet in the plant area would be deposited in one of the spoils areas described in [Section 3.9](#). Engineered fill would be used to raise the grade level in the plant area to a working grade elevation. Excavation of the power block locations would then begin. Excavated material from the power block locations could eventually be used as fill throughout the plant area. Unsuitable excavated material would be transported to the spoils areas. Stormwater would be managed with the appropriate environmental controls to reduce the amount of sediment in the surface water runoff before release to the industrial wastewater facility. The removal of original soils, replacement with compacted engineered fill material, and change of the elevation at the power block area to approximately 25.5 feet would permanently alter the flow of surface water in the plant area. However, the alterations would be limited to the plant area by the presence of the industrial wastewater facility and the berm east of the return canal, and would not result in impacts to downstream surface water bodies or resources. Therefore, impacts to surface water because of hydrologic alterations would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

### **Groundwater**

Curtain wall technology and foundation grouting would be used to isolate the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility from the plant area and minimize the amount of dewatering required during power block excavation and construction. Dewatering would not be expected to be required for the first 5 feet depth of excavated material, but would be required for subsequent excavation depths in the power block areas. As described in [Subsection 2.3.1.2](#), the subsurface soils underlying the 5 feet of muck in the vicinity of the power blocks consist of formational material capable of substantial groundwater yield. The placement of engineered fill would alter the permeability of the subsurface material currently at the plant area. As described in [Section 3.9](#), a diaphragm wall would be installed to a depth of approximately -60 feet NAVD 88 around the power blocks during dewatering and excavating subsurface materials. Following completion of the diaphragm wall, a grout plug, approximately 25 feet thick, would be constructed beneath the power block from elevation -35 feet NAVD 88 to elevation -60 feet NAVD 88 by drilling from the ground surface and injecting grout. This barrier, which is integral with the diaphragm wall, would allow any seepage encountered during excavation to be controlled by use of sump pumps, or similar methodologies, located within the excavation. The diaphragm wall and grout plug, which would both be permanent, would alter local horizontal groundwater flow around the power block excavations and would, therefore, alter the hydrologic flow through the power block area. Impacts to the hydrologic flow of groundwater would occur from the presence of the diaphragm wall and the emplacement of the engineered fill material. The impacts would be limited to the vicinity of the diaphragm wall. The use of the diaphragm wall would allow dewatering of the power block areas with minimal impacts to groundwater directly outside of the diaphragm wall containment area. Groundwater flow may also be locally altered as a result of backfilling the dead-end canal.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

During foundation excavation and construction, three distinct dewatering phases are anticipated: testing and remedial grouting phase, excavation phase, and foundation construction. Each dewatering phase has an estimated maximum dewatering rate, as discussed below.

The testing and remedial grouting phase, as discussed in [Subsection 3.9.2.1](#), would consist of up to four separate grouting injection events, based on observations made during each grouting injection phase. The estimated duration for this phase is 13 weeks per excavation, with an estimated maximum dewatering pumping rate of 1000 gallons per minute (gpm).

The excavation phase is expected to be three months in duration. As the excavation proceeds, remaining seepages that are revealed by the excavation will be evaluated and remediated as necessary. The estimated maximum dewatering pumping rate for this phase is 1000 gpm.

A groundwater model was used to calculate the dewatering rates anticipated during the foundation construction phase. As discussed previously, a grout plug was placed from elevation -35 feet NAVD 88 to elevation -60 feet NAVD 88 in the model. The groundwater modeling results indicated that the dewatering rates for the Units 6 and 7 excavations were approximately 96 gpm for each excavation, based on a grout plug hydraulic conductivity of 1.0E-04 centimeters/second (cm/sec). For the purpose of this analysis, the total dewatering rate per excavation is assumed to be 200 gpm and 24 months in duration.

For the dewatering impact analysis, it is conservatively assumed that the Unit 7 testing and remedial grouting phase would occur simultaneously with the Unit 6 foundation construction phase. It is further conservatively assumed, for maximum potential impacts, that the timeframe for these simultaneous dewatering phases is one year. Therefore, the estimated maximum dewatering rate would be 1200 gpm (1.73 MGD) for one year in duration.

The circulating water flow rate in the industrial wastewater facility for Units 1 through 4 is 4250 cubic feet per second (2747 MGD). The extracted groundwater from dewatering, which would be released into the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility, is approximately 0.06 percent of the circulating water flow rate. As described in [Subsection 2.3.1.2.2.5](#), makeup water for the industrial wastewater facility comes from treated process water, rainfall, stormwater runoff, and groundwater infiltration. This inflow, along with the low amount of predicted water withdrawal from the discharge canal, would result in minimal net effect on the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. The mean annual rainfall and standard deviation for this rainfall for the period 1948–2010 is 59.95 inches and 11.74 inches (Miami International Airport), respectively. Considering a cooling canal area of 4370 acres, the total and standard deviation of this annual rainfall, in total gallons of water added to the cooling canals on an annual basis, is 21,832 acre-feet/year (7114 MG/year) and 4275 acre-feet/year (1393 MG/year), respectively. Conservatively assuming the maximum dewatering rate of 1200 gpm (1.73 MGD) is maintained for one year, the resulting annual dewatering discharge of 631 MG/year into the cooling canals is less than the



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

standard deviation, or natural variability, of the observed annual rainfall added to the cooling canals (1393 MG/year).

Based on the groundwater modeling results for the dewatering simulations, the radius of influence is confined to the Turkey Point Plant.

The net effect on water withdrawal from construction dewatering on Biscayne Bay would also be minimal due to the substantial amount of water in the bay and the relatively temporary nature of the dewatering activities.

The dewatering system would be designed using environmental best management practices to control turbidity of the effluent released to the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. FSAR Appendix 2CC, contains a discussion of the construction dewatering simulation.

Groundwater levels at the Units 6 & 7 plant area would be altered during construction activities, due to the dewatering necessary for the deep foundations. However, these temporary alterations would be mitigated in part by the hydraulic isolation of the plant area with regard to local surface water and the interconnection between the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility and the shallow aquifer. Slight changes in percolation rates would have negligible impacts on water levels, because the surface infiltration would affect only a localized area.

During construction of Units 6 & 7, one of the deep injection wells (see [Subsection 4.2.1.1.9](#)) could be used for the disposal of construction-related and sanitary wastewater. Injection would be in accordance with the underground injection control permit and would be consistent with the use of deep injection wells in Florida. The anticipated amount of wastewater injected would be less than the amount anticipated during operations. Groundwater quality and hydrologic monitoring would be performed on two wells installed in the upper Floridan aquifer as required by FDEP's underground injection control permit.

For these reasons, the impacts of alterations to the groundwater resource would be SMALL and no further mitigation would be required.

#### 4.2.1.1.2 Spoils Area Establishment

##### **Surface Water**

Spoils areas would be established at three locations as described in [Subsection 3.9.1.1](#) and identified in [Figure 3.9-1](#). The spoils areas would be graded and bermed to direct drainage from the spoils to the industrial wastewater facility. Thus, the potential impacts resulting from hydrologic alteration of surface water would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

## Groundwater

Adding water to the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility from the spoils areas would be minimal when compared to the water normally in the canals. Temporary highs in the groundwater table could occur from drainage from the spoils areas because the canals are hydraulically connected to the underlying groundwater. Therefore, the impacts to groundwater would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

### 4.2.1.1.3 Access Roads, Heavy Haul Road, Bridges, and Equipment Barge Unloading Area Improvements

## Surface Water

Modifications to the existing equipment barge unloading area would be performed under permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) (Section 404 Permit and Section 10 — Rivers and Harbors Act Permit; [Table 1.2-1](#)). Excavation and limited dredging could create turbid waters that could migrate from the vicinity of the equipment barge unloading area into Biscayne National Park. Curtain wall technology would be used to isolate the affected area from the waters of the park.

The equipment barge unloading area would be enlarged to accommodate larger barges. The modification would be performed using sheet piles to isolate the equipment barge unloading area from the barge turning basin. Excavated and dredged soils would be stockpiled in the spoils areas described in [Section 3.9](#). Potential impacts to flow from the use of sheet piles would temporarily impact the surface water flow. Impacts to surface water flow from equipment barge unloading area modifications would be SMALL and would not warrant further mitigation.

As described in [Section 3.9](#), existing roads on the Turkey Point plant property would support the construction activities for Units 6 & 7. The construction of a heavy haul road leading from the equipment barge unloading area to the Units 6 & 7 plant area would follow existing roads and would require the improvement of those roads in several places.

Five new permanent bridges would be built for Units 6 & 7 including a bridge over the L-31 canal and one over the northern tip of the interceptor ditch. Two bridges would be built along the heavy haul route where the industrial wastewater facility is crossed. Temporary bridges would also be installed to facilitate construction activities until the permanent bridges are completed. In addition, bridges would be built to access berms within the industrial wastewater facility for construction of transmission towers. Modifications to two existing bridges would be required to support load requirements of transporting excavated material to the spoils areas. Modifications to the existing roads would be required to support the load requirements. The heavy haul road would cross a laydown area that would require filling. Constructing the heavy haul road could alter hydrologic flow in and along the road path by the stockpile of soil, stone, and fill material. Equipment staged

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

along the route could also impede surface water flow. Ditches and the use of culverts would allow surface water drainage to be maintained along the road route. During construction, surface water runoff would be released to the industrial wastewater facility. Construction activities for the heavy haul road would be temporary. Culverts would be used to maintain surface water flows where required. Restoration activities could be necessary along the road right-of-way.

Construction traffic access to the Turkey Point plant property would be via various routes including, SW 117th Avenue, SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road, SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive, SW 344 Street/Palm Drive, and SW 359th Street. The main road for construction activities would be SW 359th Street. This would allow the access road to be in the existing transmission corridor right-of-way. New construction would be required to connect SW 359th Street with an access road on the Turkey Point plant property. Most of this new construction would be offsite and is described in [Subsection 3.9.1.2](#). The access road on the Turkey Point plant property would be constructed where SW 359th Street currently terminates at the property boundary. This short section of road would cross wetlands. The new road construction would require fill material to be brought in to raise the elevation to the grade of SW 359th Street. Culverts would be used to maintain current natural flow patterns in the area. Road improvements to SW 359th Street would require the existing road to be widened and additional gravel or pavement added to meet projected load specification. Once access to the existing roads on the plant property has been established, construction traffic would flow as described above. Existing roads would be used as much as possible to limit unnecessary construction. Existing drainage features would be used including ditches and detention ponds. New ditches and detention ponds would be constructed as needed. Should modification to the existing draining ditches or drainage features be required, the impacts would be temporary and the disturbed areas would be returned to preconstruction conditions. Revegetation could be required. Work would be performed in accordance with applicable permits. Impacts to surface water hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation other than those described above.

### **Groundwater**

Modifications to the existing equipment barge unloading area would be performed under permits issued by the USACE (Section 404 Permit and Section 10 — Rivers and Harbors Act Permit; [Table 1.2-1](#)). The equipment barge unloading area would be enlarged. Unsuitable soils from the operation would be stockpiled in the spoils areas described in [Section 3.9](#). Impacts to groundwater flow from equipment barge unloading area modifications would be temporary and SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

Soils along the route of the new construction connecting SW 359th Street with an access road on the Turkey Point plant property could require excavation to a suitable base elevation before the placement of fill material. Groundwater could be encountered during these road construction

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

activities. However, potential impacts would be temporary and groundwater levels and flow direction would return to preconstruction conditions.

Hydrologic alteration to groundwater from the improvement of existing roads on the plant property could occur. However, impacts resulting from the hydrologic alteration of groundwater flow, if it occurs, would be temporary and groundwater would return to pre-existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

#### 4.2.1.1.4 Security Facilities

##### **Surface Water**

Constructing a new security building and infrastructure (see [Section 3.9](#)) could result in altering surface water hydrologic flow. Because of the small size and construction methods that would be used for these security facilities, impacts would be localized to the building site. Impacts from constructing fences, gates, and physical barriers (flow through) would also be limited in area and would not disrupt surface water flow as the result of their construction. Impacts to hydrologic alteration of surface water would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

##### **Groundwater**

As described above, the building of security facilities would result primarily in impacts from the disturbance of surface soils. Impacts to groundwater from hydrologic alteration could occur. However, impacts would be temporary. Once construction activities cease, any alteration to groundwater would cease. Impacts to groundwater from hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

#### 4.2.1.1.5 Construction Utilities

##### **Surface Water**

As described in [Section 3.9](#), temporary utilities would be constructed that support the entire construction site and associated activities. These would include aboveground and underground infrastructure for power, lights, communications, potable and construction water, wastewater and waste treatment facilities, fire protection, and for constructing gas and air systems.

The potential impacts caused by these activities would include surface water runoff from excavation activities for installing subsurface utilities and for installing the necessary structures for the aboveground utilities. Detention basins used in support of other existing facilities or Units 6 & 7 activities could be used for developing the site utilities. These activities would result in the short-term potential for impacts in a relatively small area. Impacts from hydrologic alterations would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation other than those specified through permit requirements.

## **Groundwater**

Dewatering for temporary utilities could require the use of detention basins before release to the industrial wastewater facility. Impacts to groundwater from hydrologic alteration while constructing these utilities would be temporary and flow would return to normal when construction activities ceased. Impacts would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation other than that specified in the required permits.

### 4.2.1.1.6 Construction Facilities and Preparation Activities

## **Surface Water**

Facilities include parking areas, laydown areas, storage and fabrication areas, measuring and testing facilities, offices, warehouses, workshops, sanitary facilities, locker rooms, training facilities, storage facilities, and site access facilities.

The concrete batch plant would be located in the northern portion of the plant area just north of the power blocks. Wastewater from batch plant operations would be directed to the industrial wastewater facility. The impacts associated with the construction and operations of the batch plant would have no additional impacts from hydrologic alteration than described above for the plant area.

Fill may be added to several areas. Where fill material is added, the alterations would be permanent (e.g., the laydown area just west of the plant area and the dead-end portion of the industrial wastewater facility located northwest of the plant area). However, most of the construction facilities would be in areas where fill would not be needed. Once construction activities were completed, the facilities could be removed and the areas returned to preconstruction conditions.

For these reasons, impacts on surface water would be SMALL and additional mitigation would not be required.

## **Groundwater**

These facilities would not require the deep excavation of soils during their construction and would not directly cause impacts from hydrologic alteration. Impacts from the hydrologic alteration of groundwater from constructing and operating these facilities would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.2.1.1.7 Constructing Reclaimed Water Pipelines on Turkey Point Plant Property

**Surface Water**

The reclaimed water pipelines would enter the Turkey Point plant property north of the location of the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility. Following treatment, the reclaimed water would be pumped via pipelines to the makeup water reservoir on the Units 6 & 7 plant area. The pipelines would cross areas previously disturbed and segments of the existing industrial wastewater facility, as described in [Section 2.2](#).

Installation of the reclaimed water pipelines across segments of the industrial wastewater facility would be accomplished via bridging to minimize potential impacts.

Surface disturbance that could affect hydrologic alteration would be short-term and would result in an impact to a limited area. The construction areas would be contoured to facilitate drainage and the area seeded with native species. During construction, water resulting from dewatering and surface water runoff would be released to the industrial wastewater facility. Potential impacts to surface water from hydrologic alteration for constructing the onsite portion of the reclaimed water pipelines would also be of short duration.

The potential impact from hydrologic alteration of surface water as a result of construction of the reclaimed water pipelines would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

**Groundwater**

Installing the onsite portion of the reclaimed water pipelines could alter the flow of groundwater in the proximity of the excavation activity. Once construction activities come to an end, the groundwater hydrologic flow would return to preconstruction conditions. Impacts during construction would be short-term and limited to the area of construction activity. Therefore, impacts would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

4.2.1.1.8 Constructing Radial Collector Wells

**Surface Water**

Radial collector wells would be installed adjacent to Biscayne Bay to provide cooling water for Units 6 & 7 (see [Figure 3.1-3](#)). The well caissons would be located on the Turkey Point peninsula, east of the existing units. Each radial collector well would consist of a central reinforced concrete caisson extending below the ground level with laterals projecting from the caisson. The well laterals would be advanced horizontally a distance of up to 900 feet and installed to a depth of approximately 25 to 40 feet below the bottom of Biscayne Bay. Groundwater recharge from Biscayne Bay would flow into the horizontal well laterals and flow by head force to the collection caisson located onshore where the water would be pumped via pipelines to Units 6 & 7.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Seawater from Biscayne Bay would flow downward, recharging the groundwater aquifer. Constructing the delivery pipelines from the radial collector wells to the Units 6 & 7 plant area would be accomplished using surface excavation methods. The location of the pipelines is shown on [Figure 3.9-1](#).

The construction activities would be performed in accordance with the required local, state, and federal guidelines and standard industry practices. Necessary permits would be obtained before beginning construction activities. Constructing the delivery pipelines would alter the surface flow in the vicinity of the pipelines during construction activities. However, the disturbance would be short-term and the routes would be recontoured afterward.

Constructing the radial collector wells, associated facilities, and the delivery pipelines would result in short-term alteration of surface flow patterns in the vicinity of the caissons and the delivery pipelines. Unused excavated material would be placed in the designated spoils areas. Sedimentation barriers or other appropriate measures would be installed to limit potential impacts to surface water bodies. Once construction activities are complete, the drainage would be restored to preconstruction conditions. Impacts from hydrologic alteration of surface water because of construction activities associated with the radial collector wells, associated facilities, and the delivery pipelines would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

### **Groundwater**

Construction could alter groundwater flow, primarily as a result of dewatering from the construction of the radial collector well caissons and laterals. Dewatering during construction could impact wetland areas located near the dewatering activities for the caissons and pipelines. Water from the dewatering activities for the radial collector wells and delivery pipelines would be added to the industrial wastewater facility.

FPL would comply with federal and state requirements regarding the siting of the radial collector wells and delivery pipelines. The use of standard industry construction practices would include the use of existing corridors or roadways on the Turkey Point plant property to the extent practicable. Sheet piles could be used to limit potential impacts during construction dewatering activities. The effects of groundwater drawdown would be minimal because of the relatively small volume of water that would be withdrawn from the source.

Therefore, impacts would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

#### 4.2.1.1.9 Deep Injection Wells

##### **Surface Water**

Twelve deep injection wells would be installed in the Units 6 & 7 plant area as shown on [Figure 3.1-3](#). The deep injection wells would be installed into the Boulder Zone of the Lower Floridan aquifer in accordance with a permit issued under the FDEP underground injection control program. The deep injection wells would also require the installation of dual zone monitoring wells to monitor the potential impact of the injection process on overlying aquifer units adjacent to the Boulder Zone.

As with other construction activities in the Units 6 & 7 plant area, surface water runoff during well installation would be directed to the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. Impacts to surface water from hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

##### **Groundwater**

The deep injection wells and the required monitoring wells would be installed in accordance with a permit issued under the FDEP underground injection control program. The FDEP underground injection control program stipulates methods and approaches, such as sequential casing installation and isolation of individual aquifers, to protect groundwater resources during the installation and development of the deep injection wells.

During construction of Units 6 & 7, one of the deep injection wells could be used for the disposal of construction-related wastewater. Injection would be in accordance with the underground injection control permit and would be consistent with the use of deep injection wells in Florida. Groundwater monitoring data, including groundwater elevation data and chemical data, would be collected and submitted to FDEP in accordance with the underground injection control permit. Impacts to groundwater from hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation measures other than those required by the injection permit. See [Subsection 4.2.2.2.1](#).

#### 4.2.1.1.10 Onsite Connector Transmission Corridors

##### **Surface Water**

As described in [Sections 2.2](#) and [3.7](#), alterations would be required along the existing Turkey Point-to-Davis corridor. New towers would be required to connect to the existing corridor from the new Clear Sky substation. This description is limited to the portion of that corridor from the Clear Sky substation to the Turkey Point-to-Davis corridor on the Turkey Point plant property.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The construction activities associated with new transmission towers would require the excavation and temporary storage of soils and the dewatering of groundwater at the tower locations. These activities would occur on Turkey Point plant property where the surface water runoff patterns have already been established. Existing drainage features would be used including ditches and detention ponds. New ditches and detention ponds would be constructed as needed. Should modification to the existing draining ditches or drainage features be required, the impacts would be temporary and the disturbed areas would be returned to preconstruction conditions. Work would be performed in accordance with applicable permits. The new line along the segment from the Clear Sky substation to the Turkey Point property boundary would cross over a wetland area. Adding the new line would require vehicular traffic in the corridor that could alter surface water flow direction because of rutting of the surface soils by vehicles. Excavated soils would be removed, the affected area recontoured, and the corridor segment restored to preconstruction conditions. Where needed, the vegetative cover would be re-established. For these reasons, impacts to hydrologic flow from adding a new transmission line to the existing Turkey Point-to-Davis transmission corridor would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

The Clear Sky-to-Pennsuco/Levee onsite segment would require constructing new transmission towers. The onsite segment would cross the industrial wastewater facility to the west and follow the existing transmission line corridor to the property boundary and beyond. Constructing towers within the industrial wastewater facility would require stockpiling soils that could alter surface water flow in the vicinity of the activity. Construction methods, controls, and impacts would be similar to those described for the Turkey Point-to-Davis corridor above. For these reasons, impacts to hydrologic flow from adding a new transmission line from Clear Sky to Pennsuco/Levee would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

### **Groundwater**

It could be necessary to dewater the excavations for the foundation of the towers required to make the connection from the Clear Sky substation to the transmission towers offsite. The dewatering effects would be short-term and the water level would return to preconstruction levels. Hydrologic alteration would occur only at the foundations on the Turkey Point plant property. No effects would occur offsite for this segment of the lines. Impacts to groundwater from hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation other than those required in the site-specific permits.

#### **4.2.1.1.11 Potable Water Pipelines**

### **Surface Water**

The operation of Units 6 & 7 would require potable water pipelines be constructed from an existing MDWASD supply line near the intersection of SW 288th Street and SW 137th Avenue/

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Tallahassee Road to the Turkey Point plant property, connecting to the location of the site meter for the existing Turkey Point potable water supply line (Figure 3.9-1). The route to the Turkey Point plant property would parallel and cross multiple drainage canals and the L131E Interceptor Canal along SW 359th Street. The potable water pipelines would pass just to the north of the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility, and turn south before entering the Units 6 & 7 plant area.

Standard pipeline techniques including open trenching and backfilling would be used for most of the installation. Directional drilling could also be used for canal crossings, where site conditions and pipeline size permit. Surface crossings could also be accomplished in the vicinity of the bridge to be located on the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. The onsite portion of the pipelines would cross areas previously disturbed. Surface disturbance that could alter the hydrology would be short-term and would result in an impact to a limited area. Construction areas would be contoured to facilitate drainage and the area seeded with native species, where needed. During construction dewatering, surface water runoff would be released to the industrial wastewater facility. Potential impacts to surface water from hydrologic alteration from the onsite portion of the potable water pipelines would also be of short duration.

The potential impact from hydrologic alteration of surface water as a result of construction of the potable water pipelines would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

### **Groundwater**

Installation of the onsite portion of the potable water pipelines could alter the flow of groundwater in the proximity of the excavation activity. Once construction activities come to an end, the groundwater hydrologic flow would return to preconstruction conditions. Impacts during construction would be short-term and limited to the area of construction activity. Therefore, impacts would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

#### 4.2.1.2 Offsite Facilities

##### 4.2.1.2.1 Borrow Areas

### **Surface Water**

Borrow material for construction would be obtained from a combination of an FPL-owned fill source, other regional sources, or reused material. The FPL-owned fill source is located just to the southeast of the former location of the Homestead Air Reserve Base. The borrow area would be permitted and operated in accordance with FDEP permit requirements. The facility would be operated as a dragline facility. Therefore, dewatering would not be required during dragline operations. Impacts to surface water could occur as the result of altering surface water flow in the vicinity of the property. A perimeter berm could be used to restrict the flow of surface water onto

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

the property. The berm could also be used in association with detention basins and a truck wash facility to reduce surface water runoff from the site and prevent soils from being unintentionally spread to offsite areas. Drainage ditches could be used to direct surface water flow away from the site and could be reconnected to any drainage features that once flowed through the property to maintain surface flow.

Impacts from operating a borrow area because of hydrologic alteration of surface water would be temporary and SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

### **Groundwater**

Groundwater dewatering that could alter flow direction in the aquifer would not be necessary for operating a borrow pit using a dragline. However, once dragline operations begin, water in the surrounding aquifer would flow toward the quarry to replace the void left from the mined material as the aquifer attempts to equilibrate. Once dragline operations cease, the groundwater level would return to static. Impacts from hydrologic alteration would be temporary and SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

#### 4.2.1.2.2 Transmission Corridors

### **Surface Water**

As described in [Subsection 2.2.2.1](#), new transmission lines would be routed in existing FPL transmission line corridors to the extent practicable. FPL would also pursue several substation upgrades and expansions as part of the proposed project.

#### Clear Sky-to-Levee Transmission Corridor

The preferred route (West Preferred Corridor) for the transmission line is described in [Sections 2.2](#) and [3.7](#). Water bodies potentially impacted along the primary route include several unnamed streams or surface water features, including drainage canals and wetlands. The canals include the L-31, C-113 Canal, C-103 Canal, C-102 Canal, the L-31E, and the Tamiami Canal. These water bodies could be impacted by the construction activities along the corridor.

New transmission towers would be required. The construction activities associated with new towers would require the excavation and temporary storage of soils at the tower locations. Construction activities for new transmission structures, tower pads, conductors, and access roads are described in [Section 3.7](#). These activities could result in vegetation loss and land disruption in the land types occurring along the final rights-of-way. The right-of-way for the West Preferred Corridor would be largely along existing public roads or existing rights-of-way. Existing roads could require improvements and/or continued maintenance during construction activities.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

FPL construction programs, plans, and procedures routinely use environmental best management practices and mitigation measures to ensure adverse environmental effects of construction are avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Specific environmental protection and impact mitigation measures (with the associated construction phase) that potentially would be used in the Units 6 & 7 transmission line rights-of-way include:

- Use of restrictive land-clearing processes in forested wetland areas (right-of-way clearing and preparation)
- Use of turbidity screens and erosion-control devices in areas of wetlands and water resources (access road/structure pad construction)
- Use of existing access roads for ingress and egress to rights-of-way where available (access road/structure pad construction)
- Use of standard industry construction practices for foundation and structure excavation and construction (line construction)

As described in [Section 1.2](#), FPL would comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and permit requirements. Standard industry construction practices would be used for transmission line construction, including use of existing rights-of-way, to the extent practicable, and environmental management, including erosion-control devices, matting to reduce compaction caused by equipment, use of wide-track vehicles when crossing wetlands, and restoration activities after construction.

Construction activities would require vehicular traffic in the corridor that could alter surface water flow direction because of rutting of the surface soils by vehicles. Excavated soils would be removed and the affected construction areas recontoured as necessary and restore the corridor segment to preconstruction conditions. Where needed, the vegetative cover would be reestablished. Impacts to surface water from altering hydrologic flow would be SMALL and would not require mitigation in addition to those described.

Construction activities at the Levee substation would consist of the expansion of the current facility by approximately 100 feet along the northern portion of the existing facility. The expansion would include the excavation, filling, grading, and the addition of fencing. Additional stormwater retention areas would also be added to the vacant area north of the planned expansion. Similar mitigation measures would be used for the substation construction activities. Impacts would be temporary and limited to the area of construction.

The potential impacts at the substation from hydrologic alteration would be similar to construction impacts along the transmission route, would be SMALL, and not warrant additional mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Levee-to-Pennsuco Corridor

The 230 kV transmission line terminating at the Pennsuco substation would also follow the Clear Sky-to-Levee corridor identified above, but would not connect at Levee substation.

The new line would continue largely within or along an existing right-of-way from the Levee substation to the Pennsuco substation. The right-of-way would follow along existing drainage ditches and run adjacent (and not across) ponds located along the route. The new line would require the construction of new transmission towers.

Construction activities at the Pennsuco substation would require the expansion of the fenced substation by approximately 0.65 acres (Section 2.2). The expansion could include the excavation, filling, grading, and the addition of fencing. Additional stormwater retention areas could also be added to the vacant area south of the planned facility expansion. Similar mitigation measures would be used for the substation modification activities as would be used for the transmission corridor. Impacts would be temporary and limited to the area of disturbance. Therefore, the impacts would be SMALL and not warrant additional mitigation.

Clear Sky-to-Davis Corridor

The Clear Sky-to-Davis corridor would use existing transmission line rights-of-way. This existing corridor and rights-of-way cross and border a land area that is now a small part of the property of Biscayne National Park just north of the Turkey Point plant property and near the park headquarters, and also crosses the Florida City Canal, the L-31E Canal, the North Canal, an unnamed drainage feature, the Military Canal, the Princeton Canal (C-102), and Black Creek and the Black Creek Canal (C-1) before arriving at the Davis substation.

The expansion of the transmission capacity along the Clear Sky-to-Davis corridor would require the construction of new transmission towers. The potential hydrologic impacts would be similar to those for the Clear Sky to Levee route described above. Access to the existing right-of-way would be via current access locations and under existing access agreements. Mitigation measures for potential impacts would be similar to those for the Clear Sky-to-Levee route.

Construction activities at the Davis substation would take place within the existing facility. Similar mitigation measures would be used for the substation modification activities as would be used for the transmission corridor. Impacts would be temporary and limited to the area of disturbance. Therefore, the impacts to this corridor would be SMALL and not warrant additional mitigation.

The new transmission lines would require constructing new towers, the modification of existing towers, and constructing in existing or new rights-of-way. New transmission lines would be built in Miami-Dade County and the prospective corridors are shown in Figure 2.2-5. The land use along the transmission corridors is presented in Table 2.2-2.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Davis-to-Miami Corridor

As described in **Section 3.7**, the Davis-to-Miami corridor would follow an existing FPL transmission right-of-way east from the Davis substation until the corridor crosses U.S. Highway 1. The corridor would then follow existing transportation and utility rights-of-way northeast until the corridor reaches the Miami substation. Waterbodies crossed would include the Cutler Drain Canal (C-100), the C-100A Canal, the Snapper Creek Canal (C-2), the Coral Gables Canal, and the Miami River (C-6 Canal).

New single pole towers would be required for the new 230 kV transmission line. For any minor ditches, canals, or wetlands that are crossed, construction activities could include the installation of culverts to maintain flow. The new line would be above ground except where the transmission line would be installed below ground in traditional open-cut trenches in the vicinity of the Miami River with the crossing performed beneath the river by horizontal drilling method. The new line would continue the remaining distance after the crossing via above ground installation until the substation is reached.

No new access roads would be required. Existing public access roads would be used to access the corridor. Construction would be performed to minimize disturbance to natural ground cover. Where surface disturbance is necessary or fill material required, erosion control devices would be used to minimize impacts to wetlands and other waterbodies in accordance with state stormwater regulations and environmental best management practices. Silt fence technology and other stormwater runoff controls would be used to limit the potential impacts to nearby surface waters from stormwater runoff. Disturbed areas would be graded and seeded where necessary with a Florida approved seed mix. In areas where pavement currently exists, the pavement would be replaced in a timely manner to limit the amount of exposure soils would have to possible erosion.

Excavation of trench areas could require dewatering. Water discharged to the surface during dewatering activities could be discharged to catch basins, temporary settling basins, or watercourses if the water is sufficiently free of sediments.

Drilling beneath the Miami River would be performed in accordance with applicable regulations. Impacts to surface water bodies during construction of the Davis-to-Miami transmission line would be similar to those for the other transmission line segments. Impacts would be of short duration and localized to the activities being performed. Therefore, impacts would be SMALL and not warrant additional mitigation.

There would be a need for new facility components within the existing Miami substation in support of the new 230 kV line. No additional land would be required for these activities. Construction activities would include limited excavation and construction activities associated with bring the new aboveground line into the substation. Silt fence technology and other stormwater runoff controls would be used to limit the potential impacts to nearby surface waters

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

from stormwater runoff during construction activities. FPL would obtain any permits necessary for the construction activities associated with the substation alteration.

Impacts to surface water bodies during construction activities within the Miami substation would be similar to those for the other substations. Impacts would be of short duration and localized to the activities being performed. Therefore, the impacts would be SMALL and not warrant additional mitigation.

### **Groundwater**

It could be necessary to dewater the excavations for the foundation of the towers along the rights-of-way. Dewatering during trenching activities and for manhole excavation along the Davis-to-Miami corridor would also be necessary. The dewatering effects would be short term and the water level would return to preconstruction levels. Hydrologic alteration would occur locally at the foundations within the FPL rights-of-way. Dewatering could impact areas off of the right-of-way depending on the duration. However, the impacts would be temporary. Impacts to groundwater from hydrologic alterations would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation other than those required in the site-specific permits.

#### 4.2.1.2.3 Reclaimed Water Pipelines and FPL Reclaimed Water Treatment Facility

### **Surface Water**

The use of reclaimed water would require constructing delivery pipelines from the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD) South District Wastewater Treatment Plant (SDWWTP) and an FPL reclaimed water treatment facility located on the Turkey Point plant property to treat the reclaimed water received from the Miami-Dade system. The location for the reclaimed water pipelines is from the SDWWTP located north of the Turkey Point plant property. The reclaimed water pipelines would cross water bodies including wetlands, the Florida City Canal, the L-31E Canal, the North Canal, the Military Canal, the Princeton Canal (C-102), the Goulds Canal, and the Black Creek Canal (C-1).

Construction activities for the reclaimed water pipelines would be performed in accordance with the required local, state, and federal guidelines, permitting requirements and accepted industry practices for the pipelines and treatment facility construction. Constructing the reclaimed water pipelines and the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility would alter the surface water flow in the vicinity during construction activities. The pipelines and facility excavation, the storage of excavated soils and/or spoils, stockpiling fill material, and the storage of equipment and supplies could impact surface water flow. Use of a stormwater detention basin would also alter the surface water flow.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Construction activities for the pipelines could result in vegetation loss and land disruption. As described in [Section 4.3](#), the pipelines would be trenched beneath an existing access road on the west side of the corridor and, on completion, the disturbed portions of the corridor would be graded to the contours of the surrounding landscape and revegetated or returned to previous land uses. Clearing new corridors and/or expansion of existing corridors would include use of environmental best management practices to minimize impacts to surface waters.

Dewatering could be required during the excavation of the pipelines and the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility. Disposal of the water after it passes through a detention basin could alter the surface drainage downstream of the detention basin. However, impacts would be temporary. The disturbed areas would be recontoured and restored to preconstruction conditions. The disturbance would be short term. Impacts to surface water from hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation other than those described above.

### **Groundwater**

Construction activities could also alter the groundwater flow locally because of the excavations and foundation for the pipelines and treatment facility. The alteration would be permanent, although local to the construction activity. Dewatering activity during construction would also impact groundwater flow local to the pipelines and facility foundation. Alteration to groundwater flow would be temporary and local to the activity. Therefore, impacts from hydrologic alteration because of construction activities along the reclaimed water pipelines and at the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation other than those required by permit or identified above.

#### **4.2.1.2.4 Offsite Roads**

### **Surface Water**

Impacts to surface water from construction activities on offsite roads would be similar to the onsite road impacts. Construction traffic access to the plant property would be via various routes including, SW 117th Avenue, SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road, SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive, SW 344th Street/Palm Drive, and SW 359th Street. Road improvements are described in [Subsection 3.9.1.2](#).

As part of the road improvements, drainage ditches, culverts, and swales would be installed as appropriate. During construction activities, surface water would be routed to areas that could accept the additional surface flow that would then alter the flow in the vicinity of the road. Impacts from hydrologic alterations would be SMALL for groundwater and would not require mitigation.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

## **Groundwater**

Impacts to groundwater from construction activities on offsite roads would be similar to those for the onsite roads. Impacts from hydrologic alterations would be SMALL for groundwater and would not require mitigation.

### 4.2.1.2.5 Potable Water Pipelines

## **Surface Water**

The operation of Units 6 & 7 would require potable water pipelines be constructed from an existing MDWASD supply line near the intersection of SW 288th Street and SW 137th Avenue/ Tallahassee Road to the Turkey Point plant property, connecting to the location of the site meter for the existing Turkey Point water supply line. The route to the Turkey Point plant property would parallel and cross multiple drainage canals and the L31E Interceptor Canal along SW 359th Street. The potable water pipelines would pass just to the north of the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility, and turn south before entering the Units 6 & 7 plant area.

Construction activities would also include the construction of a metering station at the intersection of SW 117th Avenue and SW 359th Street that would be used to monitor and maintain pressure in the pipelines to help meet Units 6 & 7 water requirements. Standard pipeline techniques including open trenching and backfilling would likely be used for most of the installation. Directional drilling could also be used for, road crossings and canal crossings, where site conditions and pipeline size permit. MDWASD would perform construction activities in accordance with industry standards and MDWASD protocols and procedures.

Construction activities for the potable water pipelines would be performed in accordance with the required local, state, and federal guidelines, permitting requirements and accepted industry practices for the pipelines and metering station construction. Constructing the potable water pipelines and the metering station would alter the surface water flow in the vicinity during construction activities. The pipelines and facility excavation, the storage of excavated soils and/or spoils, stockpiling fill material, and the storage of equipment and supplies could impact surface water flow. Use of a stormwater detention basin, if required, could also alter the surface water flow.

Construction and restoration along the pipelines route would be performed by MDWASD in accordance with their protocol and procedures and industry standards. Dewatering could be required during the excavation of the pipelines and the metering station. Disposal of the water after it passes through a detention basin or through other sediment control devices could alter the surface drainage downstream of the detention basin. However, impacts would be temporary. The disturbed areas could be recontoured and restored to preconstruction conditions. The

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

disturbance would be short term. Impacts to surface water from hydrologic alteration would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation other than those described above.

### **Groundwater**

Construction activities could also alter the groundwater flow locally because of the construction of the potable water pipelines and metering station. The alteration would be local to the construction activities and temporary. Dewatering activity during construction would also impact groundwater flow local to the potable water pipelines and metering station construction. Alteration to groundwater flow would be temporary and local to the activity. Therefore, impacts from hydrologic alteration because of construction activities along the potable water supply pipelines and at the metering station would be SMALL and not require additional mitigation.

#### **4.2.2 WATER USE IMPACTS**

##### **4.2.2.1 Surface Water**

Construction for Units 6 & 7 and associated onsite and offsite facilities is estimated to require approximately 565 gpm (0.8 MGD) of potable water, used for such activities as fugitive dust control, concrete production, hydrotesting and flushing, and potable water use by the construction workforce. The source of construction water would be the existing units potable water supply and/or potable water brought in from tanker trucks. In addition, freshwater from any constructed stormwater ponds may be used for fugitive dust control during backfill operations. A description of the impacts to public infrastructure is included in [Section 4.4](#). Because surface water would not be used for the construction-related activities, there would be no impacts from surface water use because of construction-related activities.

Wastewater during construction would be released to the industrial wastewater facility or to one of the deep injection wells. The impacts of release of construction wastewater to the industrial wastewater facility would be SMALL due to the small percentage of wastewater when compared to flow within the canals (0.8 MGD is the estimated potable water required for all uses during the construction of Units 6 & 7). Assuming all of the required potable water and water from dewatering activities for Units 6 & 7 would be released to the industrial wastewater facility, this would represent less than 1 percent of 2747 MGD water flow in the industrial wastewater facility. The construction wastewater flow is assumed lower.

##### **4.2.2.2 Groundwater**

As previously stated, construction water would be supplied by Miami-Dade County. Therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater use. Impacts to public water supplies is discussed in [Section 4.4](#). However, construction-related dewatering activities would be required at both onsite and potentially offsite areas. A description of these activities, impacts, and potential mitigative

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

measures is provided in the following subsections. Under authority of Chapter 373, State Statutes, 40E-20, F.A.C, the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) manages the general water use permitting process within its boundaries. Dewatering activities associated with construction of Units 6 & 7 would require a dewatering water use permit from SFWMD with appropriate regulatory requirements.

Wastewater during construction could be released to one or more of the deep injection wells. The impacts of construction dewatering and wastewater releases are described in the following paragraphs.

#### 4.2.2.2.1 Onsite Areas

Dewatering for the new power blocks would be to depths of approximately 20 to 35 feet below sea level. Dewatering would also be required for the caisson installations for the radial collector wells. This would require dewatering systems to remove subsurface water associated with the shallow water table aquifer. Impacts could also occur to surface water in the vicinity of the dewatering activities. However, in the vicinity of dewatering activities, the closest surface water features that could be impacted are portions of the existing industrial wastewater facility. The industrial wastewater facility and slurry diaphragm wall would act as barriers to localize drawdown. The results of a pumping test to determine the need for dewatering and estimate potential impacts, indicate that impacts to groundwater and surface water would remain local to the Turkey Point plant property. Any impacts associated with the dewatering activities would remain local to the excavation site. Once dewatering ceases, the groundwater level in the surficial aquifer would return to preconstruction conditions. Because of the location chosen for Units 6 & 7, the use of isolation measures, and the presence of the industrial wastewater facility, impacts to offsite groundwater users from dewatering activities would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

The injection of construction wastewater into the Boulder Zone via the deep injection wells would be in accordance with the current usage of the Boulder Zone by the State of Florida and in accordance with FDEP required permits. As described further in [Section 5.2](#), the injectate would be isolated within the Boulder Zone from the overlying drinking water aquifers due to the construction protocols for the wells. In the exploratory well permit application, a radius of influence of up to 3.5 miles was estimated over a 10 year period of time for an assumed maximum injection rate of 90 mgd. The amount of construction wastewater that would be injected would be much less than 90 mgd resulting in a substantially reduced radius of influence. For these reasons, impacts to groundwater hydrology from the injection of wastewater during construction would be SMALL.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.2.2.2.2 Offsite Areas

Shallow groundwater dewatering may be required during construction of new transmission towers, the reclaimed water pipelines, and new potable water pipelines. During any required dewatering activities along the transmission lines and water pipelines, surface water flow could be affected because of the release of groundwater to the ground surface or to nearby surface water bodies. As a mitigative measure, sheet piles could be used to limit the extent of potential impacts to surrounding areas where needed. Water from potential dewatering activities along the corridors could be released to a detention pond, surface pool, or other type of sediment trap before the release to a permitted outfall under any required NPDES permit requirements and SWPPPs for the construction activities. Therefore, impacts to groundwater along the transmission corridors and pipelines from dewatering activities would be SMALL.

Based on these considerations and their localized and temporary effects during dewatering, groundwater use impacts from construction activities would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation.

The FPL-owned borrow area that would provide fill material is located about 4.5 miles northwest of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. The aggregate mining operation would be conducted in a manner to minimize impacts to groundwater following applicable state and local regulations. Mining operations conducted below the water table would be performed without dewatering the formation. Aggregate removed from the mine would be stockpiled inside the perimeter berm and allowed to drain before it would be transported offsite. While the mine is under construction, the water may become turbid, due to the suspension of solids. This turbidity would not impact groundwater quality away from the mine property.

A lake would be created from the mining activities in the deep cut areas. The depth of the lake would be established to ensure that the mining is performed in the fresh water portion of the aquifer and that it would not induce saltwater intrusion into the aquifer or the lake. Therefore, the impacts to groundwater resources from the mining or construction of the lake would be SMALL.

4.2.3 WATER-QUALITY IMPACTS

Available surface water and groundwater quality data for existing facilities on the Turkey Point plant property is summarized in [Subsection 2.3.3](#). Impacts to the existing surface water and groundwater quality at on the Turkey Point plant property and offsite areas are summarized below.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.2.3.1 Surface Water

Impacts to surface water quality at both onsite and offsite facilities can occur as the result of soil erosion because of soil disturbance during construction of onsite and offsite facilities that could result in increased surface water sediment loading to nearby water bodies.

Surface water flow from onsite construction activities, including spoils placement, would be to the industrial wastewater facility. Impacts on surface water quality would be minimal because the industrial wastewater facility operates as a closed loop cooling water system for the existing units and it does not discharge to other surface water bodies.

Modifications to the existing equipment barge unloading area would be performed under permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) (Section 404 Permit and Section 10 — Rivers and Harbors Act Permit; [Table 1.2-1](#)). Excavation and limited dredging could create turbid waters that could migrate from the vicinity of the equipment barge unloading area into Biscayne National Park. Curtain wall technology would be used to isolate the affected area from the waters of the park.

The equipment barge unloading area would be enlarged to accommodate larger barges. The modification would be performed using sheet piles to isolate the equipment barge unloading area from the barge turning basin. Excavated and dredged soils would be stockpiled in the spoils areas described in [Section 3.9](#). Impacts to surface water quality from equipment barge unloading area modifications would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

The water quality for the dewatering effluent released to the industrial wastewater facility would be of similar quality as the water in the facility and the flow would be negligible when compared to the total flow in the cooling canals and thus would have a SMALL impact. Ground-disturbing activities that meet federal, state, and local regulations requiring permits, would be permitted and overseen by applicable regulations, and guided by an approved SWPPP. The SWPPP would also contain a plan for the construction activities. Any impacts to surface water quality during construction would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation beyond those best practices required by permits.

Construction of transmission lines would comply with applicable regulations and standard industry construction practices (including use of existing corridors to the extent practicable) would be used. Accordingly, impacts to surface water sources from transmission line and pipeline construction would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.2.3.2 Groundwater

##### 4.2.3.2.1 Onsite Areas

The plant area overlies a surficial saltwater aquifer beneath the plant that is hydraulically connected to both the industrial wastewater facility and Biscayne Bay. Makeup water for the industrial wastewater facility comes from process water, rainfall, stormwater runoff, and groundwater infiltration to replace evaporative and seepage losses. In addition, the surficial aquifer is tidally influenced and unsuitable for potable water uses.

Any spills of diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, lubricants, or other construction-related pollutants would be cleaned up to prevent them from moving into the groundwater. This would also mitigate impacts to local surface water because spills would be addressed and not allowed to flow to nearby surface water.

In the unlikely event small amounts of contaminants escape into the environment, they would have only a small, localized, temporary impact on the water table aquifer. Impacts to groundwater quality would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation beyond those described in this section or required by federal and state permits.

##### 4.2.3.2.2 Offsite Areas

Construction of new transmission towers or modification of existing lines, the construction of access roads, potable water pipelines and reclaimed water pipelines could cause potential impacts to surface water and groundwater along the chosen routes. Any spills of diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, lubricants, or other construction-related pollutants along the routes or at offsite facilities would be cleaned up to prevent spilled fuel or oil from moving into nearby surface waters. This would also mitigate impacts to local groundwater because spills would be quickly attended to and not allowed to penetrate to groundwater. The construction activities would be performed under a new SWPPP or under a modification of an existing SWPPP and associated spill prevention plan.

In the unlikely event small amounts of construction-related pollutants escape into the environment during road, transmission line, or water pipelines construction, they would have only a small, localized, and temporary impact on the water table aquifer. Impacts to groundwater quality would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation beyond those described in this section or required by permit.

#### **Section 4.2 References**

FDEP Mar 2003. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, *The Florida NPDES Stormwater Permitting Program for Construction Activity*. March 2003.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

U.S. EPA Oct 1992. (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), *Stormwater Management for Construction Activities: Developing Pollution Prevention Plans and Best Management Practices*, Office of Water, Washington, D.C., October 1992.

U.S. EPA Jun 1996. *Overview of the Stormwater Program*, Office of Water, Washington, D.C., June 1996.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

### 4.3 ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS

This section addresses potential impacts to terrestrial and aquatic communities from the construction of Units 6 & 7 and associated onsite and offsite facilities. Details of construction activities and their potential landscape alterations are provided in [Sections 3.9](#) and [3.1](#), respectively. The FLUCCS land use cover codes for Turkey Point property land disturbance are summarized in [Table 4.3-1](#). The FLUCCS land use cover codes for offsite features in the vicinity and region are summarized in [Tables 2.2-1](#) through [2.2-8](#).

The Units 6 & 7 plant area is within the industrial wastewater facility and within the larger approximately 9400-acre Turkey Point plant property ([Figures 2.4-1](#) and [2.4-2](#)). The Units 6 & 7 plant area is immediately south of Units 3 & 4 and consists primarily of hypersaline mudflats and other wetland habitats, as well as a few upland habitats established on old spoil deposits. Other onsite habitats (within the Turkey Point plant property) include the industrial wastewater facility, existing facilities associated with Units 1 through 5 (including the barge turning basin), and dwarf mangrove areas. The primary landscape features adjacent to the plant property are Biscayne Bay, Card Sound, and the Everglades Mitigation Bank. The transmission corridors, the reclaimed and potable water pipeline corridors, and expanded access roads cross a variety of land use types, including various kinds of wetlands (marshes, forested wetlands, and canals), agricultural areas, rangelands, and developed/urban areas.

The impacts on terrestrial and aquatic habitats associated with the construction of Units 6 & 7 and the associated infrastructure are primarily permanent disturbances and they are described in this section. Most terrestrial disturbance would occur on previously disturbed/filled land. Onsite wetlands and water bodies that could be impacted by construction activities include:

- Hypersaline mudflats
- Mangrove heads associated with historical tidal channels
- Dwarf mangroves
- Remnant canals

Other water bodies on the plant property that would be impacted by construction activities include:

- Cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility
- Mangrove wetlands
- Barge turning basin/equipment barge unloading area



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Offsite water bodies that could be affected by construction activities include:

- Biscayne Bay
- Canals and wetlands traversed by transmission corridors, reclaimed water pipelines, potable water pipelines, and access roads

Onsite and offsite construction activities that could impact site hydrology are described in [Subsection 4.2.1](#) and include:

- Clearing land on the Turkey Point plant property and constructing infrastructure such as roads, bridges, parking areas, and stormwater drainage systems
- Constructing new power block buildings (reactor containment structure, turbine building, auxiliary building), cooling towers, nuclear administration building, training building, security facilities, Clear Sky substation, roads, FPL reclaimed water treatment facility, laydown areas, parking areas
- Constructing reclaimed water pipelines from the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD) South District Wastewater Treatment Plant (SDWWTP) to the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility
- Constructing the radial collector wells and associated pipelines
- Creation of spoils storage areas and sand/soil/gravel stockpiles
- Deep injection wells
- Excavating and removing the upper approximately 5 feet of muck within the plant area
- Dewatering of foundation excavations during construction
- Clearing and construction/modification of transmission ROWs and construction/modification of transmission access roads, towers, access bridges, and pads for transmission lines
- Plant access road construction and expansion
- Installation of potable water pipelines
- Expanding the existing equipment barge unloading area and excavation/dredging in the vicinity of existing barge turning basin
- Mobilizing and demobilizing

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.3.1 TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEMS

The terrestrial resources of the Units 6 & 7 plant area, the Turkey Point plant property in general, and the southeastern region of Florida, are described in [Subsection 2.4.1](#). This information provides a baseline from which to gauge potential impacts of construction activities. Potential impacts to plant property areas are discussed in [Subsection 4.3.1.1](#) and potential offsite impacts are discussed in [Subsections 4.3.1.2](#) (reclaimed water pipelines) and [4.3.1.3](#) (transmission corridors, borrow site, and access roads/potable water pipelines).

##### 4.3.1.1 Potential Impacts to the Units 6 & 7 Plant Area and Other Plant Property Areas

Construction of Units 6 & 7 and associated onsite facilities ([Figure 4.3-1](#)) would result in approximately 600 acres being disturbed (and would represent the maximum possible area of soil exposed at one time) during the construction phase. A variety of wetland land cover types, as summarized in [Table 4.3-1](#), would be disturbed by construction activities. Construction of the heavy haul road would result in land disturbance, but would mostly occur on previously disturbed land on the Turkey Point property and, therefore, would not impact terrestrial habitats. Clearing methods, disposal of construction wastes, and methods of limiting erosion, runoff, and siltation are addressed in [Section 4.1](#).

As described in [Subsection 2.4.1](#), the approximately 218-acre Units 6 & 7 plant area consists primarily of hypersaline mudflats and other wetland types ([Figure 2.4-2](#)). The area has been impacted by unit operations for three decades. Although the Units 6 & 7 plant area has not been developed directly, it has been impacted by the construction of berms/spoil deposit areas and the adjacent and remnant canals associated with the industrial wastewater facility.

An approximate 52-acre laydown area would be established west of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. This area consists of streams and waterways/canals, reservoirs larger than 500 acres (note: this description applies to the part of the industrial wastewater facility that is within the laydown area), dwarf mangroves, fill area and roads and highways ([Table 4.3-1](#)). An approximate 3-acre transmission laydown area would be established and consist of ditches, dwarf mangroves and electric power facilities ([Table 4.3-1](#)).

An approximate 44-acre FPL reclaimed water treatment facility would be built on a parcel of land between SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and the test canals (immediately north of the industrial wastewater facility). This facility would be built on sawgrass marsh with scattered dwarf mangroves, Australian pine, streams and waterways/canals, and exotic wetland hardwoods ([Table 4.3-1](#)). Delivery pipelines would extend east and south from this facility through a land cover type consisting of roads/highways ([Table 4.3-1](#)), to the makeup water reservoir. The facility is immediately north of land considered crocodile critical habitat.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The existing barge facility would be expanded to allow delivery of large components and modules for Units 6 & 7. The expansion, termed the equipment barge unloading area, would be about 130 feet by 250 feet in size and located on an existing filled area on the northwest edge of the barge turning basin.

Existing roads within the Turkey Point Plant property would be improved to provide a heavy haul road for transportation of large components and equipment from the equipment barge unloading area. This would impact 5.17 acres of streams and waterways/canals, non-vegetated wetlands, disturbed land, fill areas, roads and highways and electric power facilities (Table 4.3-1), and two new bridges would be established over existing canals.

Three separate areas totaling approximately 211 acres would be used for spoils storage. One storage area would be about 77 acres and would lie along the west bank of the main north-south canal of the industrial wastewater facility (does not include the existing road). The second area would be about 116 acres and would lie along the eastern bank of the main north-south canal of the industrial wastewater facility (does not include the existing road). The final storage area would be about 18 acres and would be located along the southern bank of the east-west canal at the lower end of the industrial wastewater facility (does not include the existing road). All three storage areas would be established on portions of the Turkey Point property previously disturbed by construction and maintenance of the industrial wastewater facility. The spoils storage areas would be graded and bermed (e.g., lip berm) to minimize the amount of drainage from the spoils into the industrial wastewater facility. While water quality treatment is not required, sediment control devices such as hay bales or gravel filters may be used to ensure sediment from the spoils does not physically impact terrestrial or aquatic species in the cooling canals of the industrial treatment facility.

#### 4.3.1.1.1 Plants and Plant Communities

Plants and plant communities on the Turkey Point plant property are sparse resulting from harsh conditions (hypersaline soils and fluctuating water levels) and disturbed soils. Common plants include red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*), white mangrove (*Laguncularia racemosa*), saltwort (*Batis maritima*), and glasswort species (*Salicornia spp.*). Listed, rare, or unusual plant species have been observed in the Clear Sky to Levee transmission corridor within the Turkey Point plant property but not in other areas within the Turkey Point plant property. Listed (state threatened) plant species observed in the Clear Sky to Levee transmission corridor are locustberry (*Bysonima lucida*), mullein nightshade (*Solanum donianum*), and West Indian trema (*Trema lamarkianum*). These species would be avoided to the maximum extent practical. Because the majority of habitats to be disturbed have a previous history of disturbance or alteration, construction impacts to plants and plant communities would be SMALL and no further mitigation measures would be warranted. Construction activities would not significantly reduce the regional diversity of plants or plant communities.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.3.1.1.2 Threatened and Endangered Species

Important wildlife species, as defined by NUREG-1555, do exist and/or have existed within the Turkey Point plant property. These important species include four federally listed species: American crocodile (*Crocodylus acutus*), wood stork (*Mycteria americana*), Florida manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*), and eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon corais couperi*) (see [Subsection 2.4.1.2](#)).

Existing Turkey Point facilities and new Units 6 & 7 are within the area designated as critical habitat for the crocodile (see [Figure 2.4-4](#)), and crocodiles reside and breed within the industrial wastewater facility (see [Figure 2.4-5](#)). The harsh environment (mudflats with little cover/shade) within the construction footprint of the Units 6 & 7 plant area is poor habitat for the crocodile, although crocodiles occasionally use the adjacent canals as travel corridors. Adjacent canals may be temporarily impacted (erosion, sedimentation, turbidity) by construction activities (see [Subsection 4.3.1.3.1](#)), including transmission line construction. However, these potential impacts would be limited by standard industry construction practices (silt fences, mulching, slope texturing, vegetated buffer strips, reseeding areas of disturbed soils) and the canals would continue to provide crocodile habitat during and after construction. There are a small number of crocodile nests (three in 2008) in the northern end of the return canals (see [Figure 2.4-5](#)) within approximately 300-650 feet of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. It is possible that these nesting crocodiles may be disturbed by construction noise and increased activity on the roadways and berms (e.g., trucks carrying spoil/muck, construction materials, transmission line construction, etc.) in the industrial wastewater facility, and could possibly leave the area. Also, 359th Street will be improved immediately adjacent to the northern end of the industrial wastewater facility. Traffic on this road may pose a threat to crossing crocodiles. Project-specific management plans for crocodiles and other listed species have been created by FPL for all recent facility additions and would be created for this construction activity as well. These management plans include monitoring for species occurrence and mitigation measures. Although the affected land is considered of marginal quality for the crocodile, it is still considered “potential” habitat. The loss of potential habitat would be mitigated by the creation of additional freshwater refugia for juvenile crocodiles on selected berms and vegetation restoration (removing exotics and managing for native plants). To mitigate for hazards associated with increased traffic on the road between the northern end of the industrial wastewater facility and the test canals, four wildlife underpasses would be installed to allow safe travel between the two sites. All current aspects of the crocodile research and monitoring programs would be continued. These aspects include education of on-site workers about status of and threats to crocodiles, constraints on vehicular traffic within the industrial wastewater facility at night and during critical periods of the nesting season, and constraints on road maintenance and construction activities at night and during nesting as well as at/near crocodile crossings.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Construction activities for Units 6 & 7 would not impact crocodile populations in southern Florida or hinder continued recovery of this species. However, given that the industrial wastewater facility hosts a significant crocodile population and given the proximity of small numbers of nesting crocodiles to the construction area and to roadways that would be used during construction, impacts to the local population as a result of increased traffic and construction noise would be MODERATE and would require mitigation such as that described above.

Small numbers of wood storks have been observed in shallow water within the laydown area immediately west of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. Wetlands within this laydown area and the plant area would be eliminated by construction of Units 6 & 7. However, wood storks and other wading birds also use shallow waters within the industrial wastewater facility and, therefore, the loss of these wetlands within the construction areas would not significantly impact local or regional wood stork populations, and impacts would be SMALL (also see [Subsection 4.3.1.3.1](#)).

One Florida burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia floridana*), a species of special concern, had been observed in the southern portion of the industrial wastewater facility. Florida burrowing owls typically inhabit open, well drained landscapes such as pastures and mowed areas. Given that the Florida burrowing owl has not been observed within the construction footprint or in areas likely to be impacted by construction activities, construction impacts on the Florida burrowing owl would be SMALL.

Manatees have been observed within the barge turning basin, but this area is not designated as critical habitat for the species (see [Figure 2.4-4](#)). Construction of Units 6 & 7 would result in additional barge traffic (80 deliveries per unit over 6 years) delivering large components and modules to Turkey Point and thus could result in an increased probability of manatee/barge interactions. A management plan would be implemented for in-water activities to avoid and/or limit potential impacts to manatees. This plan would include the use of observers to spot manatees during in-water activities and reduction of in-water activities if manatees were observed within the basin. Given that the construction activities relative to the equipment barge unloading area (including barge traffic) are modifications/increases of existing activities and that a management plan would be implemented to avoid and/or limit potential impacts on manatees, the impacts of construction activities on manatees would be SMALL.

There have been occasional sightings of the eastern indigo snake on and near the Turkey Point plant property. None of these sightings occurred within the construction footprint or on areas likely to be impacted by construction activities. Given the limited number of sightings of this species on plant property (see [Subsection 2.4.1.2](#)), construction impacts on eastern indigo snakes would be SMALL.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.3.1.1.3 Other Important Species

Other important wildlife species under NUREG-1555 are state-listed species and game animals. Wildlife observed on the Turkey Point plant property includes two state-threatened species: the least tern (*Sterna antillarum*) and the white-crowned pigeon (*Columba leuccephala*). Six wading birds designated as species of special concern have been observed on and/or adjacent to the Units 6 & 7 plant area: little blue heron (*Egretta caerulea*), roseate spoonbill (*Ajaia ajaja*), reddish egret (*Egretta rufescens*), snowy egret (*Egretta thula*), tricolored heron (*Egretta tricolor*), and white ibis (*Eudocimus albus*). Given the use of other higher-quality habitats within Turkey Point plant property by these state-listed species, the impacts of construction on these species would be SMALL. Game species observed within the Turkey Point plant property include white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), rabbits (*Silvilagus sp.*), and mourning doves (*Zenaida macroura*). Habitat for these terrestrial game animals is generally limited on the Turkey Point plant property and, therefore, their onsite populations are likely to be small. Therefore, the impacts of construction activities on game species would be SMALL.

4.3.1.1.4 Wetlands

Wetlands function as breeding habitat, foraging habitat, protective cover, and water sources for a variety of wildlife species and are considered “important habitats” under NUREG-1555. Wetlands and remnant canals within the approximately 218-acre Units 6 & 7 plant area were delineated in 2008 using standard methods documenting hydrology, hydrophytic plants, and hydric soils. Approximately 250 acres of wetlands in the plant area would be eliminated by construction, with mudflats (187.5 acres) the primary wetland type converted (see [Subsection 2.4.1.3](#) and [Figure 2.4-2](#)). As hypersaline, ephemeral water bodies, the value of these wetlands to local wildlife is limited to those species that can tolerate harsh environmental conditions [e.g., sheepshead minnow (*Cyprinodon variegatus*), killifish (*Fundulus sp.*)] and the species that prey upon them (e.g., snowy egret, tricolored heron). Thus, the primary species found within the construction areas are hardy fish and invertebrate species and the piscivorous birds which use them as forage.

Excavation for the power block foundations would be on top of the hard Key Largo formation, approximately 35 feet below MSL, requiring dewatering to remove subsurface water associated with the shallow, water table aquifer. Additional construction impacts could also occur to surface water in the vicinity of the dewatering activities, including portions of the industrial wastewater facility. The cooling canals would act as a barrier limiting the impacts to the area being dewatered. The results of a pumping test determined that dewatering impacts to groundwater and surface water would/would not alter water levels within the industrial wastewater facility.

A laydown area would be established west of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. The FLUCCs land use description of this area consists of streams and waterways/canals, reservoirs larger than 500

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

acres (note: this description applies to the part of the industrial wastewater facility that is within the laydown area), dwarf mangroves, fill area and roads and highways (Table 4.3-1). An approximate 3-acre transmission laydown area would be established and consist of ditches, dwarf mangroves and electric power facilities (Table 4.3-1). After construction activities are completed, this land could be regraded.

A nuclear administration building, training building, and parking areas would be built on two adjacent parcels of land north of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. These areas total approximately 32 acres, consisting of a variety of land cover types including mangrove swamps, fill areas, and roads/highways (Table 4.3-1).

The FPL reclaimed water treatment facility would be built on a parcel by the test canals in an area historically dredged for test cooling evaluations (immediately north of the industrial wastewater facility). This facility would be built on sawgrass, dwarf mangroves, Australian pine, streams and waterways/canals, and exotic wetland hardwoods-Australian pine, roads and highways (Table 4.3-1). Pipelines would extend east and south from this facility through a land cover type consisting of roads/highways (Table 4.3-1) to the makeup water reservoir. The facility would be immediately north of land considered crocodile critical habitat. Any required mitigation for wetland loss would likely include wetland enhancement, restoration, and/or purchase of Everglades Mitigation Bank credits (see description in Subsection 4.3.1.1.4).

There would be approximately 10.8 total miles of roadway improvements and new road construction to create better access to the Turkey Point plant property for construction workers and trucks delivering fill and other material. The majority of these improvements would occur along existing paved and non-paved roads and transmission corridors, thus reducing potential impacts to the environment. Land uses/covers associated with these roadway corridors include a variety of land cover types, with the majority consisting of wetlands, farms, roads, and disturbed areas (Table 2.2-7). The new construction would occur between the existing road on the northern end of the cooling canals and SW 359th Street and would require the construction of a bridge to cross the L31E canal.

Construction/expansion of the roadways would follow the design standards of FDEP and the Miami-Dade County Public Works Department. Activities to reduce impacts to water and wetlands would include use of silt fences and floating turbidity curtains. Culverts would be installed and placed to maintain hydrologic flows through the area, based on hydrologic studies. Unavoidable wetland impacts resulting from roadway improvements would be mitigated in consultation with FDEP and USACE.

Potable water pipelines approximately 9 miles long would bring potable water from MDWASD to the Units 6 & 7 plant area. The pipelines would generally follow existing roadways/corridors. Much of the pipelines would be installed by trenching adjacent to or within the corridors

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

containing the access road improvements and construction along SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive to SW 117th Avenue to SW 359th Street to the plant area. Crossings of major canals would be established by horizontal directional drilling. The habitats/land covers associated with this corridor include a variety of land cover types, including wetlands, disturbed areas, water, and roads (Table 2.2-6).

Three bridges would need to be built along the heavy haul route where the industrial wastewater facility is crossed. Modifications to the existing roads would be required to support the load requirements. The heavy haul road would cross a laydown area that would require filling. Constructing the heavy haul road could alter hydrologic flow in and along the road path by the stockpile of soil, stone, and fill material. The heavy haul road would then extend generally south and cross over two new heavy haul bridges, one at the main cooling discharge canal and the other at the main cooling return canal.

Three spoils storage areas would be established on land bordering the cooling canals within the industrial wastewater facility. Waters within the industrial wastewater facility are not waters of the state or the United States, but still provide habitat for regional fauna including the endangered American crocodile. Soil from the spoil piles could be carried into the cooling canals with stormwater, increasing sediment levels and turbidity. Environmental best management practices such as silt fences, mulching, slope texturing, and avoiding wetlands and other sensitive habitats to the extent practicable, would be employed to minimize these potential impacts to canal waters.

Wetland habitats would be impacted by construction of Units 6 & 7 and ancillary facilities as indicated in Tables 2.2-2 through 2.2-7 and Table 4.3-1. Additional wetland acres may be impacted, although these impacts would be temporary and mitigated to the extent practical by environmental best management practices. Although much of this wetland habitat exists as harsh, hypersaline mudflats with minimal value as wildlife habitat, the impacts of construction on wetland habitats would be MODERATE. A three-pronged approach to wetland mitigation would be used. The first option would be active mitigation (e.g., creation of crocodile habitat, establishment of culverts under existing roadbeds to allow sheet flow of water, etc.). The second option would be wetland enhancement, restoration, and preservation. The third option would be purchase of wetland credits from the Everglades Mitigation Bank.

#### 4.3.1.1.5 Other Construction Impacts

Construction noise is another potential impact on wildlife at the Units 6 & 7 plant area, although wildlife utilizing Turkey Point should be acclimated to the operational noise from operation and maintenance of the existing facilities (see Subsection 4.4.1.4). Measures to reduce noise and vibration levels during construction may include staggering work activities, and use of noise dampeners and noise control equipment on vehicles and equipment. Noise levels in construction areas can be as high as 100 dBA at 100 feet from the noise source, but the noise attenuates over



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

a relatively short distance. For example, at a distance of 400 feet from a 100-dBA construction noise source, noise levels will typically drop to within the 60-80 dBA range (Golden et al. 1980). This is generally below noise levels known to startle waterfowl and small mammals. Even with attenuation, some noise-associated displacement of wildlife is expected during construction activities, with the displacement being permanent for some species and temporary for others. Given the limited number of wildlife species present due to existing harsh conditions, likely acclimation to existing facility operational noise, attenuation of construction noise and the limited displacement of local species, impacts to wildlife due to construction noise would be SMALL.

Avian collisions with equipment (cranes), structures (buildings, fences, etc.) and new transmission lines during construction could result in mortalities. Cranes would be the tallest equipment that would be used, potentially reaching up to 460 feet high. The buildings in the power block would range from approximately 36 to 228 feet above grade. The likelihood of avian collisions depends on the height and positioning of the man-made structures as well as the size and behavior of the birds, general landscape features, and weather conditions (Brown 1993). Construction activities and noise can also affect avian movements and increase the probability of collisions. Weather conditions resulting in poor visibility can result in avian mortalities because of collisions; however, these losses have not been found to significantly impact common or abundant species. Therefore, avian collisions during construction of Units 6 & 7 would be negligible and any impacts from these collisions would be SMALL.

Direction and intensity of lighting during facility construction and operation can alter the behavior of birds and bats. However, lighting for the existing units is necessary for their safe operation and would be required for safe construction of Units 6 & 7 (see [Subsection 4.4.1.3](#)). To the extent practicable, unnecessary lights would be turned off at night, lights would be turned downward or hooded (directing light downward), and lower-powered lights would be used during construction to minimize impacts on wildlife. Given the sparseness of wildlife populations in the construction areas, impacts of lights would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.1.2 Potential Impacts of Makeup Water Systems

Cooling water for Units 6 & 7 would originate from two sources. One source is reclaimed water from the nearby MDWASD South District Wastewater Treatment Plant and the other source is water obtained from radial collector wells.

##### 4.3.1.2.1 Reclaimed Water Pipelines

Reclaimed water pipelines (72-inch diameter or equivalent) would extend approximately 9 miles to bring reclaimed water from the SDWWTP to the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility. For about 6.5 miles of their length, the pipelines would be collocated with the existing Clear Sky-to-Davis transmission line right-of-way and adjacent road and canal rights-of-way. Specific land

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

cover types affected are described in [Table 2.2-6](#). The pipelines would generally be trenched beneath an existing access road on the west side of the transmission line right-of-way. Upon completion, the disturbed portions of the corridor would be graded to the contours of the surrounding landscape and allowed to revegetate or returned to previous land uses where appropriate. Clearing of new corridors and/or expansion of existing corridors would include use of standard industry construction practices to reduce impacts to sensitive habitats. Standard industry construction practices would include employing silt fences, mulching, slope texturing, vegetated buffer strips, reseeding areas of disturbed soils, and avoiding wetlands and other sensitive habitats to the extent practical. Endangered manatees may exist in any of the SFWMD canals crossed by this pipeline corridor. Temporary wetland impacts associated with pipeline installation will be restored in situ. Any required additional mitigation for the time lag associated with in situ restoration would likely include wetland enhancement, preservation, and/or purchase of Everglades Mitigation Bank credits (see description in [Subsection 4.3.1.1.4](#)).

In summary, given that the pipelines would be collocated with existing rights-of-way along much (approximately 6.5 miles) of its route, disturbed soils would be revegetated, wetlands would be restored, and standard industry construction practices would be employed during the clearing/expansion of the corridors and construction of the pipelines, impacts of the reclaimed water pipelines on terrestrial resources would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.1.2.2 Radial Collector Wells

Radial collector wells would be installed adjacent to Biscayne Bay to provide cooling water for Units 6 & 7 (see [Figure 3.1-3](#)). The wells would be located on the Turkey Point peninsula, east of the existing units. Each radial collector well would consist of a central reinforced concrete caisson extending below the ground level with laterals projecting from the caisson. The well laterals would be advanced horizontally a distance of up to 900 feet and installed to a depth of approximately 25 to 40 feet below the bottom of Biscayne Bay. The lateral screens under Biscayne Bay would be installed by horizontal drilling. Water from the wells would flow by head force to a collection caisson where the water would be pumped via pipelines to Units 6 & 7, thereby limiting surface disturbance to the bottom of Biscayne Bay.

Installation of the lateral screens by horizontal direct drilling could possibly produce noise/vibrations during this phase that potentially could disturb local aquatic biota (e.g., manatees, sea turtles, fish, etc.) sensitive to such disturbance. Given the depth (approximately 25 to 40 feet) of these screens, such disturbance is unlikely. However, if this procedure does result in disturbance, it would be temporary and at worst should only result in departure from the area for the duration of the event.

The radial collector wells would be located within 3 acres of previously filled lands on the northern edge of Turkey Point. Habitats adjacent to the filled lands include coastal mangroves and

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Biscayne Bay. The pipelines would cross the following habitat types: streams and waterways/canals, mangrove swamps, and fill areas (Table 4.3-1). Another 3 acres of industrial/filled habitat would be required for the construction laydown area.

Wildlife species existing near the well sites and the associated pipelines would be similar to those observed on the Turkey Point plant property. Concerning “important” species (under NUREG-1555), the pipelines would cross critical habitat of the threatened American crocodile. Of the land disturbed by well and pipeline construction, only 4.5 acres may provide habitat for crocodiles. Increased vehicle traffic during construction would pose a threat to individual animals at crossing sites. No other areas designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as critical habitat for endangered or threatened species would be crossed by these pipelines, nor would it cross any state or federal parks, wildlife refuges or preserves, or wildlife management areas. Approximately 19 acres of land would be impacted by radial collector well and pipeline construction.

Clearing for the well sites and new pipelines and/or modification of existing roadways and berms would include use of environmental best management practices to reduce impacts to sensitive habitats such as wetlands and critical habitat.

In summary, the pipelines would follow the existing roadway to the extent practicable and environmental best management practices would be employed during clearing/modification and construction of the pipelines and wells. Given the small amount of wetlands habitat disturbed and the potential impacts on crocodiles, the impacts of construction of the radial collector wells (including pipelines) on terrestrial resources would be SMALL. Mitigation to minimize impacts to crocodiles would include educating construction personnel concerning occurrence of and hazards to crocodiles, enforcing reduced speed limits near potential habitats, and potentially limiting nighttime work.

#### 4.3.1.3 Potential Impacts to Offsite Areas

##### 4.3.1.3.1 Transmission Corridors

Construction activities associated with new transmission lines would include clearing of new corridors (to the extent necessary), adding new transmission facilities and expanding existing substations. Existing linear corridors would be used, to the extent practicable, to limit the disturbance of wooded or sensitive habitats. Clearing of wooded areas would be accomplished using heavy equipment (bulldozers, cranes, tractors, bucket trucks, light trucks) to clear the entire corridor, establish access roads, facilitate tower and line installation, and right-of-way restoration (see Subsection 3.7.3.5). For tower and line installation in open landscapes (e.g., existing transmission corridor, agricultural fields, pasture, marsh), the installation of transmission tower pads and corridor land uses are generally permitted to continue outside of the tower footprint unless activities interfere with existing uses.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Wetlands of various types are crossed by the existing corridors and would be crossed by the proposed lines. The transmission corridors traverse regional canals in several locations, but construction activities would not impact these aquatic habitats. Portions of the Clear Sky-to-Levee corridors would require the installation of pads and towers within wetland habitats (Figure 2.2-5). Further, the West Secondary Option of the Clear Sky-to-Levee corridor would impact wetland habitats in Everglades National Park (see Subsection 2.4.1). Additional wetlands would be crossed within the West Preferred Option of the corridor. Construction impacts on adjacent wetlands could include erosion-caused sedimentation and increased turbidity. Standard industry construction practices would be used to reduce these impacts, including employing silt fences, mulching, and avoiding wetlands and other sensitive habitats to the extent practicable. Pending discussions with regulatory agencies, some mitigation for wetland loss may be required. Mitigation could include habitat enhancement, restoration, preservation, or purchasing credits from a regional wetland mitigation bank.

The initial component of the Clear Sky-to-Levee corridor would cross the industrial wastewater facility, most of which is considered critical habitat for the crocodile. Small areas of habitat within the industrial wastewater facility would be lost for transmission tower pads and bridges to access the pads and crocodiles may be disturbed temporarily during tower installation. Potential mitigation for construction impacts to crocodiles are described in Subsection 4.3.1.1.2, including enhancement of other portions of their habitat and construction constraints during sensitive periods of activity (nesting season and nocturnal period).

Eastern indigo snakes have been observed at two locations in the Eastern Preferred corridor. This snake inhabits a variety of habitats in Florida, ranging from mangrove swamps and wet prairies to xeric pinelands and scrub, so it is reasonable to conclude that appropriate habitats along other corridors exist. Construction of new corridors, modification of existing corridors, and construction/modification of access roads would result in temporary disturbance during the activity and some alteration of potential habitat. Given that the Eastern indigo snakes could continue to use habitats within any transmission corridor after construction is complete, construction impacts on the Eastern indigo snakes would be SMALL.

Florida panthers have been observed historically within the area containing the two Clear Sky-to-Levee transmission corridor options. Construction of either corridor would result in temporary disturbance during the activity and some loss of potential panther habitat. Construction of the preferred route along an existing access road would result in less habitat loss than the alternate route (see discussion in Section 2.2). Construction of new corridors, modification of existing corridors, and construction/modification of access roads will result in the alteration of panther habitat within the primary and secondary Panther Focus Area zones rather than a loss of habitat. Radio-collared panthers are known to use existing linear habitats (e.g., powerline ROWs, access roads, etc.) for travel. Pending finalization of the corridor route, the potential impacts of this construction are likely SMALL, although discussions with regulatory agencies after route

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

selection may result in mitigation actions such as habitat enhancement and/or purchase of panther mitigation credits.

Wood storks have nested in four Everglades National Park colonies near Tamiami Trail and the two alternative transmission corridors between the Clear Sky and Levee substations. Two colonies are within 1 mile of the West Preferred corridor, and both colonies are within the 2500-foot-radius primary zone for the colony where most activities are restricted (USFWS 1990). The other two colonies are within 3 miles of the corridor. Three of the colonies are within 1 mile of the West Secondary Corridor and all four are within 3 miles. Only two colonies fall within the 2500-foot-radius primary zone. The habitat management guidelines for this species recommend restriction of “high-tension power lines” within 1 mile of wood stork colonies and “tall transmission towers” within 3 miles of colonies (USFWS 1990). These recommendations stem from the concern that low-flying and/or inexperienced (e.g., recently fledged young) wood storks may collide with tall objects. Also, both the West Preferred and West Secondary Corridors are within the core foraging area of nine wood stork colonies (18.6-mile-radius around colonies where flight activities by storks are common) and there are concerns about loss of their wetland foraging habitats. Whereas collisions with transmission lines and resulting mortalities of storks have been documented, they are not common occurrences. Therefore, the impacts of establishing new transmission corridors on storks would be SMALL, but may still warrant discussions with regulatory agencies and result in mitigation activities. Mitigation actions could include marking new transmission lines and/or tower guy-wires to make them more visible and thus avoidable to the storks and possibly wetland enhancement to replace potential foraging habitat losses.

Surveys of the transmission corridors for threatened or endangered plants found approximately 36 listed species (see [Table 2.4-4](#)). Three were federally-listed candidate species: Florida brickell-bush (*Brickellia mosieri*), pineland deltoid spurge (*Chamaesyce deltoidea* ssp. *pinetorum*), and sand flax (*Linum arenicola*). All three are endemic to fire maintained, pine rockland habitats. One 9-acre pine rockland area (maintained by fire, not mowing) contained 23 listed plant species, although several species occurred on disturbed habitats (e.g., spoil areas). Impacts to rare plants found near the transmission corridors may require mitigation, pending discussions with regulatory agencies, such as avoidance (to the extent practicable), possible movement of plant populations, and/or habitat enhancement.

Given that the sensitive plants discovered within the transmission corridor already exist within managed and/or maintained habitats and an avoidance policy (to the extent practicable), impacts of installation and/or expansion of transmission corridors on listed plants would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.1.3.2 Borrow Material

Borrow material for construction would be obtained from a combination of an FPL-owned fill source, other regional sources, or reused material. The FPL-owned fill source is located about

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.5 miles northwest of the Units 6 & 7 plant area (see [Subsection 4.1.2.3](#)). The borrow area (approximately 300 acres) consists primarily of tree nurseries, Brazilian pepper, ditches, exotic wetland hardwoods, wetland scrub, freshwater marshes and roads and highways ([Table 4.3-1](#)). Fill material would be brought to the Turkey Point plant property along new and existing roads, although some modifications of existing roads to support this traffic would be necessary. Because the fill would be taken from existing quarries or a palm tree nursery, impacts on terrestrial resources would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.3.1.3.3 Access Roads and Potable Water Pipelines

Approximately 11 miles of access road expansions and construction and 9 miles of potable water pipelines would traverse existing roadways, urban/disturbed, agriculture, and various canals and wetlands. Most of the potable water pipelines would be trenched within the corridor associated with the roadway enhancements: SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive to SW 117th Avenue to SW 359th Street to the plant area. Wildlife species within the areas impacted by these projects would be those typical to southern Florida. Listed species would likely include wading birds (e.g., egrets, ibis, and possibly storks) and possibly crocodiles in adjacent wetland habitats and plants within the SW 359th Street corridor (see [Subsection 4.3.1.3.3](#)). Potential impacts to wetlands and mitigation methods are discussed in [Subsection 4.3.1.1.4](#). Given that mobile species (birds and crocodiles) would likely move to nearby similar habitat and plant species found in this habitat tend to be those that inhabit disturbed soils, impacts of these projects on wildlife species would be SMALL. As of April 21, 2009, the FWC panther mortality database contains no records of panther mortality within 2 miles of the proposed roadway improvements. The FWC panther den database contains no records of panther dens within 2 miles of the proposed roadway improvements. Florida panthers have not been recorded as occurring in the vicinity of the proposed roadway improvements or in the surrounding panther Primary Zone since 1988. Nevertheless, portions of the access roads will be located within the primary zone of the Panther Focus Area and some habitat will be altered.

The proposed road improvements will result in the loss of panther habitat within the Primary Zone. The roadways are proposed through an area that is at the urban fringe of the panther Primary Zone, and there are very few acres of habitat that could be accessed in the future by panthers moving north or east of the proposed roadways. Disturbance during construction would be temporary, but the activity could possibly result in minor habitat loss and increased traffic. Mortality risk to panthers is expected to be extremely small; thus, impacts to the panther of access road expansion would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.1.4 Summary

Construction activities would result in the permanent loss of some wetland habitats and the potential temporary disturbance to other wetland habitats. The temporary disturbance would be

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

SMALL and mitigated by standard industry construction practices, but the impacts resulting from wetland loss would be MODERATE and may warrant mitigation. Impacts to other terrestrial resources, including “important” species (as defined by NUREG-1555), would be SMALL. However, given the location of the construction activities within the designated critical habitat of the American crocodile, the proximity to active breeding habitat, and the increased construction-related traffic on roads within the industrial wastewater facility, impacts to this species would be MODERATE. Management/conservation plans would be implemented to avoid and/or limit the impacts of construction activities on protected species such as the crocodile and manatee.

#### 4.3.2 AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS - CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

##### 4.3.2.1 General Impacts to Aquatic Resources

Roads, bridges, and spoils areas, described in [Subsection 4.3.1.1](#), would be placed so as to minimize impacts to aquatic resources. However, construction on land would result in impacts to nearby onsite and offsite aquatic ecosystems, including sedimentation and increased turbidity (as a result of erosion of surface soil) and, although less likely, spills of petroleum products. Aquatic habitat would be lost in areas that would be dewatered and backfilled to support construction of Units 6 & 7. Each of these impacts is described below.

##### 4.3.2.1.1 Sedimentation

Three major groups of aquatic organisms are typically affected by the deposit of sediment in wetlands: (1) aquatic plants, (2) benthic macroinvertebrates, and (3) fish. The effects of excess sediment in wetlands, including sediment generated by construction activities, are influenced by particle size. Finer particles may remain suspended, blocking the light needed for photosynthesis, and initiating a cascade of effects from the primary producers. Suspended particles may also interfere with respiration in invertebrates and newly hatched fish, or reduce their feeding efficiency by lowering visibility (Waters 1995).

Construction sites are subject to erosion, which can then lead to sedimentation in adjacent areas. The land in the construction areas is flat and characterized by sheet flow and rapid infiltration of surface water. Much of the surface water runoff would simply be absorbed by the soil, and any sediment it carried would be deposited in place; excess runoff would be directed toward retention ponds, as described below.

Construction-related activities such as excavation, grading for drainage during and after construction, temporary storage of soil piles, and use of heavy machinery all disturb vegetation and expose soil to erosive forces. Reducing the length of time that disturbed soil is exposed to the weather is one of the most effective ways of controlling excess erosion and sedimentation (Waters 1995).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Construction impacts to water resources would be avoided or minimized through environmental best management practices and standard industry construction practices such as stormwater retention basins and silt screens, under a Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Large and Small Construction Activities, (Rule 62-621.300(4)(a), Florida Administrative Code) (FDEP 2008b). Other practices that would be used to minimize impacts to aquatic habitats during construction include mulching, slope texturing, creating vegetated buffer strips, and reseeded areas of disturbed soil. Preventing erosion by covering disturbed areas is a preferred method of controlling sedimentation, especially when constructing bridges, which are necessarily near surface water. When erosion cannot be prevented entirely, intercepting and retaining sediment before it reaches surface waters can reduce impacts (Waters 1995). Given the preventative measures employed, impacts from sedimentation would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.2.1.2 Turbidity

Sedimentation can cause a temporary increase in turbidity as the imported sediment settles to the bottom. If high turbidity persists for several days in an area that is generally clear, the photosynthetic process can be reduced (FDEP 2008a). However, most aquatic and wetland habitats in south Florida are buffeted by frequent high-energy storms that cause temporary increases in turbidity. Such temporary disturbances are part of the natural environmental dynamic experienced by the aquatic species that occur in both the onsite and offsite project areas. No crystalline springs are in the area. The Guide to Living with Florida's Wetlands (FDEP 2008a) states that the damaging effects of construction on wetlands can be minimized by good planning and design. To control sedimentation, a variety of measures would be implemented to limit the effects of increased turbidity resulting from construction activities. Impacts would be temporary and SMALL. Onsite and offsite construction would use standard industry construction practices, described in [Section 4.2](#), to minimize impacts to aquatic resources resulting from increased turbidity.

#### 4.3.2.1.3 Petroleum Spills

Spill prevention techniques would include locating storage areas for petroleum products at a safe distance from surface waters. For example, heavy equipment would be driven to a bermed and drained location for refueling. Any spills of diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, or lubricants during construction would be cleaned up to prevent spilled fuel or oil from impacting aquatic resources. A Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan would be implemented in accordance with EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 112). Spills would be attended to and not allowed to flow to nearby surface water. Any impacts to aquatic resources as a result of spills would be SMALL.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.3.2.1.4 Habitat Disturbance

Construction of Units 6 & 7 would result in the unavoidable destruction of wetlands and man-made canals, most of it hypersaline mudflats, as described in [Subsection 2.4.2.1.1](#) and shown in [Figure 2.4-2](#). Specific impacted habits (land cover types) are shown in [Table 4.3-1](#). The area contains marginal habitat which has been impacted by unit operations for at least 30 years. The aquatic species in the impacted wetlands are widely distributed across similar habitats in south Florida. No rare or specially protected species exist there.

An approximately 52-acre laydown area west of the Units 6 & 7 plant area has streams and waterways/canals, reservoirs larger than 500 acres (note: this description applies to the part of the industrial wastewater facility that is within the laydown area), dwarf mangroves, fill area and roads and highways ([Table 4.3-1](#)). An approximate 3-acre transmission laydown area would be established and consist of ditches, dwarf mangroves and electric power facilities ([Table 4.3-1](#)).

An approximately 44-acre FPL reclaimed water treatment facility would be built immediately north of the industrial wastewater facility on sawgrass marsh with scattered dwarf mangroves, Australian pine, streams and waterways/canals, and exotic wetland hardwoods-Australian pine ([Table 4.3-1](#)). Reclaimed water pipelines would extend east and south from this facility through land use of roads/highways to the makeup water reservoir ([Table 4.3-1](#)). The open water and dwarf mangrove habitats do not support any specially protected species. Only ubiquitous, hardy aquatic species are expected to occur there.

Other aquatic habitats in the plant area and on the Turkey Point plant property may be temporarily impacted, but would not be destroyed. Specific areas are described in the following sections: Equipment Barge Unloading Area ([Subsection 4.3.2.2.1](#)), Drilling Deep Injection Wells ([Subsection 4.3.2.2.2](#)), and Staging Areas ([Subsection 4.3.2.2.3](#)).

Potential impacts to offsite aquatic resources are described in [Subsection 4.3.2.3](#). Offsite construction that may impact aquatic resources includes installation of pipelines for delivery of reclaimed water ([Subsection 4.3.2.3.1](#)) installation of radial collector wells ([Subsection 4.3.2.3.2](#)), development of transmission corridors and construction of transmission lines ([Subsection 4.3.2.3.3](#)), improvement of roadways ([Subsection 4.3.2.3.4](#)), and collection and transport of borrow material to fill the plant area ([Subsection 4.3.2.3.5](#)).

4.3.2.2 Potential Impacts to the Units 6 & 7 Plant Area and Other Onsite Aquatic Resources

When a wetland or other surface water body is impacted by construction activities and aquatic organisms are present, impacts to these organisms are expected. If the water body has an outlet, and the disturbance is gradual rather than abrupt, some animals may relocate. However, construction impacts to small wetlands or other surface waters result in loss of the fishes and

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

invertebrates. No important aquatic species are known to exist in onsite construction areas (see [Subsection 2.4.2](#)).

Although the habitats onsite that would be impacted do support aquatic life, the aquatic species that exist onsite are common in nearby waters. These species, listed in [Subsection 2.4.2.1.1](#), are expected to exist in similar habitats in the vicinity. Most of these common species tend to be tolerant of salinity and temperature fluctuations, and are common in coastal wetlands throughout south Florida (see [Subsection 2.4.2](#)).

The surface water bodies that could be impacted include the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility. The power block foundations would be approximately 35 feet below MSL. Portions of the Units 6 & 7 plant area would be dewatered, organic matter removed, and backfilled. Surface waters on the Units 6 & 7 plant area would be permanently altered by the excavation of the surficial soil and the placement of backfill material. No natural aquatic habitat would remain in the plant area. The plant area is isolated from offsite aquatic resources by the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility, which lie between the Units 6 & 7 plant area and the Turkey Point plant property boundary. Sheet pile technology may be used to isolate the industrial wastewater facility from the plant area. Stormwater would be managed with the appropriate environmental controls to reduce the amount of sediment in the surface water runoff before release to the industrial wastewater facility. As described in [Section 3.9](#), a slurry diaphragm wall would be installed around the power blocks during dewatering and excavating subsurface materials. The use of the slurry wall would allow dewatering of the power block areas with minimal impacts to groundwater directly outside of the slurry wall containment area.

The impacts to aquatic species onsite would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

As described in [Subsection 4.3.1.1](#), aquatic habitat would be impacted by the construction of Units 6 & 7 and ancillary facilities. The Units 6 & 7 plant area would require the permanent use of approximately 218 acres, as shown in [Figure 3.9-1](#).

In addition to construction of Units 6 & 7, ancillary activities that may affect aquatic resources on the Turkey Point plant property include (1) enlarging the existing equipment barge unloading area, (2) installation of the deep injection wells, (3) parking areas, (4) installing the reclaimed water pipelines from the SDWWTP to the FPL reclaimed water treatment facility and the pipelines from this facility to the plant, (5) installing the radial collector wells and pipelines, (6) nuclear administration and training buildings, and (6) supporting facilities.

#### 4.3.2.2.1 Equipment Barge Unloading Area

Expansion of the equipment barge unloading area may result in some impacts to aquatic resources in the immediate area. The existing barge turning basin currently receives five to seven barge shipments of fuel oil per week throughout the year. The number of weekly shipments

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

of fuel oil would not be expected to change; however, during the 6-year construction period, there would be approximately 80 additional barge trips for delivery of construction equipment and modules per unit. The equipment barge unloading area would be expanded to a total area of about 0.75 acres (32,500 square feet). A survey of the area showed sparse growth of submerged aquatic vegetation, including seagrasses and algal species, within the turning basin. The green algae *Caulerpa paspaloides* var. *laxa* occurs along southern edge of the basin, in an area of approximately 24 square feet (ft<sup>2</sup>). Another small area of *C. paspaloides* var. *laxa* and the algae *Acetabularia calyculus* occur in an equal-sized area (approximately 24 ft<sup>2</sup>) on the northeastern shore of the basin, extending into Biscayne Bay. Sparse patches of seagrass occur along the northern shore of the basin, in the vicinity of the existing boat slip and equipment barge unloading area. Several small areas with 5 to 20 percent coverage of turtlegrass (*Thalassia testudinum*) and shoal grass (*Halodule wrightii*) were observed, comprising a total of approximately 170 ft<sup>2</sup> (0.004 acres). Temporary, local impacts to aquatic resources during expansion of the equipment barge unloading area would include sedimentation and increased turbidity, as described below.

Enlargement of the equipment barge unloading area would cause some disturbance in the immediate area. As described in [Subsection 4.2.1.1.3](#), enlargement of the equipment barge unloading area would require dredging from a 0.1 acre area (4356 square feet) in the turning basin. The excavation and limited dredging of the equipment barge unloading area could result in increased suspended sediment in the immediate area for a short period of time. Curtain wall technology would be used to isolate the equipment barge unloading area from adjacent areas. Dredging would conform to guidance provided by the Army Corps of Engineers and dredging permit conditions.

The excavation and limited dredging would cause an increase in suspended sediment in the immediate area, and could result in a plume of suspended sediment some distance from the equipment barge unloading area. The ecological effect of the suspended sediment would depend on a variety of factors, including the type of dredge used, the timing and duration of the dredging, the particle size of the suspended sediment, wind direction and speed, the success of environmental controls to contain suspended sediment, and the life stage of the species present. Both short-term direct behavioral effects (such as entrainment and fish injury) and long-term cumulative effects (such as contaminant release and habitat alteration) on marine organisms can result from dredging (Nightingale and Sinenstad, 2001). Although effects may be similar, concern is often greater at the disposal site than at the dredge site. Material dredged from this area would be placed in the spoils areas located on existing berms within the industrial wastewater facility.

When barges move into or out of the barge turning basin, turbulence and turbidity increase for a short time. This is part of the background disturbance related to the standard operation of the existing facility. Increased barge traffic during construction phase of Units 6 & 7 would result in incremental increases in the frequency of these disturbances. The organisms that currently exist

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

in the turning basin would be those that are tolerant of intermittent disturbance in the form of turbulence and turbidity associated with barge activity. No change in the nature of the impacts would occur as a result of increased barge traffic.

Aquatic resources in the barge turning basin that could be temporarily affected by dredging include eggs, larvae, and adults of invertebrates and fishes. Mojarra, grunts, and pinfish were the most common adult fishes reported in a 2008 trawl survey of the nearshore area of Card Sound (see [Subsection 2.4.2](#)). Eggs and larvae of clupeids (herring, shad, menhaden, and sardine) were also common in the area, as were larvae of gobies and sleepers. These species could be temporarily affected by high levels of suspended sediment, which can interfere with vision (impacting foraging) and respiration, as well as cause dermal abrasion to delicate fishes. Common larval and adult invertebrates in the nearshore area of Card Sound included blue crab, stone crabs, mantis shrimp, brown shrimp, and several non-commercially important crabs and bivalves (see [Subsection 2.4.2](#)). The species typically occurring in Card Sound would be expected to also occur in the barge turning basin. The effects of dredging on these particular species are unknown; however, in a study of dredging in the Chesapeake Bay, benthic communities survived deposits of suspended sediment despite the exceedance of certain water quality standards (Nichols et al. 1990).

No threatened or endangered aquatic species would be affected by the excavation and limited dredging in the equipment barge unloading area.

The assemblage of aquatic species varies throughout the year, because of spawning and migration patterns of individual fish and invertebrate species. The season of the year in which construction occurs would determine to a large extent the impact on specific aquatic resources in the barge turning basin. However, because the area to be excavated and dredged is small and in a protected near-shore area that is already dedicated to barge activity, the overall impact on eggs and larvae of aquatic organisms would be SMALL. No other significant impacts to aquatic habitats on the Turkey Point plant property would occur. Construction activities would not affect important (as defined by NUREG-1555) fish or invertebrates in surface waters, which would be protected from sedimentation and surface runoff by physical separation. Temporary, minimal sedimentation and increased turbidity are possible, as described above.

#### 4.3.2.2.2 Drilling Deep Injection Wells

Wastewater from Units 6 & 7 construction would be discharged to the Boulder Zone of the Lower Floridan aquifer, a deep and highly cavernous zone of saline groundwater that is used for underground injection of industrial and domestic wastes in south Florida. The wells would be installed under an underground injection control permit. Dual zone monitoring wells would also be installed to monitor the potential impact of the injection process on overlying aquifer units adjacent to the Boulder Zone. The wells would be located in the plant area adjacent to new Units

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

6 & 7. This area would be built up from approximately sea level to an elevation of approximately 25.5 feet. During the construction of the deep injection wells and associated facilities, any surface water runoff would be directed to a detention pond in the vicinity of the drilling operations where sediment would be allowed to settle before being released to the industrial wastewater facility. Construction of the injection wells would not impact any aquatic habitats. Therefore, impacts would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.2.2.3 Staging Areas

Muck removed from the excavated areas would be placed in the spoils storage areas. The construction impacts identified in [Subsection 4.3.2.1](#) (sedimentation, turbidity, chemical spills, habitat destruction) that could result from the placement of muck in upland areas within the industrial wastewater facility would be mitigated by using environmental best management practices designed to prevent movement of soil or to intercept soil before it reaches the canals. Runoff would be controlled through structural and operational measures such as berms, riprap, and sedimentation filters before any water drainage to the cooling canals. Environmental best management practices are described in more detail in [Section 4.2](#).

Construction of Units 6 & 7 and ancillary facilities would eliminate certain aquatic habitats, including wetlands and open water. Because no important aquatic species are present, no critical habitat for aquatic species would be impacted, and the area that would be impacted is relatively small compared to the area of the industrial wastewater facility, construction impacts on aquatic resources on the Turkey Point plant property would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.2.3 Potential Impacts to Offsite Aquatic Resources

Offsite construction that may impact aquatic resources includes (1) installation of pipelines for delivery of potable water and reclaimed water, (2) installation of radial collector wells and pipelines, (3) development of transmission corridors and construction of transmission lines, (4) transport of borrow material to fill the Units 6 & 7 plant area, and (5) roads. Each of these is presented below as well as potential impacts to essential fish habitat (6).

##### 4.3.2.3.1 Reclaimed and Potable Water Pipelines

Reclaimed water pipelines approximately 9 miles long would be constructed to carry water from the SDWWTP to Units 6 & 7. As described in [Subsection 4.3.1.2.1](#), approximately 6.5 miles of the pipelines would be collocated with the existing Clear Sky-to-Davis transmission line right-of-way and adjacent road and canal rights-of-way. The corridor for the reclaimed water pipelines was selected to use, to the greatest extent practicable, existing infrastructure and minimize environmental impacts. Because of the SDWWTP location, the reclaimed water pipeline corridor would be located primarily within and/or adjacent to existing roads and FPL-owned rights-of-way. The reclaimed water pipelines would cross water bodies including wetlands, the Florida City

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Canal, the L-31E Canal, the North Canal, the Military Canal, the Princeton Canal (C-102), the Goulds Canal, and the Black Creek Canal (C-1). No significant natural surface water bodies would be crossed by the reclaimed water pipelines.

An approximately 10-mile potable water pipeline would bring potable water from the Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department to the Units 6 & 7 plant area. The line would generally follow existing roadways/corridors. Much of the line would be established by trenching adjacent to or within the corridors containing the access road improvements and construction along SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive to SW 117th Avenue to SW 359th Street to the plant area. Crossings of major canals would be established by horizontal directional drilling. The aquatic habitats associated with this corridor include various canals, ditches, and wetlands.

Other surface water features in the water pipeline corridors include drainage ditches, which typically occur on the borders of roadside ROWs, freshwater marshes, mangroves, and mixed hardwood wetlands. Temporary impacts to wetlands may occur during excavation of the trench for subaqueous pipeline installation. Any temporary impacts to wetlands associated with pipeline installation would be addressed in accordance with FDEP and USACE requirements. Temporary wetland impacts resulting from pipeline installation would be mitigated through restoration of the excavated trench with native wetland soils. Wetland soils removed during trench excavation would be stockpiled and replaced following pipeline installation to allow the natural vegetative community to re-establish on the canal bank. The replacement of native soils at original grade would result in no net loss of wetland acreage or wetland functions following pipeline installation.

Environmental best management practices, such as silt fencing and floating turbidity curtains, would be used to prevent secondary impacts to surface waters or wetlands associated with pipeline installation. Permanent impacts to wetland habitats located within these pipeline corridors would be avoided, and no significant adverse impacts to aquatic resources would be anticipated.

The artificial canals within these corridors contain relatively steep slopes and limited littoral zone vegetation, reducing the quality of wildlife habitat. Canals provide habitat for common native freshwater forage fishes, such as mosquitofish, sailfin molly, least killifish, sunfish, and gar, as well as nonindigenous fishes such as peacock bass, spotted tilapia, blue tilapia, Mayan cichlid, jaguar guapote, and oscar. The only important aquatic species in the reclaimed water pipeline corridor is the native mangrove rivulus. According to the FNAI database, an occurrence of mangrove rivulus was documented within the C-1 Canal in the northwestern portion of the proposed reclaimed water corridor.

Because the pipelines would follow existing corridors along much of their lengths, and erosion and sedimentation would be minimized using environmental best management practices

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

(sediment screens, mulching, revegetation), no impacts to the mangrove rivulus or other aquatic resources would occur. Overall impacts to aquatic resources would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.2.3.2 Radial Collector Wells

Radial collector wells would be installed adjacent to Biscayne Bay to provide cooling water for Units 6 & 7 (see [Figure 3.3-1](#)). The wells would be located on the Turkey Point peninsula, east of the existing units. Each radial collector well would consist of a central reinforced concrete caisson extending below the ground level with laterals projecting from the caisson. The well laterals would be advanced horizontally a distance of up to 900 feet and installed to a depth of approximately 25 to 40 feet below the bottom of Biscayne Bay. The lateral screens under Biscayne Bay would be installed by horizontal drilling. Water from the wells would flow by head force to a collection caisson where the water would be pumped via pipelines to Units 6 & 7, thereby limiting surface disturbance to the bottom of Biscayne Bay. The pipelines would cross the following habitat types: streams and waterways/canals, mangrove swamps, and fill areas ([Table 4.3-1](#)). Another 3 acres of industrial/filled habitat would be required for a construction laydown area.

Construction of the radial collector wells and supporting infrastructure could affect aquatic resources in the vicinity. The only important aquatic species is the mangrove rivulus, a state and federal species of special concern (described in [Subsection 2.4.2.3.1](#)) that is associated with red mangrove communities. Red mangroves exist in the general vicinity of the radial collector wells. Because this species is closely tied to the distribution of red mangrove, any activity that removes red mangrove could have a potential impact on this fish. Construction activities for the radial collector wells and associated pipelines would be controlled so as to minimize any impacts to red mangroves. The radial collector wells would be located within five acres of previously filled lands on the northern edge of Turkey Point. No presently undisturbed mangrove habitat would be disturbed by well construction because standard industry construction practices would reduce the amount of erosion and sedimentation associated with construction, and would limit impacts to aquatic communities in down-gradient water bodies. Because the well laterals would be drilled horizontally beneath Biscayne Bay, and surface water and sediment would not be disturbed, no increases in turbidity or sedimentation would occur.

No other significant impacts to aquatic habitats would result. The construction of the radial collector wells and associated pipelines would not affect any rare or protected aquatic species. Overall, the impacts from construction of the radial collector wells would be SMALL and would not require mitigation beyond that described above.

Any temporary impacts to wetlands associated with pipeline installation would be addressed in accordance with FDEP and USACE requirements. Temporary wetland impacts resulting from pipeline installation would be mitigated through restoration of the excavated trench with native

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

wetland soils. Wetland soils removed during trench excavation would be stockpiled and replaced following pipeline installation to allow the natural vegetative community to reestablish on the canal bank. The replacement of native soils at original grade would result in no net loss of wetland acreage or wetland functions following pipeline installation.

#### 4.3.2.3.3 Transmission Corridors

Construction activities associated with the transmission corridors would include clearing, adding new transmission facilities, access road and pad construction, and expanding existing substations, as described in [Subsection 4.3.1.3.1](#). Some construction activity would occur in areas that support aquatic resources within the transmission rights-of-way and at substations. Certification of the selected transmission line corridors is ongoing pursuant to the Florida PPSA. The impacts to aquatic habitats would be avoided and minimized by using existing corridors whenever practicable, thereby reducing the disturbance to currently undisturbed habitat using environmental best management practices. Wherever towers would be installed in open landscapes (such as marshes), the towers would be built on pads and the land use surrounding the towers would be maintained to the maximum extent practical.

Wetland impacts of transmission corridors are described in [Subsection 4.3.1.3.1](#). Fish in the wetland and open water habitats within the proposed corridors include common freshwater forage fishes native to south Florida, such as mosquitofish (*Gambusia holbrooki*), sailfin molly (*Poecilia latipinna*), least killifish (*Heterandria formosa*), sunfish (*Lepomis* spp.), and gar (*Lepisosteus* spp.). Nonindigenous fishes commonly inhabiting canals of Miami-Dade County include peacock bass (*Cichla ocellaris*), spotted tilapia (*Tilapia mariae*), blue tilapia (*Oreochromis aureus*), Mayan cichlid (*Cichlasoma urophthalmus*), jaguar guapote (*Cichlasoma managuense*), and oscar (*Astronotus ocellatus*). Culverts may be placed in some wetlands, ditches, and smaller canals, resulting in localized temporary increases in turbidity. No rare or protected fish or aquatic invertebrates are known or expected to exist within the proposed corridors. Nevertheless, environmental best management practices would be used to reduce soil erosion and sedimentation to minimize impacts to aquatic resources. No withdrawals or discharges to surface water are planned during the construction of new transmission facilities or modification of existing transmission facilities. Other than the mangrove rivulus described previously, none of the 13 freshwater fishes listed by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC 2008) as endangered, threatened, or of special concern exist in the impacted areas. Impacts to important aquatic species from the construction of transmission facilities would, therefore, be SMALL.

#### 4.3.2.3.4 Roadway Improvements

The roadway improvements would involve widening of existing paved roads and paving existing unpaved roads. In addition, intersection improvements at six locations would be made to



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

accommodate peak construction traffic. The roadway improvements are about 10.75 miles in length, of which about 5.5 miles would be on the Turkey Point plant property.

Wetlands and terrestrial habitats affected by the roadway improvements are described in [Subsection 2.4.1](#). Aquatic habitats potentially affected by roadway improvements include canals and mangroves, which are described in [Subsection 2.4.2](#) and below.

The new 4-lane roadway planned for SW 359th Street would run along the northern edge of the existing industrial wastewater facility. Construction of this road would be separated from the industrial wastewater facility by the existing berms as well as construction buffers.

Canals exist adjacent to the roadways associated with SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and SW 328th Street/N. Canal Drive. In-stream vegetation is minimal within the man-made canals adjacent to existing roadways, due to the steep slopes and minimal littoral zone. These canals provide habitat for common freshwater forage fishes native to south Florida, as well as for nonindigenous fishes commonly inhabiting canals of Miami-Dade County. Areas of mangroves occur adjacent to SW 359th Street near the L-31 Canal.

Construction of the roadways would follow the Miami-Dade County Public Works Manual and the Florida Department of Transportation Design Standards. Environmental best management practices, such as silt fencing and floating turbidity curtains, would be used to prevent secondary impacts to surface waters or wetlands associated with construction of roadway improvements. No adverse changes to the aquatic habitats near the roadways would be anticipated. The roadway expansions and new roads would be located within existing linear facilities (existing paved and unpaved roads and transmission corridor), reducing required disturbance of habitats during installation.

Any impacts to aquatic habitats associated with roadway improvements would be addressed in accordance with FDEP and USACE requirements. Unavoidable wetland impacts resulting from construction of roadway improvements would be mitigated in consultation with the FDEP and USACE. No fish or other aquatic life in canals or mangroves would be impacted by construction of the roadways because fish can easily move away from the area of construction for the short duration of the disturbance.

Because the roadway improvements would occur in areas that are already disturbed by human activity and existing infrastructure, and environmental best management practices would be followed, direct and indirect impacts to aquatic habitats due to construction would be SMALL and further mitigation would not be warranted.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.3.2.3.5 Borrow Material

Borrow material for construction would be obtained from a combination of an FPL-owned fill source, other regional sources, or reused material. The FPL-owned fill source is located about 4.5 miles northwest of the Units 6 & 7 plant area (see [Subsection 4.1.2.3](#)).

Obtaining borrow material from the FPL-owned fill source would permanently disturb approximately 300 acres of land classified as agricultural. The area consists primarily of tree nurseries, Brazilian pepper, ditches, exotic wetland hardwoods, wetland scrub, freshwater marshes and roads and highways ([Table 4.3-1](#)). Fish in the ditches are expected to be species common to south Florida, such as mosquito fish, sailfin molly, least killifish, and sunfish. No aquatic habitats would be impacted by the transport of borrow material from the existing quarries to the Turkey Point plant property.

Given the limited acreage of previously altered (ditching and invasive species) wetlands at the FPL-owned fill source site, impacts on aquatic resources would be SMALL.

#### 4.3.2.4 Summary

Construction of Units 6 & 7 would result in the unavoidable disturbance of wetlands and manmade canals, most of it hypersaline mudflats, as described in [Subsection 2.4.1.3](#) and shown in [Figure 2.4-2](#). The aquatic species in the impacted wetlands and canals are widely distributed across similar habitats in south Florida. Construction impacts to small wetlands or other surface waters result in loss of the fishes and invertebrates. No imperiled aquatic species, as defined by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC Jun 2006), are believed to exist in the construction areas (see [Subsection 2.4.2](#)).

Roads, bridges, and spoils areas, described in [Subsection 4.3.1.1](#), would be placed so as to minimize impacts to aquatic resources. However, construction on land may result in impacts to nearby aquatic ecosystems on the Turkey Point plant property and offsite, including sedimentation and increased turbidity (as a result of erosion of surface soil) and, although less likely, spills of petroleum products. Complete loss of aquatic habitat would occur in areas that would be dewatered and backfilled to support construction of Units 6 & 7.

Construction of the radial collector wells and supporting infrastructure may affect aquatic resources in the vicinity. However, aquatic resources in the area affected by the radial collector wells are common and ubiquitous in south Florida. No rare or protected aquatic species would be affected. Overall, impacts from construction of the radial collector wells would be SMALL.

Important aquatic resources in the barge turning basin that may be temporarily affected by dredging include eggs, larvae, and adults of invertebrates and fishes. Construction activities would not affect important (as defined by NUREG-1555) fish or invertebrates in surface waters,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

which would be protected from sedimentation and surface runoff by physical separation. Temporary, minimal sedimentation and increased turbidity are possible, as described above.

Offsite construction may impact aquatic resources in manmade canals, including small common fishes of south Florida as well as several species of nonindigenous fishes that have become established in the canals.

The end-use land cover and status (i.e. temporary or permanent) of the disturbed areas associated with Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 are summarized in the paragraphs below.

#### Turkey Point Property

It has been assumed that all site areas described in [Table 4.3-1](#) will be 100 percent permanently impacted by the proposed activities. The end-use land cover for all disturbed areas is FLUCCS Code 831 — Electric Power Facilities, with the exception of the spoils areas, which are FLUCCS Code 743.

#### Vicinity

Land disturbances within the vicinity consist of the FPL-owned fill source and several access road upgrades. The end-use land cover for the FPL-owned fill source, which will be 100 percent permanently impacted, is FLUCCS 532 (reservoirs larger than 100 acres but less than 500 acres). Land impacts to the access roads may be temporary as these access roads could be returned to their previous lane configuration and/or impacted area land use type once construction activities are complete. If the access roads are not restored, the end-use land cover is FLUCCS Code 814 — Roads and Highways.

#### Region

Land disturbances within the region consist of the reclaimed water pipeline, the potable water pipeline, the western and eastern transmission corridors, substation upgrades, and transmission access roads. The end-use land cover for these regional features is discussed in the following paragraphs.

The land disturbed as part of the reclaimed water pipeline installation will be returned to its original land use. Although there will be temporary disturbance during installation activities, there are no permanent impacts to end-use land cover.

The land disturbed as part of the potable water pipeline installation will be returned to its original land use, where applicable. Although a corridor is listed for this pipeline, the installation will most likely follow existing roadway medians and the proposed construction access road installation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Therefore, the permanent end-use land cover is considered part of the existing roadways and proposed construction access road upgrades.

The western and eastern transmission corridors represent the maximum extent of land presented for certification as part of the Site Certification Application (SCA) state process. The actual required right-of-ways will be determined post-certification, as will the location and amount of actual land requirements/disturbances necessary for transmission line construction. Therefore, the end-use land cover for these transmission corridors cannot be determined at this time. However, where located, the tower pad locations will be FLUCCS Code 832 — Electrical Transmission Lines.

All substation upgrades represent 100 percent permanent impacts to end-use land cover. The end-use land cover for all substation upgrades is FLUCCS Code 831 — Electric Power Facilities.

It has been assumed that all transmission access roads will be 100% permanently impacted by the proposed construction activities. The end-use land cover for all transmission access roads is FLUCCS Code 814 — Roads and Highways.

Apart from the lands that will be permanently modified by construction, impacts to aquatic communities from construction would be SMALL and temporary, and would not warrant mitigation. Construction activities that may cause erosion that could lead to harmful deposits in aquatic water bodies would be (1) of relatively short duration, (2) permitted and overseen by state and/or federal regulators, and (3) guided by an approved stormwater pollution prevention plan. Any small spills of construction-related hazardous fluids, such as petroleum products, would be mitigated according to a spill prevention control and countermeasure plan(s). Some sensitive wetland habitats exist within the areas affected by construction activities; however, no important aquatic species would be affected.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Section 4.3 References**

Brown 1993. Brown, W. M. *Proceedings: Avian Interactions with Utility Structures International Workshop*, EPRI TR-103268, "Avian Collisions with Utility Structures: Biological Perspectives," Electric Power Research Institute.

FDEP 2008a. Florida Department of Environmental Protection. *Florida State of the Environment - Wetlands: A Guide to Living with Florida's Wetlands*. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wetlands/docs/erp/fsewet.pdf>, accessed October 14, 2008.

FDEP 2008b. Florida Department of Environmental Protection. *Guidance for Stormwater Pollution Prevention*. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/stormwater/npdes/swppp.htm>, accessed October 14, 2008.

FWC Jun 2006. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, *Florida's Endangered Species, Threatened Species, and Species of Special Concern*. June 2006. Available at <http://www.floridaconservation.org/imperiledspecies/pdf/Threatened-and-Endangered-Species-2006.pdf>, accessed October 14, 2008.

FWC 2008. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, *Freshwater Fisheries Management: Threatened Fishes*. Available at <http://myfwc.com/fishing/fishes/threatened.html>, accessed October 14, 2008.

Golden et al. 1980. Golden J., R. P. Ouellete, S. Saari, and P. N. Cheremisinoff, *Environmental Impact Data Book*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers 1980.

Nichols et al. 1990. Nichols, M., R.J. Diaz, and L.C. Schaffner. *Effects of hopper dredging and sediment dispersion, Chesapeake Bay*. *Environmental Geology* 15(1): 31-43. Abstract available on line at <http://www.springerlink.com/content/l4365616t1203716/>, accessed October 14, 2008.

Nightingale, B. and C. Sinenstad. 2001. *Executive Summary: Dredging Activities: Marine Issues*. Available at <http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/ahg/execdrg.pdf>, accessed October 14, 2008.

USFWS 1990. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, *Habitat Management Guidelines for the Wood Stork*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southeastern Region, Atlanta, Georgia, 1990.

Waters 1995. Waters, T. F. *Sediment in Streams: Sources, Biological Effects, and Control*, American Fisheries Society Monograph 7, 251 pages, 1995.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.3-1 (Sheet 1 of 2)**  
**Turkey Point Property Disturbed Area FLUCCS Summary**

| <b>Disturbed Area</b>                            | <b>Level 3</b> | <b>FLUCCS Land Use Category</b>                                | <b>Acres</b>  | <b>% of Total</b> |
|--|----------------|--|---------------|-------------------|
| <b>Turkey Point Units 6 &amp; 7 Plant Area</b>   | 510            | Streams And Waterways/Canals                                   | 0.30          | 0.14              |
|  | 511            | Ditches  | 8.38          | 3.8               |
|  | 612-A          | Mangrove Heads   | 12.14         | 5.56              |
|  | 650            | Non-Vegetated Wetlands   | 182.05        | 83.41             |
|  | 743            | Spoils Areas   | 6.35          | 2.91              |
|  | 743-WET        | Wetland Spoils Areas   | 9.05          | 4.15              |
|  | <b>Totals</b>  |  | <b>218.27</b> | <b>100.00</b>     |
| <b>FPL-Owned Fill Source</b>                     | 241            | Tree Nurseries   | 243.78        | 81.70             |
|  | 422            | Brazilian Pepper   | 0.25          | 0.08              |
|  | 511            | Ditches  | 5.19          | 1.74              |
|  | 619            | Exotic Wetland Hardwoods                                       | 3.02          | 1.01              |
|  | 619/631        | Exotic Wetland Hardwoods/Wetland Scrub                         | 30.71         | 10.29             |
|  | 631            | Wetland Scrub  | 4.42          | 1.48              |
|  | 641            | Freshwater Marshes   | 8.76          | 2.94              |
|  | 814            | Roads and Highways   | 2.25          | 0.75              |
| <b>Totals</b>                                    |                | <b>298.39</b>  | <b>100.00</b> |                   |
| <b>Western Laydown Areas</b>                     | 510            | Streams And Waterways/Canals                                   | 3.31          | 6.39              |
|  | 531            | Reservoirs Larger Than 500 Acres (202 Hectares)                | 11.99         | 23.10             |
|  | 612-B          | Dwarf Mangroves  | 16.87         | 32.52             |
|  | 744            | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>                                 | 19.55         | 37.68             |
|  | 814            | Roads And Highways   | 0.16          | 0.31              |
|  | <b>Totals</b>  |  | <b>51.88</b>  | <b>100.00</b>     |
| <b>Training Parking</b>                          | 612            | Mangrove Swamps  | 5.61          | 61.50             |
|  | 612-618        | Mangrove Swamps/Exotic Wetland Hardwoods/Willow and Elderberry | 1.85          | 20.33             |
|  | 744            | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>                                 | 1.64          | 173.97            |
|  | 831            | Electric Power Facilities                                      | 0.02          | 0.19              |
|  | <b>Totals</b>  |  | <b>9.12</b>   | <b>100.00</b>     |
| <b>Nuclear Administration Building</b>           | 612            | Mangrove Swamps  | 18.68         | 82.21             |
|  | 744            | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>                                 | 3.39          | 14.91             |
|  | 814            | Roads And Highways   | 0.66          | 2.89              |
|  | <b>Totals</b>  |  | <b>22.73</b>  | <b>100.00</b>     |
| <b>Radial Collector Wells Delivery Pipelines</b> | 510            | Streams And Waterways/Canals                                   | 0.15          | 1.14              |
|  | 612            | Mangrove Swamps  | 3.98          | 29.83             |
|  | 744            | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>                                 | 9.21          | 69.02             |
|  | <b>Totals</b>  |  | <b>13.34</b>  | <b>100.00</b>     |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.3-1 (Sheet 2 of 2)**  
**Turkey Point Property Disturbed Area FLUCCS Summary**


| Disturbed Area                                | Level 3       | FLUCCS Land Use Category  | Acres        | % of Total    |
|---|---------------|---|--------------|---------------|
| <b>Heavy Haul Road</b>                        | 510           | Streams And Waterways/Canals  | 0.15         | 2.99          |
|   | 650           | Non-Vegetated   | 0.00         | 0.01          |
|   | 740           | Disturbed Land  | 0.19         | 3.64          |
|   | 744           | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>  | 0.03         | 0.59          |
|   | 814           | Roads And Highways  | 1.05         | 20.26         |
|   | 831           | Electric Power Facilities   | 3.75         | 72.51         |
|   | <b>Totals</b> |   |              | <b>5.17</b>   |
| <b>Transmission Laydown Area</b>              | 511           | Ditches   | 0.02         | 0.62          |
|   | 612-B         | Dwarf Mangroves   | 0.31         | 10.76         |
|   | 831           | Electric Power Facilities   | 2.55         | 88.61         |
|   | <b>Totals</b> |   |              | <b>2.88</b>   |
| <b>Equipment Barge Unloading Area</b>         | 510           | Streams And Waterways/Canals  | 0.02         | 2.55          |
|   | 831           | Electric Power Facilities   | 0.73         | 97.45         |
|   | <b>Totals</b> |   |              | <b>0.75</b>   |
| <b>Spoils Area A</b>                          | 510           | Streams And Waterways/Canals  | 1.06         | 1.36          |
|   | 744           | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>  | 76.35        | 98.64         |
|   | <b>Totals</b> |   |              | <b>77.41</b>  |
| <b>Spoils Area B</b>                          | 510           | Streams And Waterways/Canals  | 0.00         | 0.03          |
|   | 542           | Embayments Not Opening Directly Into The Gulf Of Mexico Or The Atlantic Ocean | 0.00         | 0.02          |
|   | 740           | Disturbed Land  | 10.27        | 57.40         |
|   | 744           | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>  | 4.19         | 23.42         |
|   | 814           | Roads And Highways  | 3.42         | 19.13         |
|   | <b>Totals</b> |   |              | <b>17.89</b>  |
| <b>Spoils Area C</b>                          | 510           | Streams And Waterways/Canals  | 4.39         | 3.78          |
|   | 744           | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>  | 111.64       | 96.22         |
|   | <b>Totals</b> |   |              | <b>116.02</b> |
| <b>Radial Collector Well Area</b>             | 744           | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>  | 3.28         | 100.00        |
| <b>Radial Collector Well Laydown Area</b>     | 744           | Fill Areas <Highways-Railways>  | 2.72         | 100.00        |
| <b>FPL Reclaimed Water Treatment Facility</b> | 437           | Australian Pine   | 7.79         | 17.74         |
|   | 510           | Streams And Waterways/Canals  | 3.07         | 6.99          |
|   | 511           | Ditches   | 0.30         | 0.68          |
|   | 612-B         | Dwarf Mangroves   | 19.80        | 45.09         |
|   | 619           | Exotic Wetland Hardwoods  | 0.61         | 1.39          |
|   | 619-AP        | Exotic Wetland Hardwoods-Australian Pine                                      | 0.16         | 0.36          |
|   | 6411          | Sawgrass Marshes  | 11.93        | 27.17         |
|   | 814           | Roads and Highways  | 0.26         | 0.59          |
| <b>Totals</b>                                 |               |   | <b>43.91</b> | <b>100.00</b> |

Note: The treated reclaimed water supply pipeline is now fully within the heavy haul road disturbed area and is not separately considered.

Due to rounding, table values may not exactly sum to the total acres and percentages.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Figure 4.3-1 Turkey Point Disturbed Area





Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.4 SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

This section addresses the socioeconomic impacts of the construction of Units 6 & 7 at the Turkey Point plant property in Miami-Dade County, Florida. The evaluation assesses impacts of construction and of demands placed on the region by the workforces. [Subsection 4.4.1](#) describes and addresses an assessment of the physical impacts of construction. [Subsection 4.4.2](#) describes the impacts of construction to the region in the areas of demography, economy, taxes, land use, transportation, recreational resources and aesthetics, housing, public services, and education. [Subsection 4.4.3](#) assesses the construction of Units 6 & 7 with regard to disproportionate adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations.

##### 4.4.1 PHYSICAL IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION

This section assesses the potential physical impacts as a result of construction of the new units on the nearby communities or residences. Potential impacts include noise, air emissions, and visual intrusions. These physical impacts would be managed in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local environmental regulations and would not significantly affect the Turkey Point plant property and the vicinity.

As presented in [Subsection 2.5.2.4](#), Miami-Dade County has more than 1946 square miles of land, of which approximately 500 square miles have been developed for urban uses. The predominant existing land uses around the Turkey Point plant property are undeveloped and protected areas. Biscayne Bay and the Atlantic Ocean border the plant property to the east. The closest incorporated communities are Homestead and Florida City. Florida City is located 8 miles west of the plant property and the municipal limits of Homestead are located 4.5 miles west ([Subsection 2.2.1.2](#)). Recreational areas in the community include Homestead Bayfront Park, Biscayne National Park, Mangrove Preserve, Everglades National Park and the Homestead Miami Speedway ([Subsection 2.5.2.5](#)). There are no residential areas or public roads located within the Turkey Point plant property. Homestead Air Reserve Base is within 6 miles of Units 6 & 7. No significant industrial or commercial facilities other than the Turkey Point units are planned for this area; however, a portion of the former Air Reserve Base (717 acres) is to be set aside for mixed economic uses (commercial, residential, or recreational uses) by Miami-Dade County ([Subsection 2.2.1.2](#)).

###### 4.4.1.1 Noise

The noise impacts of Units 6 & 7 construction activities have been evaluated. The evaluation considered construction equipment associated with site preparation and construction of permanent features, such as foundations, buildings, cooling towers and other components of each unit. The noise sources used were typical of conservative noise levels from similar equipment. The highest levels of construction noise from the Units 6 & 7 plant area would be generated by impact wrenches, cranes, backhoes, front-end loaders, trucks, bulldozers and the

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

concrete batch plant. The analysis predicts that the highest onsite construction noise level would be between 70-90 dBA (measured at a distance of 50 ft). The noise level would be 85 dBA at 3 ft, 75 dBA at 200 ft and 65 dBA at 400 ft.

The noise generated during Units 6 & 7 construction activities would be attenuated by distance from the source. As described in [Subsection 2.7.7](#), an ambient noise monitoring survey was performed in June 2008 to assess existing ambient noise in areas adjacent to the existing units. From two monitoring points located at the Turkey Point plant property boundary (monitoring points S2 and S3), current daytime and nighttime noise level equivalent ( $L_{eq}$ ) readings were recorded. The daytime  $L_{eq}$  readings ranged from 60 to 68 dBA and the nighttime  $L_{eq}$  readings ranged from 60 to 67 dBA. The  $L_{eq}$  includes all noise sources including transient sounds such as traffic that influence observations. In comparison, the maximum noise level generated by construction activities at the nearest permanent private residence would be 64.4 dBA during the daytime and 54.1 dBA during the nighttime.

Other noise generated by the construction of Units 6 & 7 would be the noise levels resulting from construction of new transmission systems and substation expansions. The noise generated from construction of the transmission lines and expansion of substations would include right-of-way clearing, access road and pad construction (where necessary), line construction, and right-of-way restoration. The noise generated from the machinery required for these phases of construction would include bulldozers, shearing machinery, chain saws, trucks, cranes and possibly helicopters. The transmission line construction and expansion within the western corridor would be on primarily wetlands, agricultural or undeveloped land; therefore, any noise from the construction would be attenuated prior to reaching receptors in the urban areas. The transmission line construction and expansion within the eastern corridor would be on primarily urban land. The noise would be attenuated by distance from the source. The transmission lines construction activities would be taking place in both agricultural areas with few people to be impacted by the additional noise and urban settings where people already experience noise from construction, traffic, etc; also this phase of construction would be accelerated, short term and performed during daytime hours. Therefore, noise generated by the construction of the transmission systems and substations would result in SMALL impacts and would not warrant mitigation.

Further noise generated by construction would be due to roadway expansions and improvements and increase in traffic by the construction workforce on access roadways and onsite roads. The noise generated by the roadway improvements and expansions would be associated with jack hammers, bulldozers, road pavers, road scrapers, earth movers and trucks. The road expansions and the new access road would be constructed on agricultural or undeveloped land; therefore, any noise from the construction would be attenuated prior to reaching receptors in the urban areas. Other road improvements would be along existing roadways. The noise generated by construction activities would be short term and during daytime hours. Noise from the increase in

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

traffic by the construction workforce would occur on existing roadways as well as the road extensions once they are completed and on the Turkey Point plant property. Due to the short duration of construction activities in a single location, setting in urban areas or in agricultural or undeveloped areas with few receptors, and limiting construction to daylight hours, the impacts from noise from road construction and traffic would be SMALL and further mitigation would not be warranted.

#### 4.4.1.2 Air

Temporary and minor impacts to the local ambient air quality could occur as a result of construction activities. Fugitive dust and fine particulate matter emissions, including those less than 10 microns ( $PM_{10}$ ), would be generated during excavation of muck, backfilling, grading and compacting, concrete batching, and vehicular travel over paved and unpaved roads. Construction equipment and offsite vehicles used for hauling debris, soil, construction equipment, and supplies would also produce emissions. Wind erosion over exposed land area may also generate fugitive dust, smoke, and other fine particulate emissions. Open burning associated with clearing laydown areas and site preparation activities could be conducted as needed with proper notification to the Florida Division of Forestry.

Pollutants of primary concern include less than 10 microns of fugitive dust, reactive organic gases, oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, and to a lesser extent, sulfur dioxides. Varying affecting construction emissions have been assessed and the level of  $PM_{10}$  emissions estimated to be released during both site preparation and construction of Units 6 & 7 is 97.5 tons. Also, based on the EPA emission factors and estimated maximum numbers of vehicles, the CO,  $NO_x$ , VOC,  $PM_{10}$ , and  $SO_2$  emissions are estimated to be 63.7, 65.9, 8.3, 3.7, and 0.14 tons per year due to exhaust of construction equipment and diesel engines during both site preparation and construction of Units 6 & 7.

Impacts to air quality could be minimized by compliance with federal, state, and local regulations that govern construction activities and emissions such as the Southeast Florida Intrastate Air Quality Control Region and the Clean Air Act which established the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. These standards include criteria for pollutants such as:

- Sulfur dioxide
- Particulate matter with aerodynamic diameters of 10 microns or less ( $PM_{10}$ )
- Particulate matter with aerodynamic diameters of 2.5 microns or less ( $PM_{2.5}$ )
- Carbon monoxide

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

- Nitrogen dioxide
- Ozone
- Lead

The Southeast Florida Intrastate Air Quality Control Region is in attainment for criteria air pollutants. Attainment areas are areas where the ambient levels of criteria air pollutants are designated as being *better than, unclassifiable/attainment, or cannot be classified or better than* the EPA-promulgated National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

Aside from the six common “criteria pollutants” for which the EPA has set NAAQS (ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and lead), heat-trapping greenhouse gases, such as methane, nitrous oxide, and halocarbons would be produced during construction. The greenhouse gas of primary concern is carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). The total carbon footprint, which is the total set of greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions caused by an organization, event or product, is estimated for single AP1000 reactor to be 185,000 metric tons. Construction equipment CO<sub>2</sub> emissions account for about 19 percent of this total or approximately 35,000 metric tons. Workforce transportation accounts for a majority of the total, approximately 150,000 metric tons (NRC 2010). The estimated equipment usage for a multiple unit facility would be larger, but it is not likely that it would be a factor of 2 larger (NRC 2010). In order to provide a perspective, an International Energy Agency analysis found that nuclear power's life-cycle emissions range from 2 to 59 gram-equivalents of carbon dioxide per kilowatt-hour. Nuclear energy's life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions are lower than wind (7 to 124 grams of carbon dioxide-equivalents), solar photovoltaic (13 to 731 grams of carbon dioxide-equivalents), natural gas-combined cycle (389 to 511 grams carbon dioxide-equivalents) and a modern coal plant (790 to 1182 grams of carbon dioxide equivalents). (NEI 2010) Based on greenhouse gas life-cycle emissions generated for a nuclear plant compared to a fossil fuel plant's life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions, the atmospheric impacts of greenhouse gases from plant construction would not be noticeable and therefore the impacts would be SMALL.

Specific mitigation measures to control fugitive dust would be identified in a dust control plan, or similar document, prepared before the start of construction. These mitigation measures could include:

- Stabilizing construction roads and unsuitable soils piles
- Limiting speeds on unpaved construction roads
- Using water for dust control
- Periodically watering unpaved construction roads to control dust

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

- Performing housekeeping (e.g., removing dirt spilled onto paved roads)
- Covering haul trucks when loaded or unloaded
- Minimizing material handling (e.g., drop heights, double handling)
- Ceasing grading and excavating activities during high winds and during extreme meteorological events
- Phasing grading to minimize the area of disturbed soils
- Revegetating road medians and slopes

While emissions from construction activities and equipment would be unavoidable, a mitigation plan would minimize impacts to local ambient air quality and the nuisance impacts to the public close to the project. The mitigation plan would include:

- Phasing construction to minimize daily emissions
- Performing proper maintenance of construction vehicles to maximize efficiency and minimize emissions

Therefore, air quality impacts from construction would be SMALL and would not require mitigation.

#### 4.4.1.3 Aesthetics

The viewscape of the new units from north to south or from south to north would be similar to that of the existing units, except for the additional height of cranes being used for the construction of the cooling towers and plant modules. The cranes could reach approximately 460 feet high and would be removed after the end of construction. As stated in [Subsection 2.5.2.5](#), the tallest structures at the plant property are the existing 400-foot emission stacks. However, the viewscape perpendicular to the Turkey Point plant property, that seen by commercial and recreational boating traffic on the eastern side of the property, would have a broader view of the entire Units 6 & 7 plant area, and would have an open view of Units 6 & 7 construction. This viewscape would be temporarily impacted by the presence of construction equipment and the new reactor modules being installed, after which the viewscape would be similar to that of the existing units. Thus, the visual impact of the construction cranes and other equipment for Units 6 & 7 would be slightly more than the impacts from Units 1 & 2 emission stacks, which would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Outdoor lighting would be necessary to satisfy NRC and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements for security, worker and plant safety, including lighting walkways, parking areas and various equipment areas. Unconstrained lighting can cause light pollution and light trespass. Light pollution or sky glow is the term used to describe sky brightness caused by scattering of light in the atmosphere. Light trespass is the term used to describe light that strays from its intended purpose and becomes an annoyance.

Light pollution and light trespass would be addressed during construction of Units 6 & 7 when working in low light hours. Guidelines specifically addressing potential lighting issues, from the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA), would be adhered to. These guidelines would be incorporated into the outdoor lighting design to the extent practicable while meeting NRC and OSHA requirements. Typical features to be incorporated would include: minimize upward light from luminaries, minimize upward light in general so that light reaches its intended target, turn off lighting not needed for safety and security between 11 PM and sunrise, contain light within its intended target area by suitable choice of luminaries for light distribution, by selection of mounting height and physical location, and by minimizing glare in the horizontal or vertical directions.

Outdoor light monitoring was conducted in 2008. The monitoring was performed from ten locations surrounding Turkey Point such as the racetrack, cooling canals, and Biscayne Bay. The results indicate that, while light from the existing units is visible, the light is localized. Sky glow was observed from the major urban areas such as Homestead and Miami. The use of the IESNA guidelines to the extent practicable, while meeting NRC and OSHA security and safety requirements, would result in low lighting impacts from Units 6 & 7 and would not warrant mitigation.

The visual impacts of the construction within the eastern transmission line corridors (Clear Sky to Turkey Point, Clear Sky to Davis, and Davis to Miami) would consist of the clearing and installation of new concrete pads and 80-105 feet concrete poles upon which two 230 kV lines would be spanned. This area would consist of other construction activities and the Clear Sky to Turkey Point line would be fully contained on the Turkey Point plant property. The view would be similar to the existing lines between Turkey Point switchyard and the McGregor switchyard. The Clear Sky to Davis line would also span between 80-105 feet concrete poles in an established transmission corridor that is currently being utilized for seven other power lines. The Davis to Miami line would again span between 80-105 feet concrete poles collocated with the MetroRail and a major transportation highway. A short section of the proposed Davis-Miami 230 kV transmission line, at the crossing of the Miami River adjacent to the existing Miami substation, would be constructed underground. Construction phases would consist of right-of-way clearing (where required), access road and structure pad construction (where necessary), line construction, and right-of-way restoration. The construction of new concrete pads with a single line and new poles within this corridor would be temporary and accelerated and would be similar

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

to the current linear facilities established. Therefore the presence of these new lines would have a SMALL impact and would not warrant mitigation.

The visual impacts of construction within the western transmission line corridor (Clear Sky to Levee and Clear Sky to Pennsuco) would consist of clearing area within the current and preferred corridors to expand the right-of-way to contain new concrete pads and concrete poles for two 500 kV lines and a single 230 kV line. These lines would follow an existing corridor up to the Everglades National Park (ENP), after which, the two 500 kV lines would terminate at the Levee substation and the 230 kV line would continue to the Pennsuco substation. The existing corridor to the ENP is currently utilized by a single transmission line and predates much of the current development along the corridor. The visual impacts of the construction of the addition lines would consist of the installation of new 80-105 feet high concrete poles and new concrete guyed single-circuit structures at heights of 135-150 feet approximately 1000 feet apart. The construction of these new structures would alter and inhibit the viewscape; however, due to the flat topography, the visibility would be reduced with increased distance. The present corridor located within ENP would be visible within the park up to 4 miles away; however, visibility would be reduced with increased distance from the structures and at the furthest distances the image would be faint. There is an option to relocate the corridor along the eastern edge of the park; however, the impacts would be similar to the previous corridor through ENP, except it would be farther away from visitors immediate view within the park. The 230 kV line that continues through Levee substation to Pennsuco substation would be in portions of existing rights-of-way where the line would be collocated with existing transmission lines and would require construction in heavily industrial and urban areas. Impacts to the natural and built environment would be minimized due to the presence of existing facilities and, to the extent feasible through the selection process, engineering options, and construction techniques used. Therefore, the presence of these new lines would have a SMALL impact and would not warrant additional mitigation measures.

#### 4.4.1.4 Traffic

FPL would route construction traffic to a new construction entrance. SW 117th Avenue and SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road would be extended south of SW 344th Street/Palm Drive. SW 359th Street (which runs east-west, south of SW 344th Street/Palm Drive) would be extended east from its current termination to a new construction entrance. As described in [Subsection 2.5.2.2.1](#) for the current workforce, construction traffic could use a number of different routes to reach SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road, SW 117th Avenue, SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive, or SW 344th Street/Palm Drive, and from these roads, access SW 359th Street to the construction entrance ([Figure 4.4-2](#)).

Construction materials would arrive at the Turkey Point plant property by truck and barge. Large components and equipment would arrive by barge. Approximately 80 barge trips for large components and modules would be required for each unit over a 6-year period (see

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Subsection 3.9.1.3**). Materials arriving by barge would then be trucked over the onsite heavy haul road to the Units 6 & 7 plant area. Florida's Intracoastal Waterway traverses the eastern coastline of Florida and intersects with the port of Miami, as shown in **Figure 2.5-7**. The existing barge turning basin is accessed via the waterway through an existing shipping channel in Biscayne Bay. Modifications to the equipment barge unloading area would be required to accommodate the delivery of large components and modules. These alterations would be limited to the equipment barge unloading area of the turning basin and would not impact Biscayne Bay barge traffic. As explained in **Subsection 4.3.1.1**, the barge facility is currently active throughout the year, receiving five to seven shipments of fuel oil per week for Units 1 & 2. Because of the infrequent number of trips required to deliver large components and modules by barge, the current frequent number of fuel oil shipments, the impacts to waterborne traffic in Biscayne Bay and the Intracoastal Waterway would be SMALL and would not require mitigation.

#### 4.4.1.5 Conclusion

Physical impacts to the surrounding communities and residences as a result of construction of the new units and linear facilities would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation. However, the impacts from traffic and transportation would be MODERATE and would require mitigation.

#### 4.4.2 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS

This section evaluates the impacts to various socioeconomic factors in the region of influence as a result of constructing Units 6 & 7 in Miami-Dade County Florida. These factors are demography and community services. Community services include the economy, transportation, taxes, land use, aesthetics and recreation, housing, public services and community infrastructure (water, wastewater, law enforcement, fire protection, and medical services), and education. The evaluation assesses impacts of construction-related activities and of the construction workforce on the region of influence.

The population data in this section was updated to reflect the American Community Survey Estimates for 2005-2009. The population projections in **Table 2.5-1** and FSAR Subsection 2.1.3, however, used the 2010 Census dataset in order to be consistent with the base population used by the Florida Office of Economic Development and Research for the state projected population growth between 2010 and 2030. The 2010 Census dataset was also used in FSAR Subsection 2.1.3 to calculate the same base growth rate multiplier as the state, so that the population projections would be consistent with those projected by the state through 2030.

The construction schedule assumes a 123-month duration from the start of preconstruction activities to the start of commercial operation of Unit 7. Site preparation activities would begin in 2013. The projected commercial operation dates for Units 6 & 7 are 2022 and 2023, respectively. See **Table 3.9-1**.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

A total of 3983 workers are estimated (including 3950 construction and 33 operation workers) at peak construction activity (anticipated to occur in 2019 ([Subsection 3.10.1.2](#))). There would be two types of workforces onsite during the construction peak because the operation of Unit 6 would begin before the completion of construction for Unit 7. [Figure 3.10-1](#) illustrates the distribution of the construction workforce over the anticipated construction period, [Figure 3.10-2](#) illustrates the distribution of operation workers during the same period, and [Figure 3.10-3](#) illustrates the distribution of both workforces during the construction period. The nature of the two types of workforces is different and may cause differing impacts. In [Subsection 4.4.2](#), these two workforces are analyzed together and separately.

Major factors in determining socioeconomic impacts are the number of workers and family members that relocate to an area and where they settle. Assumptions regarding workforce characteristics and migration, family characteristics, and workforce retention at Units 6 & 7 are depicted in [Table 4.4-1](#). Assumptions regarding families, children, and the indirect workforce are described in more detail in [Subsection 4.4.2.1](#). As stated in [Subsections 3.10.2](#) and [3.10.3](#), it is assumed that 50 percent of the total construction workforce would migrate into the region of influence and 50 percent of the operation workforce would migrate into the region of influence. Therefore, the peak number of workers that would migrate into the region of influence would be 1992 (50 percent of 3983 workers). This would include 1975 construction workers and 17 operation workers.

As described in [Subsection 2.5.1](#), the evaluation of the residential distribution of the current workforce for Turkey Point Units 1 through 5 and socioeconomic variables within 50 miles of the Turkey Point plant property has determined that the socioeconomic region of influence for this project includes Miami-Dade County, and specifically, the Homestead and Florida City area. Approximately 83 percent of the current operation workers reside in Miami-Dade County. Approximately 43 percent of Turkey Point's workers reside in the Homestead and Florida City area. For this project, it could be assumed that 83 percent of the in-migrating construction workforce would reside in Miami-Dade County and the remainder would reside in the other counties in or near the 50-mile radius, but Miami-Dade County's population is so large and resources are so plentiful that it can be conservatively assumed that 100 percent of the 1992 workers would migrate to the county. On a more local level, however, it is assumed that, based on the residential distribution of the current operation workforce, approximately 43 percent of the in-migrating workers (845 construction and 7 operation workers) would reside in the Homestead and Florida City area. The impact analyses in [Subsection 4.4.2](#) are based on the socioeconomic conditions of Miami-Dade County in general and the Homestead and Florida City area in particular.

In [Subsection 4.4.2.2](#), incremental increases in resource use caused by the incoming workforces for the new units are compared to the available capacity of those resources in Miami-Dade County and particularly the Homestead and Florida City area.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

As stated in [Section 1.1](#), the significance of the impacts as SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE have been identified in accordance with the NRC-established criteria in 10 CFR Part 51, Appendix B, Table B-1, Footnote 3, as follows:

SMALL — Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

MODERATE — Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, any important attribute of the resource.

LARGE — Environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize any important attributes of the resource.

These impact significance terms are assigned to both county-level and city-level analyses.

#### 4.4.2.1 Demography

It is estimated that both units would be in commercial operation by 2023. The 2010 population within 50 miles was approximately 3,459,894 and is projected to grow to approximately 3,723,288 by 2020 ([Table 2.5-1](#)). The population in Miami-Dade County was 2,496,435 in 2010, and is projected to grow to 2,722,889 by 2020 ([Table 2.5-4](#)). The 2000 populations of Homestead and Florida City were 31,909 and 7843, respectively ([Subsection 2.5.1](#)). The 2005-2009 estimates for the two cities were 55,036 and 9808, respectively ([Subsection 2.5.1](#)). Population projections for the two cities in 2020 are not available.

It is anticipated that 1992 workers (1975 construction workers and 17 operation workers) would migrate into Miami-Dade County to support the construction of the new units ([Table 4.4-1](#)). It is anticipated that 852 (845 construction workers and 7 operation workers) of those workers would migrate to the Homestead and Florida City area ([Table 4.4-1](#)). The demographic analysis is based on these numbers.

Multipliers are used to estimate how much a one-time or sustained increase in economic activity, such as the construction of Units 6 & 7, in a particular region, such as Miami-Dade County, will impact a defined region. Multipliers are used to estimate the number of indirect jobs created in a region. Indirect jobs are created when new, directly employed workers, spend their earnings and hence, create a greater demand for goods and services than existed before the new worker wages were introduced to the region. The in-migration of 1992 workers would create new indirect jobs because of the multiplier effect.

Under the multiplier effect, each dollar spent on goods and services by an in-migrant becomes income to the recipient, who saves a portion but re-spends the rest. In turn, this re-spending becomes income to someone else, who, in turn, saves part and re-spends the rest. The number

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

of times the final increase in consumption exceeds the initial dollar spent is called the multiplier. The U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), Economics and Statistics Division, provides multipliers for industry jobs and earnings (BEA 2009a). Their economic model, RIMS II, incorporates buying and selling linkages among regional industries, and provides multipliers by industry sector to estimate the impacts of changes in that sector to a regional economy. The analysis here uses the detailed employment multipliers for the construction industry and the power generation and supply industry to estimate the number of indirect jobs and the impact of new nuclear plant-related expenditures in Miami-Dade County, as a result of the influx of construction and operation workers during the period of construction.

**Table 4.4-2** provides direct and indirect employment data for the county.

The multipliers predict that for every in-migrating construction worker, an estimated additional 0.9535 jobs would be created in Miami-Dade County (BEA 2009a). During the construction peak, the influx of 1975 construction workers would generate approximately 1883 indirect jobs, resulting in a total of 3858 new jobs (direct and indirect) in Miami-Dade County (**Table 4.4-2**). For every in-migrating operation worker (17 during the construction peak), an estimated additional 2.1696 jobs would be created in Miami-Dade County (BEA 2009a). During the construction peak, the influx of 17 operation workers would create approximately 36 indirect jobs, for a total of 52 new jobs (direct and indirect) in Miami-Dade County (**Table 4.4-2**). Therefore, the total number of indirect jobs created in Miami-Dade County by the construction of Units 6 & 7 would be 1919.

Most indirect jobs are service or retail-related and not highly specialized, so, for this analysis, it was assumed that most indirect jobs would be filled by the existing labor force in the 50-mile region of influence, and, specifically, Miami-Dade County, where there were 156,562 unemployed people in 2011 (**Table 2.5-7**). The number of indirect jobs, 1919, represents approximately 1.2 percent of the number of unemployed people in Miami-Dade County in 2011.

To estimate the family characteristics of the construction and operation workforces, the NRC study, *Migration and Residential Location of Workers at Nuclear Power Plant Construction Sites* (BMI Apr 1981) and U.S. Census Bureau (USCB) data were evaluated. Published in 1981, the Battelle Memorial Institute (BMI) study was based on 49,000 observations from 28 surveys at 13 nuclear power plant construction sites. The study sought to improve the accuracy of socioeconomic impact assessments by providing an improved methodology for predicting in-migrating workforce sizes and residential distribution patterns at future nuclear power plant construction project sites. Though the study was an analysis of construction workforces in general, information about nuclear plant nonconstruction workers (i.e., managers, engineers, supervisors, clerical, security, and medical personnel who were on the site during construction) was also included. Because nonconstruction workers have many similar characteristics to operation workforces, their data is useful for this analysis. The study is the most current of its nature and there is little evidence that the observations of fundamental worker characteristics and behaviors detailed in the BMI study have changed meaningfully since the study's publication.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Therefore, the worker migration patterns and family characteristics described in the 1981 study are a valid proxy for assumptions made for nuclear power plant construction and operation workforces today.

According to the BMI study, approximately 70 percent of the in-migrating nuclear plant construction workers were likely to bring families (BMI Apr 1981). Therefore, for this project, of 1975 in-migrating construction workers, 1383 would bring families into Miami-Dade County and 592 would not. Approximately 591 workers would bring families into the Homestead and Florida City area. According to the BMI study, the average family size of a nuclear plant construction worker was 3.25 (BMI Apr 1981).

Consequently, it is estimated that the size of the construction worker family for this project would be 3.25. Therefore, 1383 in-migrating construction workers would bring 3111 family members into Miami-Dade County. The 591 workers that would move into the Homestead and Florida City area would bring 1331 family members (Table 4.4-1).

According to the BMI study, the average number of school-age children per construction worker who relocated his/her family was 0.8 (BMI Apr 1981). Therefore, 1383 in-migrating families would include 1106 school-age children. The 591 families that would relocate to the Homestead and Florida City area would include 473 children.

With respect to the operation workers onsite during the construction peak, it is assumed that 100 percent of the 17 in-migrating workers would bring families. Seven of those workers would settle in the Homestead and Florida City area. According to the BMI study, the average family size of a nuclear plant nonconstruction worker (i.e., managers, engineers, supervisors, clerical, security, and medical personnel who were onsite during construction) was slightly less than 3.25 (BMI Apr 1981). According to the USCB (USCB 2010b), the average family size in Miami-Dade County in 2010 was 3.33, while the average family size for the state of Florida was 3.01 (USCB 2010b). Therefore, it is assumed that the average family size of 3.25 used for the construction workforce, would also be a reasonable estimate for the operation workforce. Thus, 17 in-migrating operation workers would bring 37 family members, for a total of 54 additional people in Miami-Dade County (Table 4.4-1). The 7 workers that would migrate to the Homestead and Florida City area would bring 16 family members, for a total of 23 additional people in that area (Table 4.4-1).

The BMI study reported that while construction workers averaged 0.8 school-age children per family, nonconstruction workers had an average of 0.6 children. However, to provide a more conservative impact estimate, it is estimated that, like the construction worker families, each of the 17 operation worker families would bring 0.8 school-age children, for a total of 13 children. The 7 families that would settle in the Homestead and Florida City area would include 6 children (Table 4.4-1).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

When the population increases from the two sets of in-migrating workers are totaled, Miami-Dade County's population during the construction peak would grow by 5139 people (Table 4.4-1). This represents an increase of approximately 0.2 percent over Miami-Dade County's projected 2020 population (Table 2.5-4). Therefore, Units 6 & 7-related population impacts to Miami-Dade County during construction would be SMALL.

When approximately 43 percent of the in-migrating workers (construction and operation) settle in the Homestead and Florida City area, the Homestead and Florida City area's population during the construction peak would grow by 2199 people (Table 4.4-1). This represents an increase of approximately 6 percent over the combined 2000 populations of Homestead and Florida City (Table 2.5-3), and approximately 3.4 percent over the combined 2005-2009 population estimates of Homestead and Florida City. Therefore, Units 6 & 7-related population impacts to the Homestead and Florida City area during construction would be SMALL.

Upon construction completion, it is assumed that, based on the BMI study, 50 percent of the in-migrating construction workforce would leave the region of influence and 50 percent would remain (BMI Apr 1981). Essentially, 2543 people, including workers and family members, would migrate back out of the region of influence (Table 4.4-1). One thousand eighty-eight (1088) people would leave the Homestead and Florida City area (Table 4.4-1). Because the Turkey Point project-related impacts to the populations of the region of influence would be small, the impacts of the post-construction population declines would also be SMALL.

#### 4.4.2.2 Impacts to the Community

This section evaluates the economic, infrastructure, and community service impacts to the region of influence, Miami-Dade County, and, specifically, the Homestead and Florida City area, as a result of constructing Units 6 & 7. Site preparation and construction activities would continue for 123 months and employ as many as 3983 workers (3950 construction workers and 33 operation workers) at peak employment, 50 percent of which would migrate into Miami-Dade County.

##### 4.4.2.2.1 Economy

As noted previously, a one-county region of influence—Miami-Dade County—has been identified. The impacts of construction on the local and regional economy depend on the region of influence's current and projected economy and population.

In 2010, there were 31,395 jobs in the construction industry in the region of influence, which represented approximately 3.9 percent of jobs in the region of influence (Table 2.5-11). In 2010,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

17.2 percent (5401) of these construction jobs were in heavy and civil engineering construction.<sup>1</sup>

As explained in [Subsection 4.4.2 \(Table 4.4-1\)](#), approximately 1992 construction and operation workers would be expected to migrate into the region of influence during the peak construction period. [Table 4.4-3](#) shows that these workers would represent 0.25 percent of the region of influence's 2010 total employment, 6.3 percent of the region of influence's employment in construction, and 36.9 percent of the region of influence's employment in heavy and civil engineering construction.

[Subsection 4.4.2](#) also addresses employment multipliers, which predict that the in-migrating workers would create 1919 indirect jobs (1883 construction workers and 36 operation workers) in the region of influence, resulting in a total of 3911 (1992 + 1919) new jobs in the region of influence during the construction peak. It is estimated that region of influence residents would be available to fill the 1919 indirect jobs. To the extent that the new indirect jobs would reduce unemployment in the region of influence, the impact would be SMALL and positive.

The BEA's RIMS II program ([Subsection 4.4.2.1](#)) calculates earnings multipliers. The analysis here uses the detailed earnings multipliers for the construction industry and the power generation and supply industry sectors to estimate the impacts in the region of influence from earnings by in-migrating construction and operation workers, respectively. For every dollar earned by an in-migrant construction worker, an estimated additional 0.8022 dollars would be injected into the regional economy, while each dollar earned by an in-migrant operation worker would inject an estimated additional 0.788 dollars into the region of influence's economy (BEA 2009).

#### 4.4.2.2.1.1 Construction In-Migrants

To estimate impacts to the region of influence economy by the construction in-migrants, wage data for Industrial Sector 237, Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction, was obtained from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), *Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages* (BLS 2012b). As shown in [Table 2.5-12](#), the average annual wage in this sector for Miami-Dade County was \$58,662 in 2010. The estimated average monthly wage of \$4889 ( $\$58,662 \div 12$ ) was multiplied by the number of in-migrating workers for each month and then summed to calculate total dollars earned by the in-migrants. The number of in-migrants is assumed to be 50 percent of the total workforce onsite per month. [Table 4.4-4](#) provides the total construction worker wages for each month during the construction period. The wage total for the 123-month construction period is \$637,093,763. The impact of these wages to Miami-Dade County is calculated as follows. The earnings multiplier (1.8022) for the construction industry in

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers for total employment for all industries, construction, and heavy and civil engineering construction reflect privately owned firms and establishment sizes. These figures do not include government employees.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

the region of influence is applied to the wages (BEA 2009a). According to these calculations, the total economic impact of in-migrating construction worker wages on the region of influence would be \$1,148,170,379 over the life of the construction project (Table 4.4-5). There are numerous commercial establishments and opportunities scattered throughout the many urbanized areas of the region of influence, but BEA does not report data at the local level for municipalities such as Homestead and Florida City. Therefore, it is not possible to estimate the economic impact from the in-migrating construction worker wages to the Homestead and Florida City area. However, such impacts are expected to be positive and SMALL.

To approximate the magnitude of the impacts in the region of influence, the total wages for each year during the construction period are computed. The multiplier is applied to these values and compared the annual totals to the region of influence's total personal income for 2009. As seen in Table 4.4-6, these estimates predict that wages spent in the region of influence would represent increases to the region of influence's total personal income of 0.01 percent in the first year, 0.23 percent in the eighth year, and 0.01 percent in the final year of construction. Impacts to the region of influence's economy would be positive and SMALL. However, as a result of potential growth in personal income in the region of influence, independent of Units 6 & 7, the construction worker wages could very well represent a decreasing proportion of total income in the future. In this case, impacts to the region of influence's economy would remain SMALL and positive.

Another local economic impact would result from possibly increased earnings by the 50 percent of construction workers who would already reside in the region of influence. The level of this impact would depend on those workers' existing wages and the amount by which their wages would increase when working on Units 6 & 7. While that information cannot be known at this time, it is assumed that such impacts would be SMALL and positive.

#### 4.4.2.2.1.2 Operation In-Migrants

In addition to the in-migrating construction workers, operation workers would also be onsite during the construction period. At the peak construction period, an operation workforce of 33 workers is estimated, but the operation workforce would grow to 806 workers by the end of the construction phase (Section 3.10). As stated previously, it is assumed that 50 percent of operation workers would migrate into the region of influence.

The BLS collects employment and wage data by occupational category. To estimate impacts to the region of influence economy by the operation in-migrants, Florida wage data was obtained for category 51-8011, Nuclear Power Reactor Operators, from the BLS, *Occupational Employment and Wages*, BLS 2010. Although the lower paid Nuclear Technicians, as opposed to Nuclear Power Reactor Operators, would comprise a larger share of the operation workforce, Florida data for the 2010 average annual wage of nuclear technicians is not available. Therefore, to be

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

conservative, the current average annual wage of the higher paid Nuclear Power Reactor Operators was used.

The methodology for predicting in-migrant operation worker impacts was similar to that used for predicting in-migrant construction worker impacts. The average annual wage of \$81,980 is divided by 12 to obtain an average monthly wage of \$6832, which is then multiplied by the number of in-migrating workers each month, and summed to calculate total dollars earned. [Table 4.4-7](#) provides these calculations, and shows that total operation worker wages during the construction period would total \$72,251,707.

The impacts of these wages to Miami-Dade County is calculated as follows. The earnings multiplier for power generation and supply workers (1.7880) is applied. Impacts to the region of influence's economy from operation worker wages would total over \$129,186,052 over the construction period ([Table 4.4-8](#)). As noted above, it is not possible to predict economic impacts from in-migrating operation worker wages to the Homestead and Florida City area. However, it is likely that local businesses would experience SMALL and positive impacts as a result of expenditures by in-migrating workers and their families.

Total wages are then computed by year. The multiplier is applied to these values, and the annual totals are compared to the region of influence's total personal income for 2009. The results are shown in [Table 4.4-9](#). As noted previously, these impacts could be slightly overstated because of possible growth in the region of influence's total personal income, independent of Units 6 & 7. Operation worker wages would increase steadily through the construction period as new workers arrived onsite, and would represent an increase in the region of influence's total personal income ranging from zero in the first year (when no operation workers are present) to 0.016 percent in the final year of construction. Therefore, impacts to the region of influence's economy during the construction period would be positive and SMALL.

Impacts to the region of influence's economy during the assumed 60-year operation of Units 6 & 7 are explained in [Subsection 5.8.2.2.1](#).

#### 4.4.2.2.1.3 Summary of Combined Impacts of Construction and Operation Workers

In all, in-migrating construction and operation workers during the construction period would earn a total of more than \$709 million over the estimated 123-month construction period ([Table 4.4-10](#)). The creation of the Units 6 & 7 jobs would inject approximately \$1.3 billion into the region of influence's economy during construction. Although large in absolute terms, because of the region of influence's large economy, this would be a SMALL and positive impact.

Annual impacts are conservatively estimated to range from approximately \$4.9 million in the first year, to a peak of \$211.6 million in the eighth year, to \$20.8 million in the final year of construction. As shown in [Table 4.4-11](#), these wages and their multiplied impacts would increase



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

total personal income in the region of influence by 0.01 percent in the first year, by 0.23 percent in the eighth year, and by 0.02 percent in the final year, when compared to the region of influence's total personal income in 2009. Impacts to the region of influence's economy would be positive and SMALL.

In addition, the injection of new income would create jobs in the region of influence's economy and create business opportunities for housing and service-related industries. While the magnitude of those impacts cannot be predicted at this time, it is assumed that impacts would be SMALL in the region of influence overall and could be SMALL to MODERATE in specific communities in the region of influence. All impacts would be positive.

#### 4.4.2.2.1.4 End of Construction Period

It is estimated that after construction is complete, approximately 50 percent of the construction worker in-migrants would leave the region of influence. Operation workers would remain in the region of influence. The loss of construction jobs, population, wage income, and indirect jobs and income (from the multiplier effect), would be considered a negative and SMALL impact to the region of influence, and depending on the worker residence patterns, impacts could be SMALL to MODERATE in specific region of influence communities, such as Homestead or Florida City.

However, as [Figure 3.10-1](#) indicates, the out-migration would occur gradually over the last few years of the construction phase, and the out-migration of construction workers would be partially offset by the incoming operation workers. The gradual nature of the decline in the construction workforce would assist in mitigating the impact to communities in the region of influence from the destabilizing effects of a sudden decrease in households.

Because it cannot be known with certainty where in the region of influence incoming workers would reside, it is not possible to gauge which communities in the region of influence would be most affected by the departing workforce and their families. In some locations where impacts could be MODERATE, mitigation may be warranted. To mitigate these impacts, FPL would maintain timely communication with municipal and county government authorities and nongovernmental organizations to disseminate project information that could have socioeconomic impacts in the community. FPL would also provide timely information to the local media, enabling businesses and individuals to make informed decisions and economic choices.

Even before the construction worker influx, local agencies, organizations, businesses, and individuals could make planning decisions regarding economic choices with the understanding that much of the positive economic impact of the construction project would be temporary, and could disappear when the construction project is complete.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.4.2.2.2 Taxes

Construction-related activities, purchases, and workforce expenditures would generate several types of taxes, including corporate income taxes, sales and use taxes, and property (also known as *ad valorem*) taxes. Increased tax collections are viewed as a benefit to the state of Florida, the region of influence, and communities in the region of influence.

In the *Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (NUREG-1437), the NRC presents its method for defining the impact significance of tax revenue impacts during refurbishment (i.e., large construction activities). Although these criteria are focused on property taxes, the impact ranges can also be applied to other types of taxes. This methodology was reviewed and it was determined that the significance levels were appropriate to apply to an assessment of tax impacts as a result of construction.

In the GEIS, the NRC concluded that changes in tax revenues at nuclear plants would be:

**SMALL** — When new tax payments by the nuclear plant constitute less than 10 percent of total revenues for local taxing jurisdictions. The additional revenues provided by direct and indirect plant payments on refurbishment-related improvements result in little or no change in local property tax rates and the provision of public services.

**MODERATE** — When new tax payments by the nuclear plant constitute 10–20 percent of total revenues for local taxing jurisdictions. The additional revenues provided by direct and indirect plant payments on refurbishment-related improvements result in lower property tax levies and increased services by local municipalities.

**LARGE** — When new tax payments by the nuclear plant represent more than 20 percent of total revenues for local taxing jurisdictions. Local property tax levies can be lowered substantially, the payment of debt for any substantial infrastructure improvements made in the past can easily be made, and future improvements can continue.

4.4.2.2.2.1 Personal and Corporate Income Taxes

As noted in [Subsection 2.5.2.3](#), Florida has no personal income tax, but does levy a corporate income tax on corporations that conduct business in Florida. The tax liability is computed using federal taxable income, modified by certain Florida adjustments, to determine adjusted federal income. At the present time, FPL is subject to Florida corporate income tax as a result of owning and operating power plants and other properties throughout the state, including the existing Turkey Point generation facility. FPL currently files as a member of a consolidated group for federal and state income tax purposes. At the time when FPL places the units in service, in 2022 for Unit 6 and 2023 for Unit 7, the additional taxable income will be included in the consolidated federal and state income tax filings. Because of the many factors involved in computing the

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

amount of tax liability, it is not possible at this time to estimate an amount by which corporate taxes may increase, and how much of the total would be attributable to Units 6 & 7. In 2011, the state of Florida collected approximately \$1.9 billion in corporate income tax revenues. The expectation is that Turkey Point 6 & 7 would have a SMALL and positive impact to the state's overall corporate income tax collections.

Local construction expenditures and purchases by the construction workforce<sup>1</sup> would have a multiplier effect on the local economy, where money would be spent and re-spent in the region of influence (Subsection 4.4.2). Because of this multiplier effect, region of influence businesses, particularly retail and service sector firms, could experience revenue increases, and there may be prospects for new startup firms to service the construction effort as well as workers and their families. Existing and new firms could generate additional profits, which would contribute to increased corporate income taxes, although the exact amount is unknown. Impacts would be positive, and SMALL, relative to overall state corporate income tax revenues.

#### 4.4.2.2.2 Sales and Use Taxes

The state of Florida and Miami-Dade County would experience an increase in the amount of sales and use taxes collected. The additional taxes would be generated from construction expenditures for Units 6 & 7 and from retail purchases of goods and services by the construction workforce and visitors. As explained in Subsection 2.5.2.3.2, Florida imposes a 6 percent sales and use tax, and Miami-Dade County adds a 1 percent discretionary sales tax, bringing the total sales tax in the region of influence to 7 percent. Cities and towns in the region of influence do not levy local sales tax.

Florida provides a 100 percent tax exemption for equipment and materials associated with the construction of power plant equipment and for pollution control equipment, leaving purchases of labor and services as the only taxable expenditures directly associated with construction activities. Therefore, FPL's expenditures for Units 6 & 7 for labor and services from Florida providers would be subject to the state's sales tax of 6 percent, and purchases from Miami-Dade County providers would also be subject to the 1 percent sales tax levied by the county. FPL estimates that labor and services will make up 34 percent of construction costs. Of this labor and services component, 33 percent would be purchased from out-of-state providers, and 67 percent would be purchased from Miami-Dade County providers. Therefore, 23 percent of the construction expenditures for Units 6 & 7 (67 percent x 34 percent = 22.78 percent, rounded to 23 percent) would generate sales tax (FPL Undated) (Table 4.4-13).

---

1. As addressed in Subsection 4.4.2, the "construction workforce" includes both construction workers and operation workers who are onsite during the 123-month construction period.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

FPL's *Nuclear Power Plant Cost Recovery For The Years Ending December 2010 and 2011* was submitted to the Florida Public Service Commission on May 3, 2010 (FPL May 2010). In this testimony, two construction cost estimates were developed for the total project cost over a 12-year period<sup>1</sup>. The estimated low total project cost is \$12.8 billion and the estimated high total project cost is \$18.7 billion (Table 4.4-13).

To estimate the potential sales tax impacts to Miami-Dade County and Florida, the total estimated project cost figures for each scenario were multiplied by 23 percent to obtain the amounts subject to sales tax, and then multiplied by 1 percent and 6 percent, respectively, to calculate the tax revenues for Miami-Dade County and the state. That amount was then divided by 12 years to determine an average yearly amount, which in turn was taken as a percentage of the 2011 total sales tax revenues for each taxing entity. Table 4.4-13 shows the potential sales tax impacts to Miami-Dade County and Florida from the two scenarios. Because of their large economies, both entities have sizable sales tax revenues. Therefore, while the absolute amount of FPL's sales tax payments on Units 6 & 7 would be large, the payments would represent small increases over 2011 revenues, ranging from 4.2 to 6.2 percent for Miami-Dade County and 0.08 percent to 0.11 percent for Florida, a SMALL and positive impact. Note that although this methodology uses a yearly average to estimate the tax impacts, it is highly improbable that expenditures would be evenly distributed during the 12-year period. In fact, if a sufficient proportion of the expenditures occurred within 1 year, it is possible that impacts to Miami-Dade County could be MODERATE in that year. Table 4.4-14 shows that for 2011, taxable purchases exceeding \$57,559,000 would yield sales tax payments in the order of \$5,755,900 that would increase Miami-Dade County's sales tax revenues by more than 10 percent. However, Miami-Dade County's tax revenues are likely to increase over the construction period, and a corresponding increase in FPL's taxable purchases would be required to exceed the 10 percent threshold.

As explained in Subsection 2.5.2.3, workers and visitors would pay Florida sales or use tax on items purchased in the state (or purchased elsewhere but subject to state use tax), regardless of whether the purchase was made in the region of influence. They would also pay Miami-Dade County sales or use tax on purchases in the county or subject to county taxation. In absolute terms, the amount of state sales and use taxes collected from workers during the construction period could be sizable, but would provide a SMALL and positive impact when compared to the total amount of taxes collected by Miami-Dade County and Florida.

Because Homestead, Florida City, and other cities in the region of influence do not impose a local sales tax, they would not experience direct sales tax impacts as a result of the construction of Units 6 & 7. However, they could benefit indirectly from Florida's and Miami-Dade County's

---

1. In this report, FPL defined the construction period as 12 years, from the initiation of licensing activities to completion of Unit 7.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

increased sales tax revenues if those revenues allowed more services to be provided in their communities. Impacts would be SMALL and positive.

#### 4.4.2.2.2.3 Other Sales and Use-Related Taxes

Units 6 & 7 workers who reside in the state would also be subject to the state's communications services tax on phone, cable, cellular phone, and related services, and the documentary sales tax on deeds and other types of legal documents ([Subsection 2.5.2.3.3](#)). If one were to conservatively assume that workers and their families migrating into the region of influence would come from out of state, the in-migrating workers and their families would represent an increase of only 0.03 percent over Florida's 2005-2009 population ([Table 4.4-15](#)). Therefore, impacts to Florida's tax revenues for the communications services tax and the documentary sales tax would be SMALL but positive.

#### 4.4.2.2.2.4 Property Taxes — County and Special Districts

In 2010, FPL paid personal property taxes for the Turkey Point Plant totaling \$8.8 million to Miami-Dade County, representing 0.9 percent of the county's property tax revenues, and FPL paid \$6.6 million to the Miami-Dade County school district, representing 0.35 percent of the school district's local funding ([Table 4.4-16a](#)). FPL also paid tangible personal property taxes to four special taxing districts: the Florida Inland Navigation District, the South Florida Water Management District, the Everglades Construction Project, and the Children's Trust Authority ([Table 4.4-16a](#)).

According to FPL's Economic Impact Analysis, ad valorem (property) tax is based on the undepreciated book value of the plant through its life, with exemptions for pollution control equipment (FPL Undated). The assessed value of Units 6 & 7 during construction is not known at this time, and the projected amount of tax payments to the various taxing districts cannot be estimated. However, as [Table 4.4-16a](#) shows, FPL's payments to these jurisdictions in 2010 represented less than 1.5 percent of each district's total revenues, because of the region of influence's large tax base. Although property tax payments could increase during the construction of Units 6 & 7, the increases would constitute SMALL and positive impacts to each district.

To the extent that new homes were constructed or property values rose, the in-migrating construction period workers and their families could also increase property tax revenues in the jurisdictions where they choose to reside. As [Table 4.4-15](#) shows, if incoming worker families were to reside in Miami-Dade County, they would represent an increase of 0.2 percent over Miami-Dade County's 2005-2009 population. These increases would have a positive and SMALL impact on property tax revenues in Miami-Dade County.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

If approximately 43 percent of in-migrants would choose to reside in the Homestead and Florida City area, in accordance with the residence patterns of current Turkey Point workers, incoming workers and families would make up approximately 3.4 percent of the 2005-2009 population of the Homestead and Florida City area (Table 4.4-15). These in-migrating worker families would contribute property taxes to the county and special districts where they reside.<sup>1</sup> It is unlikely that the percentage of tax revenue increase in Homestead or Florida City would be as much as the potential population increase associated with the construction of Units 6 & 7, because much of any jurisdiction's tax base consists of higher-valued industrial or commercial property rather than residential. Therefore, the property tax impacts from new residents would be positive and could be SMALL to MODERATE.

#### 4.4.2.2.2.5 Property Taxes — Independent School District

As stated in Subsection 2.5.2.3, property taxes for Turkey Point are paid to the Miami-Dade County tax collector for the Miami-Dade School District (Tables 2.5-19 and 2.5-20). As shown in Table 4.4-16a, FPL's payments to this district represented 0.35 percent of the district's local revenues in 2010. The amount of property taxes that would be assessed on Units 6 & 7 during construction could increase, but the amount is unknown at this time. However, because of the district's large tax base, FPL's payments for Units 6 & 7 would likely represent a SMALL and positive impact.

In-migrating workers who purchase existing homes or build new residences in Miami-Dade County would also pay property taxes to the Miami-Dade County tax collector for the Miami-Dade School district, resulting in positive but SMALL impacts to the school district's revenues.

#### 4.4.2.2.2.6 Summary of Tax Impacts

The overall potential beneficial impacts of taxes collected during the construction of Units 6 & 7 would be positive and SMALL in the region of influence and the state of Florida. Property tax impacts in smaller entities in the region of influence, such as Homestead or Florida City, could be SMALL to MODERATE and positive, and would thus require no mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.3 Land Use

In the GEIS, the NRC provides the methodology for defining the impact significance of land use during refurbishment (i.e., large construction activities).

In the GEIS, the NRC concluded that land use changes during refurbishment at nuclear plants would be:

---

1. Even workers who occupy rented housing or lodging contribute indirectly to the property tax payments by the property owner, although in this case, the tax base would not increase unless assessed valuations rose.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

SMALL — If population growth results in very little new residential or commercial development compared with existing conditions and if the limited development results only in minimal changes in the area's basic land use pattern.

MODERATE — If plant-related population growth results in considerable new residential and commercial development and the development results in some changes to an area's basic land use pattern.

LARGE — If population growth results in large-scale new residential or commercial development and the development results in major changes in an area's basic land-use pattern.

Further, the NRC defined the magnitude of population changes as follows:

SMALL — If plant-related population growth is less than 5 percent of the study area's total population, especially if the study area has established patterns of residential and commercial development, a population density of at least 60 people per square mile, and at least one urban area with a population of 100,000 or more within 50 miles.

MODERATE — If plant-related growth is between 5–20 percent of the study area's total population, especially if the study area has established patterns of residential and commercial development, a population density of 30 to 60 people per square mile, and one urban area within 50 miles.

LARGE — If plant-related population growth is greater than 20 percent of the area's total population and density is less than 30 people per square mile.

This methodology was reviewed and it was determined that the significance levels were appropriate to apply to an assessment of land use impacts as a result of new construction. Miami-Dade County is the focus of the land use analysis because the new units would be built in Miami-Dade County and it was assumed that the workforce during construction would reside in the county. Impacts to land use would be confined to Miami-Dade County.

#### 4.4.2.2.3.1 Land Use

All or parts of four Florida counties are within 50 miles of the Turkey Point plant property: Broward, Collier, Miami-Dade, and Monroe. The 50-mile radius encompasses over 3168 square miles. However, impacts to land would be confined to the region of influence, Miami-Dade County. As explained in [Subsection 2.2.3](#), most of the land use and land cover in the 50-mile region consist of wetlands (69.1 percent) and urban or built-up area (17.5 percent) ([Figure 2.2-6](#)).

As addressed in [Subsection 2.5.2.4](#), Miami-Dade County and the municipalities of Homestead and Florida City use comprehensive land use planning to guide residential and commercial

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

development. There are 35 incorporated cities in Miami-Dade County. Only two of the 35 incorporated communities are within 10 miles of the plant property, Homestead and Florida City.

From the land use perspective, Miami-Dade County and the Homestead and Florida City area are likely to continue to urbanize as the projected population increases. The population-related increases (5139 people) associated with the construction of Units 6 & 7 would create an increase in commercial and residential activity. If the population influx results in new construction, both the region of influence and the Homestead and Florida City area have some undeveloped land currently zoned for residential and commercial uses ([Subsection 2.5.2.4](#)). The present housing inventory in Miami-Dade County and in the Homestead and Florida City area can support the in-migrating workers and their families without the addition of new housing units ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.6](#)). Miami-Dade County had 135,004 total vacant housing units in 2005-2009. The Homestead and Florida City area had 4046 vacant units in 2005-2009. Because both the region of influence in general, and the Homestead and Florida City area in particular, have well-established residential and commercial districts, little land use conversion, from undeveloped to residential or commercial use, or residential to commercial, would be expected from the construction-related population increase in the area. Any conversion that did occur would be in the areas that are already well-defined and identified in the applicable comprehensive land use plans.

Using the NRC's GEIS guidance, it is concluded that impacts to land use as a result of Turkey Point-related population increases that would cause land use conversions in Miami-Dade County would be SMALL because the population influx would result in very little new residential or commercial development compared with existing conditions and because there would be minimal changes in the area's basic land use pattern.

#### 4.4.2.2.3.2 Construction-Related Population Growth

The 2000 population of Miami-Dade County was 2,253,362 people, with a population density of 1158 people per square mile (USCB 2008). The 2010 population for the region of influence, Miami-Dade County, was 2,496,435 people (USCB 2012), which is 1316 people per square mile. The 2000 population of the Homestead and Florida City area was 39,752 people (USCB 2012) and the area had a population density of 2196 people per square mile. The population for the area in 2012 is 71,757 people (USCB 2012) or 3402 persons per square mile. As a point of reference, the population per square mile in the USA is 87.4 people per square mile (USCB 2012), approximately 1/15th (6.66 percent) of the density of the region of influence.

Units 6 & 7 construction-related growth in Miami-Dade County would consist of 5086 construction workers and family members along with 54 operation workers and family members, for a total of 5139 in-migrants ([Subsection 4.4.2.1](#)), which equates to 0.2 percent of the 2000 population and a similar percentage of the 2005-2009 population ([Table 4.4-15](#)). Assuming that about 43 percent



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

of the in-migrating workers and families would settle in the Homestead and Florida City area, the increase in population would represent 3.4 percent of the total 2005-2009 population (Table 4.4-15).

Using the GEIS guidance, land use impacts attributed to construction workforce population growth in Miami-Dade County would be SMALL because the county has established patterns of residential and commercial development, there is a population density of at least 60 people per square mile, and there is at least one urban area with a population of 100,000 people or more within 50 miles. The Homestead and Florida City area meets the NRC criteria for a SMALL land use impact because the population increase is 3.4 percent of the 2005-2009 population. The area also has a population density greater than 60 people per square mile, has established patterns of residential and commercial development, and has at least one urban area with a population of 100,000 people or more within 50 miles.

#### 4.4.2.2.3.3 Conclusion

Overall, impacts to land use in the region of influence, Miami-Dade County in general, and in the Homestead and Florida City area in particular, would be SMALL. There would be very little new residential or commercial development and basic land use patterns would remain in place. Existing comprehensive plans would guide development of new residential construction. Population increases would represent less than 5 percent of the 2005-2009 population base and not meaningfully alter land use densities or use.

Therefore, overall land use impacts would be SMALL. To mitigate these impacts, FPL would maintain communication with local and regional governmental and nongovernmental organizations to disseminate project information in a timely manner. This would allow these organizations to be given the opportunity to plan accordingly.

#### 4.4.2.2.4 Transportation

The Units 6 & 7 construction activities were assessed for impacts on transportation infrastructure and traffic from deliveries of materials and commuting workers. The assessment focuses on roadways; however, some components used in construction, such as the reactor vessel, would arrive by barge. The analysis focuses on the likely commuting routes east of the principal arterial roads. FPL believes that the excess capacity of U.S. Highway 1 and Florida's Turnpike is adequate to accommodate construction traffic (Table 4.4-16b).

A peak workforce during construction of 3983 (3950 construction workers and 33 operation workers) workers would exceed the capacity of the local roads in the vicinity of the construction site. As described in Section 4.4.1.4 construction traffic would be routed to a new construction entrance. This will alleviate traffic congestion at the existing entrance to Turkey Point Units 1 through 5. In addition, a traffic study was conducted to determine road improvements to alleviate

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

traffic congestion between the construction site, and the principal arterial roads west of the site, including U.S. Highway 1 and Florida's Turnpike (Traf Tech 2009). The analysis presented below considers the impacts of traffic during the peak morning and evening commute hours and assumes a maximum workforce of 3983 and a conservative vehicle occupancy of 1.0 persons per vehicle. It was assumed that 70 percent of the construction workforce would be assigned to the day shift and would arrive between 5:00 and 6:00 am and leave between 4:30 and 5:30 pm. The evening shift would comprise 30 percent of the workforce and would arrive between 4:00 and 5:00 pm and leave between 3:00 and 4:00 am. The analysis further assumes that half of the shift would arrive in the first half hour of the peak hour and half would arrive in the second half hour.

These assumptions result in the following trip generations for the construction workforce:

Shift 1 (6:00 am to 4:30 pm)

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Percent of total workforce                       | 70                 |
| Number of vehicles (3983 X 0.7)                  | 2788               |
| Inbound time                                     | 5:00 – 6:00 am     |
| Inbound traffic                                  | 2788               |
| Traffic distribution (5:00 - 5:30)/(5:30 - 6:00) | 1394/ 1394         |
| Outbound traffic (beginning of Shift 1)          | None               |
| Outbound time                                    | 4:30 – 5:30 pm     |
| Outbound traffic (end of Shift 1)                | 2788               |
| Traffic distribution (4:30 - 5:00)/(5:00 - 5:30) | 1394/ 1394         |
| Inbound traffic                                  | 1195 (See Shift 2) |

Shift 2 (5:00 pm to 3:00 am)

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Percent of total workforce                       | 30                 |
| Number of vehicles (3983 X 0.3)                  | 1195               |
| Inbound time                                     | 4:00 – 5:00 pm     |
| Inbound traffic                                  | 1195               |
| Traffic distribution (4:00 - 4:30)/(4:30 - 5:00) | 597/ 597           |
| Outbound traffic (beginning of Shift 2)          | 2788 (See Shift 1) |
| Outbound time                                    | 3:00 – 4:00 am     |
| Outbound traffic (end of Shift 2)                | 1195               |
| Inbound traffic                                  | none               |

The time of maximum construction traffic would be from 4:30 to 5:00 pm when half of each shift was leaving or entering the site, resulting in a maximum construction commuting workforce of

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

1991. The analysis looks at the hour of greatest traffic (4:30 to 5:30 pm) when all the Shift 1 workforce and half of the Shift 2 workforce would be commuting to or from the site, or 3385 commuters in one hours.

Trip distributions and traffic assignments for construction traffic were based on the traffic patterns of the existing workforce. Most existing traffic arrives from and departs to the north via SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road. The second most traveled access/egress route is SW 344th Street/Palm Drive to U.S. Highway 1. Most of the remainder of the existing workforce uses SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive.

The Traf Tech conclusions and recommendations (Traf Tech 2009) were further validated for a peak workforce during construction of 3983 (3950 construction and 33 operations) people. The maximum construction workforce is expected to be on site for 12 months.

#### 4.4.2.2.4.1 Deliveries of Construction Materials to the Turkey Point Site

The traffic study assumed that a maximum of 36 trucks per hour would enter and leave the site for a total of 72 trips per hour. The Traf Tech (2009) analysis looked at the impact of 72 truck trips per hour during the peak traffic hours, identified above. Fifty percent of the trucks were assumed to come from a quarry north of the site and access the construction site using SW 117th Avenue and the plant access road. The other 50 percent were assumed to access the site via U.S. Highway 1 to SW 344th Street/Palm Drive to SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road to the plant access road. The discussion of the impacts of the commuting construction workforce includes these trucks.

For delivery of construction materials at other than peak construction commute times, the available capacity of relevant road was compared with estimated truck traffic. Given the flat terrain in Miami-Dade County, a standard of one large truck equivalent to 1.5 passenger cars was used. SW 344th Street/Palm Drive has available peak hour capacity of 2799 vehicles west of SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road and SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive has available peak hour capacity of 2346 west of SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road. If all the trucks arriving and departing the construction site use SW 344th Street/Palm Drive or North Canal Drive, the available peak hour capacity would decrease by 114 (76 trucks X 1.5 passenger vehicles) on each roadway. The remaining available vehicle capacity on SW 344th Street/Palm Drive would be 2685, and on SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive it would be 2232.

The impact from deliveries of fill and construction materials to the Turkey Point site would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.4.2.2.4.2 Workers Commuting to the Turkey Point Site

As shown in [Table 4.4-16b](#), the principal arterial roads have adequate surplus capacity to support construction traffic. Therefore the traffic study focused on the streets east of these arterial roads and the intersections that will be most impacted by construction traffic. The analysis considered existing intersection counts and seasonal adjustments (Traf Tech 2009).

The analysis concluded that, in general, the roadways between the plant and the principal arterial roads have adequate capacity to support construction-generated trips, based on a link analysis of the roadways which are part of the Miami-Dade Concurrency Management System ([Table 4.4-16c](#)).

The analysis concluded that the six most affected intersections (all within 5 miles of Turkey Point) would need improvements to maintain the Miami-Dade level of service (LOS) standard of D.

LOS is a quality measure describing operating conditions within a traffic stream. LOS classes are assigned from “A” which represents the best operating conditions, to “F”, the worst. Miami-Dade County uses LOS D as their standard for planning and operational analyses. If the LOS is D, Miami-Dade considers options to improve the LOS.

For these analyses, roadway improvements were identified in order to provide acceptable LOS at the six study intersections. [Table 4.4-16d](#) provides the LOS at the six intersections with the identified roadway improvements.

In addition to the intersection improvements described in [Table 4.4-16d](#), the following improvements to roadway segments would be required to maintain acceptable operating conditions (FDOT's Generalized Capacity Tables use a link capacity of 1100 vehicles per hour per lane):

- Widen North Canal Drive from two to four lanes between SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road and SW 117th Avenue
- Widen SW 344th Street/Palm Drive from two to four lanes between SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road (W) and SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road (E)
- Widen SW 117th Avenue from two to four lanes between SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive and SW 344th Street/Palm Drive
- Improve SW 359th Street by constructing two eastbound lanes and one west bound lane between SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road and SW 117th Avenue

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

- Improve SW 359th Street by constructing four lanes between SW 117th Avenue and the construction entrance
- Improve SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road by constructing two southbound lanes and one north bound lane between SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and SW 359th Street
- Improve SW 117th Avenue by constructing four lanes between SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and SW 359th Street.

Based on the traffic engineering study, the roadway improvements discussed above would result in MODERATE impacts during peak construction traffic. The impacts would be temporary and may warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.4.3 Refueling Outage

Refueling outages for the existing units would occur during construction. Of these outages, the outage in month 45 would occur when the most construction and operation staff are onsite. The estimated temporary refueling workforce would be 600. In addition to these temporary staff, the workforce for Units 1 through 5 at that time is estimated to be 1476. The operation workforce at Units 6 & 7 is estimated to be 33. The total workforce accessing Turkey Point during the outage would be 6059. At the time of the outage, access to the site would be available from SW 344th Street/Palm Drive and SW 359th Street. Therefore, impacts associated with this outage would be the maximum workforce impacts during Units 6 & 7 construction and would last approximately 30 days. Mitigation could include staggering the outage shifts to ensure they did not coincide with construction shifts, encouraging outage workers to carpool, or providing van service to remote parking facilities for outage.

#### 4.4.2.2.4.4 Roads in Miami-Dade County (Region of Influence)

As stated in [Subsection 2.5.2.2.](#), Miami-Dade County has a well-developed road and transportation infrastructure. The adult population increase of 1992 workers during construction to the region of influence and accompanying licensed drivers (1992) could add 3984 drivers in the region of influence ([Table 4.4-1](#)). Miami-Dade County roads support a driving age population in excess of 1.8 million people and the additional traffic generated by 3984 additional drivers represents an increase of approximately 0.2 percent of the adult population and would be dispersed throughout the county. The impact to the region of influence's traffic would be SMALL and not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.4.5 Region of Influence Public Transportation

Miami-Dade County operates public transportation services including rail, express bus, and buses that have multiple stops ([Subsection 2.5.2.2.2](#)) and a daily ridership of 300,000 (MDC

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

2008). The population increase of 5139 into Miami-Dade County ([Subsection 4.4.2.1](#)) as a result of the in-migrating construction workers and their families could increase public transportation use in the county, but even if all the workers and their families used public transportation, the increase would be only 1.7 percent (5139/300,000). Impacts to public transportation would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.4.6 Evacuation Routes

The severe weather evacuation routes for the Florida City and Homestead area are shown in [Figure 2.5-8a](#). The in-migrating households could add 3984 vehicles to an evacuation of Miami-Dade County if each household evacuated in two vehicles. Approximately 43 percent of the in-migrating construction workforce would live in the Homestead/ Florida City area, for a total of 1704 maximum additional vehicles evacuating from this area. ([Table 4.4-1](#))

#### 4.4.2.2.4.7 Summary

The traffic study assumed maximum numbers of vehicles and represents an upper bounding analysis. In order to minimize impacts, FPL could employ several mitigation measures. Carpooling could be encouraged through multiple programs. Offsite park-and-ride lots have been identified, including the Homestead Speedway. Construction shifts, operations shifts for Units 1 through 5 and outage shifts for Units 3 & 4 could be staggered. During events at the Homestead Speedway that draw large crowds for several days, FPL may consider adjusting the construction schedule to ensure that the construction workforce is not commuting when the most traffic will be arriving or departing the Speedway.

#### 4.4.2.2.5 Aesthetics and Recreation

This subsection describes the aesthetics and use impacts on recreation opportunities of the construction activities for Units 6 & 7 and its associated facilities in the 6-mile vicinity and 50-mile region. [Subsection 2.5.2.5.2](#) presents basic information on recreation in the vicinity and 50-mile region. [Section 3.9](#) describes the construction activities that could cause aesthetic impacts and environmental protection procedures to address the impacts. [Subsection 4.4.1.3](#) analyzes the aesthetic impacts of the construction of Units 6 & 7 and associated facilities.

As stated in [Subsection 4.1.1.2](#), the major land uses within 6 miles are undeveloped and protected wetland and forestland. The topography of the region and the Turkey Point plant property is relatively flat. Construction facilities would include parking areas, laydown and fabrication areas, offices, warehouses, workshops, a concrete batch plant, and cranes. The cranes used during construction could reach a height of approximately 460 feet.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

4.4.2.2.5.1 Aesthetic Impacts to Recreation

Aesthetic impacts can be visual, auditory, and/or tactile (vibratory, etc.). With respect to aesthetic impacts to recreation, these impacts can be experienced by humans directly (e.g., visually) and/or indirectly by affecting the flora and fauna used by humans in the pursuit of recreation (e.g., frightening animals from viewing stations).

Changes to the viewscape that would result from construction of the new power block structures, elevation gradient changes, and land cover changes, could be seen from 10 miles because the area is relatively flat. However, trees and vegetation to the west and north screen the view.

People boating on Biscayne Bay are accustomed to seeing the structures of Units 1 through 5. The construction cranes and additional structures associated with Units 6 & 7 would not appreciably alter the plant's appearance as viewed from Biscayne Bay. People using Biscayne Bay could hear the onsite construction activities. Individuals in recreational facilities that are not adjacent to the Turkey Point plant property would be unable to distinguish the noise from construction of Units 6 & 7 from urban and traffic noise.

The private and public recreational facilities and opportunities within 6 miles are Biscayne National Park, Homestead Bayfront Park, Mangrove Preserve, and Homestead Miami Speedway. Therefore, these are the recreational opportunities that are analyzed for aesthetic impacts to recreation.

Property boundaries of Biscayne National Park and Homestead Bayfront Park are within 1 mile of the Turkey Point plant property along the western shore of Biscayne Bay. Recreational users would be able to see the cranes and taller structures on the Units 6 & 7 plant area; however, recreational users are accustomed to seeing Units 1 through 5. Recreational users may hear the onsite construction activities, but they would not experience tactile impacts. Although recreational users would be able to see and hear temporary construction activities, aesthetic impacts to this resource would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

Only a small portion of the Mangrove Preserve is within 6 miles of the Turkey Point plant property. There are three types of mangroves: red, black, and white with tree heights ranging from 20–50 feet (Law and Arny Undated). The privately owned Mangrove Preserve is not open to the public. Recreational users of the preserve would not be able to see the construction activities at the Units 6 & 7 plant area through the mangroves. With only a portion of the preserve approximately 6 miles from the power blocks, recreational users would experience no auditory or tactile impacts. Therefore, aesthetic impacts to this resource would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

As stated in [Subsection 2.5.2.5.2](#), Homestead Miami Speedway is a privately owned auto-racing track approximately 5 miles northwest of the Units 6 & 7 plant area. [Subsection 4.4.2.2.4](#) addresses the potential transportation impacts for Homestead Miami Speedway from Units 6 & 7

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

traffic, which could affect recreational users of the speedway. Spectators may be able to see the construction cranes; however, they are accustomed to seeing Units 1 through 5. Speedway patrons would not be able to discern the auditory impacts from construction of Units 6 & 7 from the operations of Units 1 through 5 and from the racing vehicles. There would be no induced tactile impacts. Therefore, aesthetic impacts to this resource would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

In summary, aesthetic impacts to recreation would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.5.2 Use Impacts to Recreation

While aesthetic impacts to recreation are driven by the recreation user's proximity to the site, use impacts to recreation are driven by how close the recreational facilities and events are to the user's residence. Construction workers and their families would be expected to use recreational facilities near their residences, rather than near their place of work (i.e., the Turkey Point plant site). Some recreational opportunities would be sought out because of their uniqueness, a particular national park for example, independently of recreation area's proximity to the workers' residences.

The influx of 5139 people (Table 4.4-1) during construction could affect the use of recreational areas and participation in recreational events in the 50-mile region. Use impacts to recreation would be the result of the plant-related population growth in the region of influence, and therefore, increased use of recreational facilities and events. Residential distribution of the in-migrating workers in Miami-Dade County is the most important determinant of recreational facility use.

The in-migrating construction workforce and their families would result in a 0.2 percent increase over the 2005-2009 Miami-Dade County's population (Table 4.4-15). Use of recreational facilities and areas would be expected to increase by a similar percentage. For the purpose of this analysis, the recreational facilities are broadly classified into three groups: (1) wildlife management areas, national wildlife refuges, and preserves, (2) state parks, and (3) privately owned recreational facilities expected to be impacted by construction-related population increases. Tables 2.5-29 and 2.5-30 present information about these facilities and events and, where available, information about the current use rates and capacities of those facilities and events.

The wildlife management areas, national wildlife refuges, and preserves could be impacted by the construction-related population increase. There are eight wildlife management areas, national wildlife refuges, and preserves that are open to the public (Table 2.5-29) in the 50-mile region. Generally, agencies managing these properties do not tabulate the number of annual visitors or determine capacity information. All 5139 residents of the project-induced population in



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

the region could use the areas, refuges, and preserves. Because the wildlife management areas, national wildlife refuges, and preserves are so large and have open and wooded lands appropriate for multiple uses (snorkeling/scuba diving, nature walks, picnics, camping, fishing), they can accommodate a large number of people. Impacts to wildlife management areas, national wildlife refuges, and preserves from the in-migrating construction workforce would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

The state park system could be impacted by the construction-related population increase. The 11 state parks in the region (Table 2.5-30) had a total annual visitor count of 2,739,696 from July 2007 to June 2008, and a total daily capacity of 29,147 visitors, or approximately 10,638,655, annually. Thus, the 11 state parks within 50 miles could accommodate an additional 21,641 daily visitors. The construction-related population increase of 5139 people represents approximately 24 percent of the available capacity if the construction-related population were to visit on any single day. Because the state park system has open and wooded lands appropriate for multiple uses (snorkeling/scuba diving, nature walks, picnics, camping, fishing), the state park system can accommodate additional use more readily than local park systems, which often specialize in dedicated use opportunities (tennis courts, swimming pools, baseball fields). Impacts to state parks from the in-migrating construction workforce would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

Homestead Miami Speedway may be impacted by construction of the new units. The commuter traffic and construction vehicles could interrupt traffic flow during the speedway's racing events. Subsection 4.4.2.2.4 addresses traffic impacts. The Homestead Miami Speedway seats 65,000 people. It is unlikely that the in-migrating population increase would meaningfully impact this resource's capacity. Impacts to this recreational facility use would be SMALL, beneficial, and would not warrant mitigation.

As noted in Subsection 2.5.2.5, there are over 400 community, neighborhood, and municipal parks in the 50-mile region. Approximately 22 of these are in the Homestead and Florida City area. Increased use of community, municipal, and neighborhood parks would likely reflect the same rate of project-induced population increase.

In summary, during construction, some employees and their families would use the regional recreational facilities in the region; however, the increase attributable to construction would be small compared to overall use of these facilities. Impacts of facility construction on recreation use would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.6 Housing

Impacts on housing from the Units 6 & 7 construction workforce and the operation workers employed during construction would depend on the number of workers that would relocate from

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

outside the region of influence and the type of housing workers would desire. Therefore, it was conservatively assumed that 1992 workers would migrate into the region of influence for construction and require housing (Table 4.4-1).

Approximately 1399 of these workers would bring families and 592 workers would relocate to the region of influence without families (Table 4.4-1). All 1992 in-migrating workers would need housing. Some of the workers would require permanent housing, generally owner-occupied, and others would elect to rent housing. Still others would elect to reside in transitional housing such as residential hotels, motels, rooms in private homes, or to bring their own housing in the form of campers and mobile homes. To present a more realistic analysis, the impacts to housing during construction for the region of influence were analyzed, as well as the Homestead and Florida City area.

Subsection 2.5.2.6 presents data about the existing housing conditions in the region of influence and the Homestead and Florida City area. The sources for data presented in this section are from Subsection 2.5.2.6, except where cited.

#### 4.4.2.2.6.1 Miami-Dade County (Region of Influence)

In 2010, there were 383,478 rental occupied units and about 37,848 additional vacant units for rent (USCB 2010a). Rental units include housing such as single-family units, multifamily units, apartments, or mobile homes that, if occupied are not owner-occupied, and if vacant are “for rent.” Mobile homes, a popular temporary housing option among construction workforces, represent 1.6 percent (or 15,085 units) of the housing in Miami-Dade County (Table 2.5-31). Some temporary workers may transport recreational vehicles (RVs) to facilities near the jobsite. There are nine recreational vehicle (RV) parks in Miami-Dade County, with a capacity of 1587 spaces with full hookup (Table 2.5-34). The RV parks could accommodate up to 80 percent of the in-migrating workforce. There are 47,642 hotel/motel rooms per night throughout Miami-Dade County, which could accommodate the in-migrating workers and their families.

As described in Subsection 2.5.2.6, Miami-Dade County had 135,004 total vacant housing units in 2005-2009. In Miami-Dade County, an additional 110,657 housing units were added to the total inventory between 2000 and 2005-2009, increasing the 2000 housing inventory by 13 percent. Because of the temporary nature of construction, workers often choose not to live in permanent housing. However, permanent housing could accommodate the entire in-migrating peak construction workforce.

If the 1992 workers elected to make the county their home, readily available housing could accommodate them. Miami-Dade County could accommodate the entire construction workforce based on the vacancy of housing units. The entire in-migrating workforce could be accommodated in vacant permanent housing units, in vacant rental units, or in hotel or motels. In

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

addition, the existing RV parks could accommodate up to 80 percent of the in-migrating workforce. If workers elect to build new housing, comprehensive plans are in place to guide development ([Subsection 2.5.2.4](#)).

Rental rates for housing units, new and existing housing prices, and short-term and long-term hotel/motel leasing rates, are unlikely to rise as a result of increased demand because of the abundance of available units. In 2000, the median gross monthly rent for a renter-occupied unit in Miami-Dade County was \$647, but the estimated median gross monthly rent was \$965 in 2005-2009, an increase of 49 percent during that period ([Table 2.5-31](#)). Given the potential Units 6 & 7-related increase in demand for housing, purchase prices of existing and newly constructed housing and rental rates could rise with the influx of workers during construction. However, with the uncertainty of the current housing market in Miami-Dade County and the large housing inventory, the housing and rental rates at the time of construction of Units 6 & 7 cannot be predicted. The county government would benefit from any increased real property values.

The current housing inventory is sufficient to accommodate 100 percent of the in-migrating workforce. Impacts to housing in the region of influence would be SMALL.

#### 4.4.2.2.6.2 The Homestead and Florida City Area

As stated in [Subsection 4.4.2](#), approximately 43 percent of the site's current workforce resides in the Homestead and Florida City area. It is assumed that approximately 852 workers could settle in the Homestead and Florida City area.

As described in [Subsection 2.5.2.6](#), the Homestead and Florida City area had 4046 total vacant housing units in 2005-2009 ([Table 2.5-32](#)). Because of the temporary nature of construction, workers often choose not to live in permanent housing. In 2010, there were 13,519 renter-occupied units and an additional 2146 vacant units "for rent" (USCB 2010b). Rental units include housing such as single-family units, multi-family units, apartments, or mobile homes that, if occupied are not owner-occupied, and if vacant are "for rent" or "for sale." Vacant permanent housing and vacant rental units could accommodate the entire in-migrating workforce in the Homestead and Florida City area. If workers elect to build new housing, comprehensive plans are in place to guide development ([Subsection 2.5.2.4](#)).

Mobile homes, a popular temporary housing option among construction workforces, represent 2.5 percent (or 611 units) of the housing in Homestead and Florida City area ([Table 2.5-32](#)). Some temporary workers may transport RVs to facilities near the jobsite, less than 10 miles from the Homestead and Florida City area. There are six RV parks in the Homestead and Florida City area, with a total capacity of 1080 spaces with full hookup ([Table 2.5-34](#)). The RV parks could accommodate the in-migrating workforce expected to settle in the Homestead and Florida City

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

area (Table 2.5-35). There are 1928 hotel/motel rooms per night in the South Dade area of Miami-Dade, the area that includes Homestead and Florida City.

If more than 852 workers elected to make the Homestead and Florida City area their home, readily available housing could accommodate them. Vacant units for rent or for sale could be used. Seasonal or occasional use units could be converted to a more traditional use. Additional housing units could be built, additional mobile homes could be set up, and additional hotel/motel rooms and RV spaces could be made available (Subsections 2.5.2.4.4 and 2.5.2.4.5). The in-migrating workforce expected to settle in the Homestead and Florida City area could be accommodated in vacant permanent housing units and in vacant rental units, in hotel/motels, or in the existing RV parks. In addition, the in-migrating workforce expected to settle in the Homestead and Florida City area workforce could bring mobile homes.

Impacts to the housing in the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL and not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.6.3 Conclusion

The region of influence has ample existing housing to accommodate the entire in-migrating construction workforce. The existing inventory includes a wide range of housing choice by type, location, and price. The Homestead and Florida City area has the capacity to provide enough housing to accommodate the in-migrating workers expected to settle in the area.

County and local governments in the region of influence, including Homestead and Florida City, would benefit from the increased taxable value of existing housing and from any new residential construction. It is concluded that the region of influence and the Homestead and Florida City area would benefit from positive tax impacts. Therefore, the impact to the Miami-Dade County and the Homestead and Florida City area's housing market would be SMALL and mitigation would not be warranted.

#### 4.4.2.2.7 Public Services

##### 4.4.2.2.7.1 Water Supply Facilities

The South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) is a regional governmental agency that oversees the water resources in the southern half of Florida, covering 16 counties from Orlando to the Florida Keys and serving a population of 7.5 million residents. It is the largest of Florida's five water management districts and is responsible for water supply planning for each region within its jurisdiction. SFWMD's mission is to manage and protect water resources of the region by balancing and improving water quality, flood control, natural systems and water supply.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The SFWMD serves local governments by supporting efforts to safeguard existing natural resources and meet future water demands through one of the four water supply planning areas. The four water supply planning areas are the Upper East Coast, the Lower East Coast, the Lower West Coast, and the Kissimmee Basin. The planning areas are generally defined by the drainage divides of major surface water systems in South Florida. The Lower East Coast (LEC) Planning Area of the SFWMD encompasses approximately 6100 square miles that includes all of Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties, most of Monroe County, and the eastern portions of Hendry and Collier Counties. The SFWMD, through the LEC planning area, provides regional oversight to these specific counties for water demand projections, assessment of existing and projected resource conditions, and formulation of strategies to meet urban, agricultural and environmental water needs. (SFWMD 2005)

Miami-Dade County is one of ten counties in the LEC planning area. Miami-Dade County's water is provided by five suppliers: the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department, the city of North Miami, the city of North Miami Beach, the city of Homestead and the city of Florida City. The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD) provides drinking water to approximately two million customers in Miami-Dade County and currently draws drinking water from the Biscayne Aquifer. The MDWASD is composed of three water treatment facilities: the Hialeah-Preston Water and Sewer Department (WASD), serving the northern part of Miami-Dade County, the Alexander Orr, Jr. WASD, serving the central and portions of the southern part of Miami-Dade County and the South Dade WASD, serving the southern part of Miami-Dade County. The MDWASD has plans for the construction and operation of the South Miami Heights (SMH) Water Treatment Plant in the South Dade area, which is scheduled to come online in 2012. The MDWASD has a 20 year water use permit issued by the SFWMD which limits its annual allocation to 149,106 million gallons and its monthly maximum allocation to 13,047 million gallons. These allocations are further limited by a wellfield operational plan, described in Limiting Condition 27 of the water use permit. (MDWASD 2008)

The city of North Miami supplies water within its municipal boundary as well as outside of its municipal boundary to certain northern parts of unincorporated Miami-Dade County. The city of North Miami Beach supplies water within its municipal boundary as well as outside its municipal boundaries to certain northern parts of unincorporated Miami-Dade County. The city of Homestead provides water within its municipal boundary and for a portion of unincorporated Miami-Dade County, including the Redavo development, from 6 city-owned withdrawal wells. The city of Homestead also has an agreement with the MDWASD to provide some water service within portions of Homestead municipal boundary. Florida City also provides water to portions of unincorporated Miami-Dade County as a water supplier. Florida City provides water service within its incorporated boundaries from 4 production wells (MDWASD 2008).

The impacts on local public water resources from both construction demand and population increases during the construction phase were considered. Construction-related impacts are

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

primarily based on the population increase caused by the number of workers and their families migrating into the region of influence. The workers would include construction employees and operation workers. This in-migrating population is estimated to be 5139 people (Table 4.4-1).

### **Miami-Dade County (Region of Influence)**

As explained in Section 3.3, water from Miami-Dade county would provide the necessary water for potable onsite uses during construction. The estimated maximum use during the peak construction period, including personal use (potable), concrete batch plant operation, concrete curing, cleanup activities, dust suppression, placement of engineered backfill, and piping hydrotests and flushing operations is 565 gpm, or 0.8 million gallons per day (mgd) (Section 4.2). The MDWASD system has an operating capacity of 470.35 mgd (Table 4.4-17). The estimated construction water demand represents 0.17 percent of the rated capacity of the MDWASD system. However, not all of the water uses would occur simultaneously. The increased use would not stress the public water supplies or infrastructures. Impacts to the MDWASD system would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

As indicated in Table 4.4-1, construction of Units 6 & 7 could bring as many as 5139 workers and family members to the region of influence. As addressed in Subsection 2.5.2.7.1.1, municipal water suppliers in the county have excess capacity. The impact to the local water supply systems from construction-related population growth can be estimated by calculating the amount of water that would be required by the total population increase. People in the United States use an average of approximately 100 gpd (U.S. EPA 2008). The 100 gpd estimate includes all water uses. It provides a conservative estimate of potential water demand from the population increase because a portion of the worker's daily water usage is accounted for in the peak construction demand for the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 project. The increase of 5139 people could increase consumption by 0.5139 mgd. The increased use would not stress public water supplies or infrastructure.

Collectively, public water suppliers in Miami-Dade County are operating at 74.74 percent capacity (Table 4.4-17). If 5139 construction-related individuals relocated to Miami-Dade County, the population served by these water systems would increase above the 2007 population by 0.2 percent. The additional demand of approximately 0.5139 mgd would increase the Miami-Dade County operating capacity use to 74.84 percent. When the construction-related population increase (0.5139 mgd) is combined with the peak construction water use estimate (0.8 mgd), the total public water usage in Miami-Dade County would be increased by 0.25 percent. Impacts to the public water supply systems in Miami-Dade County, based on the construction-related population increase and the peak construction water demands, would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

## Homestead and Florida City Area

The impact to the Homestead and Florida City area, which are likely candidates for the workers to relocate, can be estimated by adding the estimated distribution of likely construction-related population to the area. The increased population would represent approximately 43 percent of the in-migration workforce, or 2199 people, into the Homestead and Florida City area. This population increase would, in turn, increase demand collectively of the public water capacity for Homestead and Florida City systems, respectively, from 70.79 percent capacity usage to 75.73 percent capacity usage ([Table 4.4-17](#)).

Therefore, the increased demand from the estimated increase in population as a result of the construction-related workforce would not exceed the available capacity of the municipal water supplies in the entire region of influence. Also, the 43 percent population distribution in the Homestead and Florida City area would not exceed the available capacity of the combined water supplies of the Homestead and Florida City area. Therefore, the impacts to the region of influence and to the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation.

To mitigate impacts, FPL would communicate with local and regional governmental planning organizations such as the Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning, the MDWASD, and the South Florida Water Management District. FPL could share information such as project activity scheduling and projected workforce in-migration, thus giving these organizations time to prepare for demands on services because of the increased population as a result of Units 6 & 7 construction.

### 4.4.2.2.7.2 Wastewater Treatment Facilities

Units 1 through 5 use an existing onsite wastewater treatment facility to meet current operational needs.

Sanitary/wastewater treatment during the initial phases of Units 6 & 7 construction would be provided via portable facilities and/or a separate, packaged wastewater treatment facility. Portable toilet facilities would be used until the wastewater treatment facility could be completed. Therefore, onsite construction-related activities for Units 6 & 7 would have no impact on public wastewater services.

[Subsection 2.5.2.7.1.2](#) describes the public wastewater treatment systems in the region of influence, their plant-designed average flows, and monthly average wastewater processed. Wastewater treatment facilities in the region of influence have at least 15 percent available capacity with the exception of the city of Homestead ([Table 4.4-18](#)).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Impacts to local wastewater treatment systems would occur as the population increases as a result of the in-migration of the construction-related workers and their families. The magnitude of the impact can be conservatively estimated by assuming that 100 percent of the water used by this population would go to a wastewater treatment facility. As previously described, the construction-related population increase could require 0.5139 mgd of potable water and, by extension, 0.5139 mgd additional wastewater treatment capacity. As described in the following paragraphs, the in-migration of the maximum construction-related workforce and their families would increase the current wastewater treatment system use for the region of influence from approximately 79.85 percent to 79.98 percent.

### **Miami-Dade County (Region of Influence)**

**Subsection 2.5.2.7.1.2** describes the public wastewater treatment systems in the region of influence, their plant-designed average flows, and monthly average wastewater processed. Yearly average wastewater processed in the region of influence is 298.62 mgd, with a systems capacity of 374.00 mgd. If an additional 0.5139 mgd were processed in the region of influence, the average daily flow of wastewater to be processed would increase by 0.14 percent. Impacts to wastewater treatment capacity in the region of influence would be SMALL and would not require mitigation.

### **Homestead and Florida City Area**

The Homestead wastewater treatment facilities (WWTFs) are currently operating at approximately 102.20 percent (**Table 4.4-18**) capacity; however, the city of Homestead WWTF uses the SDWWTP system as backup and excess flows are diverted to the county wastewater treatment facilities. These excess flows are included in the SDWWTP flow reports. The wastewater generated in Florida City falls under the jurisdiction of the SDWWTP. The SDWWTP was operating at 78.54 percent of its capacity in 2009 (**Table 4.4-18**). If the estimated distribution of construction-related workers (2199 people) settled in the area of Homestead and Florida City, the overall capacity could accommodate 2199 people. This could be accomplished by using both the Homestead WWTF and the SDWWTP because of the remaining capacity of both facilities. Therefore, impacts on wastewater treatment facilities as a result of construction-induced population increases for Homestead and SDWWTP would be SMALL and would not require mitigation.

To mitigate any potential impacts, FPL would initiate early communication with local and regional governmental organizations, including planning commissions and local and regional economic development agencies, such as the Miami-Dade Planning and Zoning Department, to disseminate construction-related information in a timely manner. Local governments and planning groups would have time to plan for the influx. Infrastructure upgrades and expansions



could be funded, at least in part, by construction-related property and sales and use tax payments.

#### 4.4.2.2.7.3 Law Enforcement, Fire, and Medical Services

##### **Law Enforcement**

With respect to onsite law enforcement, FPL would employ its own security force. Security services and emergency response are addressed in the Emergency Plan.

##### **Miami-Dade County**

Residents-to-law enforcement officer ratios for the region of influence are presented in [Table 4.4-19](#). Currently, the region of influence ratio of residents-to-law enforcement officer is 825 to 1.

With respect to the influx of workers and their families during peak construction periods, 5139 people would move into the region of influence ([Table 4.4-1](#)), and this population increase would increase the current residents-to-law enforcement officer ratio in the region of influence by 0.21 percent ([Table 4.4-19](#)), creating a SMALL impact.

Assuming the region of influence is already near or at its capacity to provide law enforcement protection, maintenance of the current preconstruction ratio would be desirable. Therefore, to accommodate the additional population caused by the construction of Units 6 & 7, six additional law enforcement officers (and associated equipment) would be needed in the region of influence during the peak construction period to maintain the current ratio.

##### **Homestead and Florida City Area**

Residents-to-law enforcement officer ratios for the Homestead and Florida City area are presented in [Table 4.4-19](#). Currently, the Homestead and Florida City area ratio of residents-to-law enforcement officer is 480 to 1 ([Table 4.4-19](#)). With respect to the influx of workers and their families during the peak construction period, 2199 people would increase the current residents-to-law enforcement officer ratio by 3.4 percent, creating a SMALL impact. The community would need five additional officers to maintain current ratios during construction.

This conclusion and its mitigation are based in part on the GEIS. The NRC selected seven case study plants whose characteristics resembled the spectrum of nuclear plants in the United States today, and reported that public safety services were not disrupted as a result of the construction of new plants. The taxes directed to the local communities as a result of the plant construction enabled the growth of the public safety services in these areas by purchasing new buildings and equipment, and acquiring additional staff.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Moreover, impacts created by the influx of workers and their families could be mitigated by the increased property and sales/use tax revenues that would be generated by the construction project. However, expanding law enforcement services, including the hiring of additional personnel, would likely begin before a sufficient amount of these tax revenues would be available to local governments. Therefore, local governments could access other funding sources or issue bonds until the tax revenues would become available. Additionally, FPL would communicate regularly with local and regional governmental officials regarding Units 6 & 7 and its schedules, allowing local and regional officials ample opportunity to plan for the population influx.

Upon construction completion, the additional law enforcement personnel and equipment needed to support the personnel could be considered in excess. However, some, if not all, of the personnel and equipment could be used to continue to support the Units 6 & 7 operation workforce-related population growth and future non-Units 6 & 7-related population growth in the region of influence. The additional personnel and equipment could also be used to supplement the general provision of law enforcement services in the region of influence. These services could continue to be funded by the plant's property taxes and the sales and use tax revenues generated by Units 6 & 7 and workforce expenditures in the region of influence.

During the peak construction period, to maintain pre-Units 6 & 7 construction ratios, six additional law enforcement officers would be required in the region of influence to maintain preconstruction ratios and five additional officers would be required in the Homestead and Florida City area (Table 4.4-19). The operation workforce would reach its peak in month 77 of construction, well after the construction peak. During the operation period (when the number of workers on the site would drop to 806) fewer officers would be needed than during construction (Figure 3.10-2). Officers could be retained to supplement the general provision of law enforcement services in the region of influence, thereby reducing the ratios. Units 6 & 7-related tax payments, including both property taxes and sales and use taxes made by the Units 6 & 7 and its employees, could continue to assist in funding these services.

### **Fire Protection Services**

Fire protection services and emergency response are addressed in the Emergency Plan.

### **Miami-Dade County**

Residents-to-active firefighter ratios for the region of influence are presented in Table 4.4-20. Currently, the resident-to-active firefighter ratio in the region of influence is 702 to 1. If the number of active firefighters in the region of influence remained at current levels, the additional population of 5139 would increase the residents-to-active-firefighter ratios in the region of influence to 703 to 1, a 0.21 percent increase, creating a SMALL impact. To maintain preconstruction ratios, seven

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

additional active firefighters (and associated equipment) would be needed in the region of influence during peak construction period.

### **Homestead and Florida City Area**

As noted in [Subsection 2.5.2.7.2](#), Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue provides fire protection services for the Homestead and Florida City area. The residents-to-active firefighter ratio in the Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue service area is not available for strictly the Homestead and Florida City area. However, if the Homestead and Florida City area experience a population increase of 2199 people, or 3.4 percent of the 2005-2009 population, the ratio of residents-to-active firefighters in the Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue service area would increase by less than 3.4 percent (because the service area would have a larger population base), creating a SMALL impact.

This impact could be mitigated by the use of the increased property and sales/use tax revenues that would be generated by the construction activities. However, expanding fire suppression services, including the hiring of additional personnel, would likely begin before a sufficient amount of these tax revenues would be available to local governments. Therefore, local governments could access other funding sources or issue bonds until the tax revenues would become available. Also, the peak construction workforce would not be in place until month 42 of construction activities, giving local governments time to plan and budget accordingly. Additionally, FPL would communicate regularly with local and regional governmental officials about the Units 6 & 7 construction activities and schedule, allowing local and regional officials ample opportunity to plan for the population influx.

As with the analysis of the adequacy of law enforcement, this conclusion and its mitigations are also based in part on the GEIS.

Upon construction completion, the additional fire protection personnel and equipment needed to support the population increase during peak construction period could be considered in excess. However, some, if not all, of the personnel and equipment could be used to continue to support the operation workforce-related population growth and future non-Units 6 & 7-related population growth in the region of influence. The additional personnel and equipment could also be used to improve the general provision of fire suppression services in the region of influence. These services would continue to be funded by the plant's property taxes and the sales and use tax revenues generated by Units 6 & 7 and workforce expenditures in the region of influence.

During peak construction period, to maintain pre-Units 6 & 7 construction ratios, seven additional active firefighters would be required in the region of influence. The operation workforce would reach its peak in month 77 of construction, well after the peak construction period ([Figure 4.4-1](#)). During the operation period, fewer active firefighters and associated equipment would be

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

required than during construction in the region of influence. Firefighters could be retained to supplement the general provision of fire protection services in the region of influence, thereby reducing the ratios from their pre-Units 6 & 7 construction levels. Units 6 & 7-related tax payments, including both property taxes and sales and use taxes made by Units 6 & 7 and its employees, could continue to assist in funding these services.

### **Medical Services**

Information concerning medical services in the region of influence is provided in [Subsection 2.5.2.7.3](#).

Medical services and emergency response are addressed in the Emergency Plan. Minor injuries to construction workers would be assessed and treated by onsite medical personnel. Other injuries would be treated at hospitals in the region of influence, depending on the severity of the injury. Agreements would be in place with some local medical providers to support emergencies.

The opportunities for medical care in Miami-Dade County are provided in [Table 2.5-41](#). According to information in [Table 2.5-41](#), in 2006, there were 8420 staffed hospital beds in the region of influence. As identified in [Table 2.5-3](#), the 2005-2009 population of the region of influence was 2,457,044. Adding 5139 residents to the region of influence population would increase the population by 0.2 percent ([Subsection 4.4.2.1](#)). The 0.2-percent increase in the annual admissions; the average daily census, and the annual outpatient visits would not be noticeable or burden existing medical service capacity. Therefore, the impacts of construction on medical services would be SMALL and mitigation would not be warranted.

#### **4.4.2.2.8 Education**

It is estimated that approximately 1119 school-aged children would be part of the in-migration during the construction period. Because the Miami-Dade County Public School District covers the entire region of influence, it was assumed that the school-aged children would reside in Miami-Dade County. This subsection addresses the public and private school system and postsecondary institutions in the region of influence. The source for the data presented is [Subsection 2.5.2.8](#), except where cited.

##### **4.4.2.2.8.1 Miami-Dade County School District**

It is assumed that each in-migrating worker with a family, during the construction period, would have 0.8 school-age children. Therefore, the in-migrating construction workforce with families (1399 workers) would bring approximately 1119 school-aged children ([Table 4.4-1](#)). This analysis conservatively assumes that school-aged children would attend public schools.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

As described in [Subsection 2.5.2.8](#), the district enrolled 347,133 students in 2010–2011. The new and expanded public primary and secondary facilities will provide capacity for an additional 13,746 students by 2015–2016 ([Table 2.5-42](#)). The additional 1119 students would represent an increase of 0.3 percent of the 2010–2011 enrollment in the Miami-Dade County Public School District and 8 percent of the additional capacity expected to be available by 2012–2013. Because the additional capacity is greater than the estimated number of in-migrating students and the county public school enrollment has steadily decreased recently, the education system in the county could accommodate students that would accompany the construction workers.

Impacts to public education in the region of influence, Miami-Dade County Public School District, would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.8.2 Homestead and Florida City Area

As stated in [Subsection 2.5.2.8](#), the Homestead and Florida City area is part of the District IX region. The number of school-aged children likely to locate in the Miami-Dade County Public School system, District IX region, but outside of the immediate Homestead and Florida City area was not determined. Therefore, the percentage impact to the District IX region could not be specifically determined, but the impact would be approximately 1 percent even if half of the 1119 children in-migrating to Miami-Dade County were to locate in the District IX region. Hence, the impacts to public schools would be SMALL. The construction-related student population in the Homestead and Florida City area could increase by 479 students ([Table 4.4-1](#)) and be spread out over the 76 area schools. These students would represent an increase of 0.86 percent of the 55,860 District IX region students enrolled in 2010. Therefore, when spread over pre-K-12 grades, it is unlikely that the school-aged children of the in-migrating construction workforce would affect class size, teacher ratios, or facility capacity in the area schools.

Impacts to public education schools in the Homestead and Florida City area, which are a part of the Miami-Dade County Public School District system, would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

#### 4.4.2.2.8.3 Private Schools – Pre-Kindergarten through 12

##### Miami-Dade County

The assumption was made that the same percentage of in-migrating school-aged children could attend private school as those who currently attended private school (15 percent). Of the 1119 in-migrating children, 168 may attend private school. As described in [Subsection 2.5.2.8.2](#), there was a total enrollment of 61,161 students in Miami-Dade county private schools. The 168 new students represent less than 0.3 percent of the private school enrollment. Impacts to private education in the region of influence would be SMALL and not warrant mitigation.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

## Homestead and Florida City

The assumption was made that the same percentage of in-migrating school-aged children could attend private schools in the Homestead and Florida City area as school-age children attending private schools in Miami-Dade County (15 percent). Therefore, of the 479 in-migrating school-aged children expected to reside in the Homestead and Florida City area, 72 may attend private schools. As noted in [Subsection 2.5.2.8.2](#), there was a total of 2263 students in private schools in Homestead and Florida City. The 72 new students represent about 3.2 percent of the enrollment. Impacts to private education in the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL and not warrant mitigation.

### 4.4.2.2.8.4 Conclusion

The Florida Education Finance Program and equalized funding legislation would ensure that the Miami-Dade County Public School District would receive additional funding to support the educational services provided for the new students. However, the legislation also means that the project-related increases in property tax may not go directly to the Miami-Dade County Public School District ([Subsections 2.5.2.3](#) and [4.4.2.2.2](#)). FPL would provide the local communities with timely information regarding the construction activities, giving the school district time to make accommodations for the additional influx of students. It is concluded that impacts to the Miami-Dade County Public School System and to the schools in the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation.

### 4.4.2.2.8.5 Postsecondary Institutions

[Subsection 2.5.2.8.3](#) addresses postsecondary institutions, colleges and universities, and technical colleges in the region of influence and 50-mile radius. The peak workforce during construction would not be reached until approximately month 42 of construction activities. FPL would provide the local education institutions, including postsecondary institutions, with timely information regarding the construction activities, giving the institutions several years to make accommodations for the influx of construction workers or worker family members that may seek postsecondary education or training. The institutions could also modify curriculum offerings and/or contract with FPL to provide onsite and offsite academic courses and job-specific training.

## 4.4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Environmental justice refers to a federal policy under which federal agencies identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health, environmental, or low-income populations. The NRC has a policy on the treatment of environmental justice matters in licensing actions (69 FR 52040).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The USCB 2005-2009 data at the block group level was used to identify concentrations of minority (racial and ethnic) and of low-income populations. [Subsection 2.5.4](#) defines minority and low-income populations, and [Figures 2.5-24](#) through [2.5-31](#) identify minority and low-income populations within 50 miles. There are 1627 census block groups that are at least partially within 50 miles, 1222 of which are wholly in the region of influence (Miami-Dade County). It is assumed that 100 percent of the in-migrating construction workforce would settle in Miami-Dade County; therefore, the health and environmental impacts and socioeconomic impacts evaluated in this environmental justice analysis are focused on Miami-Dade County. Of the 1222 block groups in Miami-Dade County, 319 have significant Black race populations, 335 have significant racial aggregate populations, and 783 have significant Hispanic ethnic populations. The plant property is in a block group meeting the Other race, the aggregate of races, and the Hispanic ethnicity criteria. Two hundred twelve (212) block groups contain a significant percentage of low-income households in Miami-Dade County. The closest low-income block group is approximately 4.7 miles north of the plant property.

For the environmental justice analysis, two types of impacts were evaluated: health and environmental impacts and socioeconomic impacts. The following paragraphs summarize the magnitude of each type of impact to the general population and address whether minority and low-income populations would experience disproportionately high and adverse impacts. The evaluation identified the most likely pathways by which adverse environmental impacts associated with construction could affect human populations, determined the level of significance of the impact, and assessed whether characteristics of the minority or low-income populations would result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts to those populations. Several socioeconomic resources were also evaluated to determine if construction-related activities could disproportionately, in a high and adverse manner, impact minority or low-income populations. If the impacts to the general population were found to be SMALL, and there were no resource dependencies, preexisting health conditions, or location-dependent reasons that would affect the level of significance of the impact to minority or low-income populations, it was concluded there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impact on low-income or minority populations.

#### 4.4.3.1 Health and Environmental Impacts

Impacts from construction of a nuclear power plant would be similar to impacts from other large construction projects. There are three primary pathways for health and environmental impacts: soil, water, and air.

Construction activities would involve moving large quantities of soil for construction of Units 6 & 7, modification to the equipment barge unloading area, transmission lines, and pipelines. The majority of these impacts would be on the Turkey Point plant property. Water-related health and environmental impacts include sedimentation and, less likely, spills of petroleum products. However, any land-disturbing activities that could adversely affect water quality would be of

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

relatively short duration, would be permitted and overseen by state and federal regulators, and would be guided by an approved stormwater pollution prevention plan. Modifications to the equipment barge unloading area would be performed under permits issued by the USACE. Further, surface flow from the construction areas on the Turkey Point plant property would be to the industrial wastewater facility. Any spills would be mitigated according to a construction phase spill prevention, control, and countermeasures plan. Impacts to surface water quality would be SMALL ([Subsection 4.2.3.1](#)). In the unlikely event that small amounts of contaminants escape into the environment, they would have only a small, localized, temporary impact on the aquifer. Any impacts to groundwater quality would be SMALL ([Subsection 4.4.3.2](#)).

Construction activities could cause temporary and localized physical impacts such as noise, odors, vehicle exhaust, and fugitive dust emissions. In general, noise during construction activities would not significantly affect offsite areas. Construction of new transmission systems and expansion of substations would take place in agricultural, wetland, undeveloped, or very urban areas. Construction would be short-term, accelerated, and occur only during daytime. Good road conditions and appropriate speed limits would minimize the noise level generated by the workforce commuting to the site. Thus, the noise impacts as a result of construction and the commuting workforce would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation ([Subsection 4.4.1.1](#)).

Temporary and minor impacts to local ambient air quality could occur as a result of normal construction activities. Specific mitigation measures to control fugitive dust would be identified in a dust control plan, or similar document, prepared before the start of construction. Because of the size and population of the surrounding areas, the small emissions from the small increase in local traffic would not noticeably affect the air quality in the area. Air quality impacts from construction and traffic would be SMALL and would not require mitigation ([Subsection 4.4.1.2](#)).

Health and environmental impacts to the general population from construction, via the three pathways, would be SMALL. Any soil disturbance, noise, vehicle exhausts, and fugitive dust emissions would not extend offsite. Impacts to groundwater and surface water quality would be SMALL. Any radiological doses to the public would meet public dose criteria. Therefore, it is concluded that there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations within 50 miles of the site via soil, water, or air pathways that would affect the health and environment of populations studied in this environmental justice analysis.

#### 4.4.3.2 Socioeconomic Impacts

This analysis estimates the Units 6 & 7 in-migrating construction-related worker households to be 1992. This represents 1.6 percent of the available housing in Miami-Dade County for the in-migrating, direct workforce if existing vacant housing, including seasonal or occasional use housing, were available for the in-migrating workers ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.6](#)). The current housing inventory within the region of influence is sufficient to accommodate 100 percent of the in-



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

migrating workforce. Impacts to housing in the region of influence would be SMALL and mitigation would not be warranted. The Homestead and Florida City area is a likely area for some of the workers to live based on the proximity to the site and the current residential distribution of Turkey Point employees. This area's housing market would likely be affected the most. If, as expected, approximately 43 percent of the construction workforce moved into the Homestead and Florida City area, the area could accommodate the workers during peak construction if the vacant housing met workers' requirements for type, size, price, condition, or other characteristics. Therefore, impacts to the housing in the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL because the area has enough housing to accommodate the in-migrating workers. New and existing housing prices, rental rates for housing units, and short-term and long-term hotel/motel leasing rates, are unlikely to rise as a result of increased demand because of the abundance of available units. County and local governments would benefit from the increased taxable value of existing housing and any new residential construction. Because the existing housing market in the region of influence could accommodate the expected in-migration, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations (Subsection 4.4.2.2.6).

As presented in Subsection 4.4.2.2.8, it is estimated that 1119 school-aged children would accompany the in-migrating construction workforce. This would represent a 0.3 increase over the 347,133 students that were enrolled in the Miami-Dade County Public School District during the 2010–2011 school year. New and expanded public primary and secondary facilities will provide capacity for an additional 13,746 students by 2015–2016 (Table 2.5-42). The estimated number of in-migrating school-aged children would represent 8 percent of this additional capacity. The number of school-aged children likely to locate in the Miami-Dade County public school system, District IX region, but outside of the immediate Homestead and Florida City area was not determined. Therefore, the percentage impact to the District IX region could not be specifically determined, but the impact would be approximately 1 percent even if half of the 1119 children in-migrating to Miami-Dade County were to locate in the District IX region. Hence, the impacts to public schools would be SMALL. Because the excess capacity is greater than the estimated number of in-migrating students, the education system in the county could accommodate students that would accompany the workers during construction. Therefore, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

As stated in Subsection 4.4.2.2.3, minimal land use conversion is anticipated as a result of the construction of Units 6 & 7. From a land use perspective, Miami-Dade County is likely to continue to urbanize. Commercial and residential development in Miami-Dade County is increasing with the demand of the growing population. The construction of Units 6 & 7 would create an additional increase in residential and commercial activity. However, because the county has a 2010 population of approximately 2.5 million and the Homestead and Florida City area is also experiencing growth, this would not create a discernible change in housing availability, change

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

rental rates and housing values, or spur housing construction and/or conversion. Thus, minimal land use conversion is anticipated as a result of construction of Units 6 & 7. Offsite land use changes would be considered SMALL in Miami-Dade County and in the Homestead and Florida City area. Therefore, there would not be disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations.

Initially, the current workforce and Units 6 & 7 construction workforce would use a number of different routes (SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road, SW 117th Avenue, SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive, or SW 344th Street/Palm Drive) and, from these roads, access the existing entrance to the site. FPL proposes to route construction traffic to a new construction entrance. To do this, SW 117th Avenue and SW 137th Avenue/Tallahassee Road would be extended south of SW 344th Street/Palm Drive. SW 359th Street (which runs east-west, south of SW 344th Street/Palm Drive) would be extended east from its current termination to a new construction entrance. Because the roads are in racial and ethnic minority areas, these populations would be impacted by increased traffic and construction activities. In particular, Black races, Other races, and Hispanic ethnic block groups are along and between SW 117th Avenue and SW 137th Avenue, where the road improvements would be made. As described in [Subsection 4.4.2.2](#), impacts would be SMALL during peak construction. LARGE impacts could occur on the current access roads for a few months before completion of the new access roads. Mitigation measures would be implemented, such as staggering arrival and departure times, to minimize the impacts to transportation.

The construction of Units 6 & 7 could reduce unemployment, create new business opportunities for housing and service-related industries, and increase the personal income of the population in the region of influence. The impacts of construction on the economy of the region of influence would be positive and SMALL ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.1](#)). Minority and low-income populations would benefit from these positive impacts just as the general population would. There would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations; impacts would be positive and SMALL.

The potential impacts from construction on public services in the region of influence ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.7](#)) were also assessed. Collectively, Miami-Dade's municipal water supplies are operating at 74.74 percent capacity. The estimated increase in population as a result of in-migrating construction workforce and their families would not exceed the available capacity of the municipal water supplies in the region of influence. When the construction-related population increase (0.5139 mgd) is combined with the peak construction water use estimate at the site (0.8136 mgd), the total public water usage in the Miami-Dade County would be increased by 0.25 percent. Impacts to Miami-Dade County based on the construction-related population increase and the peak construction water demands at the site would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation. The increased population to the Homestead and Florida City area, which is a likely candidate for the construction workers to relocate, is 2199 people. This demand could increase

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

the public water usage in Homestead and Florida City systems collectively from 70.79 percent capacity usage to 75.73 percent capacity usage. Therefore, the estimated increase in population as a result of the construction-related workforce would not exceed the available capacity of the municipal water supplies in the entire region of influence or in the Homestead and Florida City area ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.7.1](#)). Therefore, the impacts to both areas would be SMALL and there would not be disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

Sanitary/wastewater treatment during construction of Units 6 & 7 would initially be provided via potable facilities and/or a separate, packaged wastewater treatment facility. Therefore, there would be no impact on public wastewater facilities during construction. Portable toilet facilities would be used until the site's wastewater treatment facility could be completed. Therefore, onsite construction-related activities for Units 6 & 7 would have no impact on public wastewater services.

Population increase as a result of in-migration of the construction-related workers and their families would impact local wastewater treatment systems. The magnitude of the impact to local wastewater treatment systems is conservatively estimated by assuming 100 percent of the water used by the in-migrating construction population would go to a wastewater treatment facility. The construction-related population increase could require 0.5139 mgd of drinking water, and by extension, 0.5139 mgd of additional wastewater treatment capacity. The additional 0.5139 mgd would increase the wastewater processed by 0.14 percent in the region of influence. Impacts to wastewater treatment capacity in the region of influence would be SMALL and would not require mitigation. As stated in [Subsection 2.5.2.7](#), the Homestead WWTF is currently operating at approximately 102.20 percent of capacity; however, the city of Homestead WWTF uses the SDWWTP system as backup and excess flows are diverted to the county wastewater treatment facilities. These excess flows are included in the SDWWTP flow reports. The wastewater generated in Florida City falls under the jurisdiction of the SDWWTP. The SDWWTP is currently running at 78.54 percent of its capacity. If the expected distribution of construction-related workers (approximately 43 percent or 2199 people) settled in the area of Homestead and Florida City, the overall capacity could accommodate the increased population by using both the Homestead WWTF and the SDWWTP as a result of the remaining capacity of both facilities. There is enough excess capacity to accommodate the estimated in-migrating construction-related workforce population. Impacts on wastewater treatment facilities as a result of Units 6 & 7-induced population increases for the city of Homestead and the SDWWTP would be SMALL and would not require mitigation. Therefore, the estimated increase in population as a result of the construction-related workforce would not exceed the available capacity of the wastewater systems in the entire region of influence or in the Homestead and Florida City area ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.7.2](#)). The impacts to both areas would be SMALL. Therefore, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

With respect to onsite law enforcement, FPL would employ its own security force. The estimated increase in population as a result of in-migrating construction workforce and their families is 5139. The current resident-to-law enforcement officer ratio for the region of influence is 825 to 1. This population increase would increase the resident-to-law enforcement officer ratio in the region of influence by 0.21 percent, creating a SMALL impact. Currently, the Homestead and Florida City area ratio of residents-to-law enforcement officer is 480 to 1. With respect to the influx of workers and their families into Florida City and Homestead during peak construction period, 2199 people would increase the resident-to-law enforcement officer ratio by 3.4 percent, creating a SMALL impact. To accommodate the additional population caused by Units 6 & 7 construction, six additional active law enforcement officers would be needed in the region of influence during peak construction period; five of which would be required in the Homestead and Florida City area. The impacts to the region of influence and the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.7.3](#)). There would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

The estimated increase in population as a result of the in-migrating construction workforce and their families is 5139, which would increase the residents-to-active firefighter ratios in the region of influence by 0.21 percent, creating a SMALL impact in the region of influence. The current residents-to-active firefighter ratio in the region of influence is 702 to 1. To maintain pre-construction ratios, seven additional active firefighters would be needed in the region of influence during peak construction period. This impact could be mitigated by the use of the increased property and sales/use tax revenues that would be generated by the construction. As noted in [Subsection 2.5.2.7.2](#), Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue provides fire protection services for the Homestead and Florida City area. The residents-to-active firefighter ratio in the Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue service area is not available for strictly the Homestead and Florida City area. However, if the Homestead and Florida City area experience a population increase of 2199 people, or 3.4 percent of the 2005–2009 population, the ratio of residents-to-active firefighters in the Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue service area would increase by less than 3.4 percent (because the service area would have a larger population base), creating a SMALL impact. The impacts to the region of influence and the Homestead and Florida City area would be SMALL. There would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

Adding 5139 residents to the region of influence population would increase the population by 0.2 percent. The 0.2 percent increase in the annual admissions, average daily census, and the annual outpatient visits to area hospitals would not be noticeable or burden existing medical service capacity. Therefore, the potential impacts of construction on medical services would be SMALL and mitigation would not be warranted. Because the existing medical services in Miami-Dade County could accommodate the expected in-migration, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority populations.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Local government officials, staff of social welfare agencies, and the Miccosukee Indian Tribe were contacted concerning unusual resource dependencies or practices or health conditions that could result in potentially disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations. Contacts with multiple government entities in Miami-Dade County were attempted.

Many agencies had no information concerning activities and health issues of minority populations. Interviews were conducted with the Community Action Agency, Miami-Dade Office of Community Advocacy, Miami-Dade County Community and Economic Development, Countywide Healthcare Planning, Metro Miami Action Plan Trust, and the Miami-Dade Black Advisory Board. No agency reported dependencies or practices, such as subsistence agriculture, hunting, or fishing, or preexisting health conditions through which the populations could be disproportionately or adversely affected by the proposed project. Several agencies alluded to the extreme urban nature of the study area and implied that there was no possibility of any subsistence activity on the part of any group.

Contact with the Miccosukee Indian Tribe reported that the Indians residing in the reservation within the 50-mile radius do not depend on hunting, fishing, or gardening for subsistence. The Miccosukee Tribe does lease land from the SFWMD for hunting, fishing, frogging, agriculture, and to carry on the traditional Miccosukee way of life. However, most tribal members rely on modern means to meet their food needs.

In summary, there were no construction-related impacts identified that would have disproportionately high and adverse effects on the human health, environment, or socioeconomics of minority or low-income populations. Therefore, it is concluded that impacts from construction-related activities to minority or low-income populations would reflect impacts to the general population and would be SMALL.

#### **Section 4.4 References**

BEA 2009a. U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, Bureau of Economic Analysis, *RIMS II Multipliers 1997/2006, Table 1.5, Total Multipliers for Output, Earnings, Employment, and Value Added by Detailed Industry, Miami-Dade County, Florida*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C., April 2009.

BEA 2011. U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table CA04, Personal Income and Employment Summary. Updated April 21. Available at <http://www.bea.gov/>, accessed March 7, 2012.

BLS 2010. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Employment Statistics, Nuclear Power Reactor Operators (51-8011) Annual Mean Wage (May 2010). Available at <http://data.bls.gov/>, accessed March 8, 2012.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

BLS 2012a. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Local Area Unemployment Statistics. Available at <http://data.bls.gov/>, accessed February 10, 2012.

BLS 2012b. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, Wages. Available at <http://data.bls.gov/>, accessed February 11, 2012.

BLS 2012c. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, Employment. Available at <http://data.bls.gov/>, accessed February 11, 2012.

BMI Apr 1981. Battelle Memorial Institute, S. Malhotra and D. Manninen, Migration and Residential Location of Workers at Nuclear Power Plant Construction Sites; Forecasting Methodology (Volume 1) and Profile Analysis of Worker Surveys (Volume 2), NUREG/CR-2002, PNL-3757, U.S. NRC Accession Numbers 8105180373 (Volume 1) and 8105180378 (Volume 2), prepared by Pacific Northwest Laboratory for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, April 1981.

FBI 2010a. U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Report, Crime in the United States, Table 80, Full-time Law Enforcement Employees by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties, 2010. Available at <http://www.fbi.gov/>, accessed February 13, 2012.

FBI 2010b. U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Report, Crime in the United States, Table 78, Full-time Law Enforcement Employees by Cities, 2010. Available at <http://www.fbi.gov/>, accessed February 13, 2012.

FDOE 2011. Florida Department of Education. Financial Profiles of Florida School Districts: 2009-2010 Financial Data Statistical Report. February 2011. Available at <http://www.fldoe.org/>, accessed March 23, 2012.

FDOR 2011. Florida Department of Revenue, 2011 Annual Report. Available at <http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/report/>, accessed March 23, 2012.

FDOR 2012a. Florida Department of Revenue. Discretionary Sales Surtax Information. Report DR-15DSS, as of November 2, 2010. Available at <http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/forms/2011/>, accessed March 25, 2012.

FDOR 2012b. Florida Department of Revenue. Tax Information for New Residents. Available at <http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/>, accessed March 25, 2012.

FIND 2010. Florida Inland Navigation District. Florida Inland Navigation District. Annual Financial Report. September 30, 2010. Available at <http://www.aicw.org/>, accessed May 1, 2012.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

FPL Undated. Florida Power & Light Company, FPL Turkey Point Public Hearing Application: *Economic Impact Analysis*. Prepared by Sharpton, Brunson & Company, P.A., Miami, Florida. Undated.

FPL May 2010. Florida Power and Light Company. Before the Florida Public Commission, Docket No. 100009-EI. In Re: Nuclear Power Plant Cost Recovery For the Years Ending December 2010 and 2011, May 3, 2010.

Law and Arny Undated. Beverly E. Law and Nancy P. Arny, Mangroves-Florida's Coastal Tree, University of Florida. Available at <http://www.sfrc.ufl.edu/extension/pubtxt/for43.htm>, accessed August 22, 2008.

MDC 2008. Miami-Dade Transit History. Available at [http://www.miamidade.gov/transit/transit\\_history.asp](http://www.miamidade.gov/transit/transit_history.asp), accessed August 18, 2008.

MDC 2012. Miami-Dade County FY 2011-12 *Adopted Budget and Multi-Year Capital Plan*. Available at <http://www.miamidade.gov/budget/FY2011-12/>, accessed March 23, 2012.

MDWASD 2009. Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department. Miami-Dade Consolidated PWS Water Use Permit No. 13-00017-W; Alternative Water Supply Plan and Reuse Feasibility Plan Annual Progress Report. January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009. Appendix B Annual Reuse Reports. Available at <http://www.miamidade.gov/water/water-use-permit.asp>, accessed March 28, 2012.

MDWASD 2008. Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department, Draft Water Supply Facilities Work Plan, March 2008.

NEI 2010. Nuclear Energy Institute. *Life-Cycle Emission Analysis*. <http://www.nei.org/keyissues/protectingtheenvironment/lifecycleemissionsanalysis/>.

NRC 2010. NUREG 1939 Volume 1 and 2, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Combined Licenses for Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Units 2 and 3, Section 5.7.2 and Appendix J. Available at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1939/>.

SFWMD 2005. South Florida Water Management District, Lower East Coast Water Supply Plan. 2005-2006. Available at <http://www.sfwmd.gov/>, accessed August 3, 2010.

SFWMD 2010. South Florida Water Management District. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2010. Available at <http://www.sfwmd.gov/>, accessed May 1, 2012.

SFWMD 2010a. South Florida Water Management District Water Use Permit No. Re-Issue 13-00017-W. November 1, 2010. Available at <http://www.sfwmd.gov/>, accessed March 28, 2012.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

SFWMD 2011. South Florida Water Management District. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2011. Available at <http://www.sfwmd.gov/>, accessed May 16, 2012.

TCT 2010. The Children's Trust. *Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. For the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2011*. Available at <http://www.thechildrenstrust.org/financials>, accessed May 1, 2012.

Traf Tech. 2009. Turkey Point Power Plant Peak Construction Analysis. Traffic Study. Prepared for Golder Associates, Inc by Traf Tech Engineering, Inc. June 2009.

USCB 2008a. *Miami-Dade County QuickFacts*. Available at <http://www.census.gov>, accessed August 27, 2008.

USCB 2010a. U.S. Census Bureau. Table DP-5 *Demographic and Housing Estimates: 2005-2009, 2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*. Available at <http://factfinder2.census.gov/>, accessed January 27 and 30, 2012.

USCB 2010b. U.S. Census Bureau. Table DP-1 Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, 2010 Demographic Profile Data, 2010 Census. Available at <http://factfinder2.census.gov/>, accessed February 19, 2012 and March 12, 2012.

USCB 2012. U.S. Census Bureau. *State and County QuickFacts*. Updated January 17 and 31. Available at <http://quickfacts.census.gov/>, accessed March 12, 2012.

USFA 2010. U.S. Fire Administration. *National Fire Department Census*. Available at <http://apps.usfa.fema.gov/>, accessed February 13, 2012.

USEPA 2008. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Water Trivia Facts. Available at [http://www.epa.gov/safewater/kids/water\\_trivia\\_facts.html](http://www.epa.gov/safewater/kids/water_trivia_facts.html), accessed August 5, 2008.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-1 (Sheet 1 of 2)**  
**Assumptions for Workforce Characterization During Peak Construction Period, Units 6 & 7**

|  | Construction | Operation | Total |
|--|--------------|-----------|-------|
| <b>Workforce Characterization</b>  |              |           |       |
| Peak number of workers onsite during construction (month 45) (See <a href="#">Table 3.10-2</a> )   | 3,950        | 33        | 3,983 |
| <b>Workforce Migration</b>   |              |           |       |
| Percent of workforce migrating into Miami-Dade County  | 50%          | 50%       | —     |
| Total number of workers migrating into Miami-Dade County during construction peak  | 1,975        | 17        | 1,992 |
| Percent of in-migrating workforce that migrates into Homestead and Florida City area (See <a href="#">Subsection 2.5.1</a> )   | 42.78%       | 42.78%    | —     |
| Total number of workers migrating into Homestead and Florida City area during construction peak  | 845          | 7         | 852   |
| <b>Families</b>  |              |           |       |
| Percent of workers who bring families <sup>(a)</sup>   | 70%          | 100%      | —     |
| Percent of workers who do not bring families   | 30%          | 0%        | —     |
| Average worker family size (worker, spouse, children) <sup>(a)(b)</sup>  | 3.25         | 3.25      | —     |
| Number of workers who would move into Miami-Dade County and bring families   | 1,383        | 17        | 1,399 |
| Number of workers who would move into Miami-Dade County and not bring families   | 592          | 0         | 592   |
| Number of workers who would move into the Homestead and Florida City area and bring families   | 591          | 7         | 598   |
| Number of workers who would move into the Homestead and Florida City area and not bring families   | 254          | 0         | 254   |
| <b>Total In-Migration — Families and Unaccompanied Workers</b>   |              |           |       |
| Total number of workers who would bring families into Miami-Dade County (= total families in Miami-Dade County)  | 1,383        | 17        | 1,399 |
| In-migrating workers family members (Miami-Dade County)  | 3,111        | 37        | 3,148 |
| Total in-migrating workers accompanied by family, plus family members  | 4,493        | 54        | 4,547 |
| Total number of workers who would not bring families into Miami-Dade County  | 592          | 0         | 592   |
| Total number of workers and family members migrating into Miami-Dade County (= new population in Miami-Dade County)  | 5,086        | 54        | 5,139 |
| Total number of workers who would bring families that would migrate into the Homestead and Florida City area (= total families in the Homestead and Florida City area) | 591          | 7         | 598   |
| In-migrating workers' family members (Homestead and Florida City area)   | 1,331        | 16        | 1,347 |
| Total workers accompanied by family, plus family members, that would migrate into the Homestead and Florida City area  | 1,922        | 23        | 1,945 |
| <b>Total In-Migration — Families and Unaccompanied Workers (cont.)</b>   |              |           |       |
| Number of workers who would migrate into the Homestead and Florida City area and not bring families  | 253          | 0         | 253   |
| Total number of workers and family members that would migrate into the Homestead and Florida City area (= new population in Homestead and Florida City area)           | 2,176        | 23        | 2,199 |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-1 (Sheet 2 of 2)**  
**Assumptions for Workforce Characterization During Peak Construction Period, Units 6 & 7**

|  | Construction | Operation | Total |
|--|--------------|-----------|-------|
| <b>School-age children</b>   |              |           |       |
| Number of school-age children per family <sup>(a)</sup>  | 0.8          | 0.8       | —     |
| Number of school-age children in Miami-Dade County (0.8 per family)  | 1106         | 13        | 1119  |
| Number of school-age children in Homestead and Florida City area (0.8 per family that would migrate to the Homestead and Florida City area)                      | 473          | 6         | 479   |
| <b>Post-construction workforce retention</b>   |              |           |       |
| Percent of in-migrating workforces that would leave Miami-Dade County, post-construction <sup>(a)</sup>  | 50%          | —         | —     |
| Number of in-migrating workforces that would leave Miami-Dade County, post-construction  | 988          | —         | 988   |
| Number of in-migrating workforces and their families plus in-migrating workers without families that would leave Miami-Dade County, post-construction            | 2543         | —         | 2543  |
| Number of school-age children of in-migrating workers that would migrate to Miami-Dade County  | 1106         | 13        | 1119  |
| Number of school-age children of in-migrating workers that would leave Miami-Dade County, post-construction  | 553          | —         | 553   |
| <b>Homestead and Florida City area</b>   |              |           |       |
| Percent of in-migrating workforces that would leave the Homestead and Florida City area, post-construction <sup>(a)</sup>  | 50%          | —         | —     |
| Number of in-migrating workers that would leave the Homestead and Florida City area, post-construction   | 422          | —         | 422   |
| Number of in-migrating workers and their families plus in-migrating workers without families that would leave Homestead and Florida City area, post-construction | 1088         | —         | 1088  |
| Number of school-age children of in-migrating workers that would migrate to the Homestead and Florida City area  | 473          | 6         | 479   |
| Number of school-age children of in-migrating workers that would leave Homestead and Florida City area, post-construction  | 237          | —         | 237   |

Note: Sums may not equal totals because of rounding

(a) Source: BMI Apr 1981.

(b) According to the USCB Table DP-1, Profile of the General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010 (USCB 2010b), the average family in Miami-Dade County in 2010 was 3.33. The average family size in Florida was 3.01. Therefore, FPL assumes that an average family size of 3.25 for the construction workforce, as presented in the Battelle Memorial Institute Study (BMI April 1981), would also be a reasonable estimate for the operations workforce.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-2  
Direct and Indirect Employment, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period**

| Employment  | Units 6 & 7 |
|---|-------------|
| Construction workforce peak (Table 4.4-1)   | 3,950       |
| Operations workforce onsite during construction (Table 4.4-1)                         | 33          |
| Number of construction workers who migrate into Miami-Dade County (Table 4.4-1)       | 1,975       |
| Number of operations workers who migrate into Miami-Dade County (Table 4.4-1)         | 17          |
| Employment multiplier for construction workers (indirect portion only) <sup>(a)</sup> | 0.9535      |
| Employment multiplier for operations workers (indirect portion only) <sup>(a)</sup>   | 2.1696      |
| Indirect jobs resulting from in-migrating construction workers                        | 1,883       |
| Indirect jobs resulting from in-migrating operations workers                          | 36          |
| Total number of indirect jobs ( from both in-migrating workforces)                    | 1,919       |
| Number of persons unemployed in Miami-Dade County, 2011 <sup>(b)</sup> (Table 2.5-7)  | 156,562     |

(a) Source: BEA 2009.

(b) Source: BLS 2012a.

Note: Sums may not equal totals because of rounding.

**Table 4.4-3  
Industry Sector Direct and Indirect Employment, Miami-Dade County,  
Construction Period**

|   |                             |                          |              |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Miami-Dade County Total Private Employment, 2010 <sup>(a)</sup> (Table 2.5-11)  | —                           | —                        | 803,654      |
| Miami-Dade County Employment, Sector 23 — Construction, 2010 <sup>(a)</sup> (Table 2.5-11)                              | —                           | —                        | 31,395       |
| Miami-Dade County Employment, Sector 237 — Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction, 2010 <sup>(a)</sup> (Table 2.5-11) | —                           | —                        | 5,401        |
|   | <b>Construction Workers</b> | <b>Operation Workers</b> | <b>Total</b> |
| Workforce during peak construction period <sup>(b)</sup> (Table 4.4-1)  | 3,950                       | 33                       | 3,983        |
| Number of workers assumed to migrate into Miami-Dade County (50%) (Table 4.4-1)   | 1,975                       | 17                       | 1,992        |
| In-migrating workers as a percentage of Miami-Dade County 2010 total private employment                                 | 0.25%                       | 0.00%                    | 0.25%        |
| In-migrating workers as a percentage of Miami-Dade County 2010 employment, Sector 23                                    | 6.3%                        | 0.1%                     | 6.3%         |
| In-migrating workers as a percentage of Miami-Dade County 2010 employment, Sector 237                                   | 36.6%                       | 0.3%                     | 36.9%        |
| Indirect workers during construction period (already residents of Miami-Dade County) (Table 4.4-1)                      | —                           | —                        | 1,919        |
| Indirect workers as a percentage of Miami-Dade County total private employment in 2010                                  | —                           | —                        | 0.2%         |

(a) Source: BLS 2012b.

(b) Source: Section 3.10.

Note: Sums may not equal totals because of rounding.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-4 (Sheet 1 of 2)**  
**In-migrating Construction Worker Wages, by Construction Month, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period**

| Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce(c) | Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) |
|--------------------|---|--|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|
| -39                | 20  | \$97,770   | -3                 | 713   | \$3,483,056   | 34                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 70                 | 1,300   | \$6,355,050   |
| -38                | 23  | \$109,991  | -2                 | 725   | \$3,544,163   | 35                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 71                 | 1,250   | \$6,110,625   |
| -37                | 28  | \$134,434  | -1                 | 738   | \$3,605,269   | 36                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 72                 | 1,200   | \$5,866,200   |
| -36                | 30  | \$146,655  | 1                  | 750   | \$3,666,375   | 37                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 73                 | 1,150   | \$5,621,775   |
| -35                | 35  | \$171,098  | 2                  | 763   | \$3,727,481   | 38                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 74                 | 1,100   | \$5,377,350   |
| -34                | 38  | \$183,319  | 3                  | 775   | \$3,788,588   | 39                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 75                 | 1,050   | \$5,132,925   |
| -33                | 45  | \$219,983  | 4                  | 800   | \$3,910,800   | 40                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 76                 | 950   | \$4,644,075   |
| -32                | 50  | \$244,425  | 5                  | 813   | \$3,971,906   | 41                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 77                 | 850   | \$4,155,225   |
| -31                | 55  | \$268,868  | 6                  | 825   | \$4,033,013   | 42                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 78                 | 750   | \$3,666,375   |
| -30                | 65  | \$317,753  | 7                  | 838   | \$4,094,119   | 43                 | 1,963   | \$9,593,681   | 79                 | 650   | \$3,177,525   |
| -29                | 75  | \$366,638  | 8                  | 850   | \$4,155,225   | 44                 | 1,950   | \$9,532,575   | 80                 | 550   | \$2,688,675   |
| -28                | 90  | \$439,965  | 9                  | 863   | \$4,216,331   | 45                 | 1,935   | \$9,459,248   | 81                 | 400   | \$1,955,400   |
| -27                | 115   | \$562,178  | 10                 | 875   | \$4,277,438   | 46                 | 1,925   | \$9,410,363   | 82                 | 275   | \$1,344,338   |
| -26                | 140   | \$684,390  | 11                 | 888   | \$4,338,544   | 47                 | 1,913   | \$9,349,256   | 83                 | 225   | \$1,099,913   |
| -25                | 160   | \$782,160  | 12                 | 900   | \$4,399,650   | 48                 | 1,900   | \$9,288,150   | 84                 | 187.5   | \$916,594   |
| -24                | 195   | \$953,258  | 13                 | 913   | \$4,460,756   | 49                 | 1,888   | \$9,227,044   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -23                | 233   | \$1,136,576  | 14                 | 925   | \$4,521,863   | 50                 | 1,875   | \$9,165,938   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -22                | 270   | \$1,319,895  | 15                 | 950   | \$4,644,075   | 51                 | 1,863   | \$9,104,831   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -21                | 288   | \$1,405,444  | 16                 | 975   | \$4,766,288   | 52                 | 1,850   | \$9,043,725   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -20                | 325   | \$1,588,763  | 17                 | 1,000   | \$4,888,500   | 53                 | 1,838   | \$8,982,619   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -19                | 370   | \$1,808,745  | 18                 | 1,050   | \$5,132,925   | 54                 | 1,825   | \$8,921,513   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -18                | 413   | \$2,016,506  | 19                 | 1,125   | \$5,499,563   | 55                 | 1,813   | \$8,860,406   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -17                | 450   | \$2,199,825  | 20                 | 1,175   | \$5,743,988   | 56                 | 1,800   | \$8,799,300   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -16                | 500   | \$2,444,250  | 21                 | 1,225   | \$5,988,413   | 57                 | 1,788   | \$8,738,194   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -15                | 510   | \$2,493,135  | 22                 | 1,300   | \$6,355,050   | 58                 | 1,775   | \$8,677,088   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -14                | 545   | \$2,664,233  | 23                 | 1,375   | \$6,721,688   | 59                 | 1,763   | \$8,615,981   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -13                | 590   | \$2,884,215  | 24                 | 1,450   | \$7,088,325   | 60                 | 1,750   | \$8,554,875   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -12                | 600   | \$2,933,100  | 25                 | 1,525   | \$7,454,963   | 61                 | 1,725   | \$8,432,663   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -11                | 610   | \$2,981,985  | 26                 | 1,600   | \$7,821,600   | 62                 | 1,700   | \$8,310,450   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -10                | 620   | \$3,030,870  | 27                 | 1,675   | \$8,188,238   | 63                 | 1,650   | \$8,066,025   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -9                 | 650   | \$3,177,525  | 28                 | 1,750   | \$8,554,875   | 64                 | 1,600   | \$7,821,600   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -8                 | 660   | \$3,226,410  | 29                 | 1,825   | \$8,921,513   | 65                 | 1,550   | \$7,577,175   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -7                 | 670   | \$3,275,295  | 30                 | 1,925   | \$9,410,363   | 66                 | 1,500   | \$7,332,750   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -6                 | 675   | \$3,299,738  | 31                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 67                 | 1,450   | \$7,088,325   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -5                 | 688   | \$3,360,844  | 32                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 68                 | 1,400   | \$6,843,900   | —                  | —   | —   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-4 (Sheet 2 of 2)**  
**In-migrating Construction Worker Wages, by Construction Month, Miami-Dade County, Construction Period**

| Construction Month  | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Construction Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-Migrating Construction Workforce (c) |
|---|---|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|
| -4  | 700   | \$3,421,950   | 33                 | 1,975   | \$9,654,788   | 69                 | 1,350   | \$6,599,475   | —                  | —   | —   |
| Grand Total, In-migrating Worker Wages                    |   |   |                    |   |   |                    |   |   |                    | \$637,093,763                                       |   |
| Earnings Multiplier, Construction Industry <sup>(d)</sup> |   |   |                    |   |   |                    |   |   |                    | 1.8022  |   |

- (a) Source: [Table 3.10-2](#).
- (b) The number shown represents 50 percent of the total construction workforce because that is the percentage assumed to be migrating into Miami-Dade County ([Table 4.4-1](#))
- (c) Source: BLS 2012c. This column equals the number of in-migrating workers times the average monthly wage of \$4,889 (average annual wage of \$58,662 divided by 12, [Table 2.5-12](#)).
- (d) Source: BEA 2009.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-5**  
**In-migrating Construction Worker Wages, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Construction Workforce Total Wages over 123-month Construction Period<br>(Table 4.4-4) | \$637,093,763    |
| Earnings Multiplier for Construction Industry Sector <sup>(a)</sup><br>(Table 4.4-4)   | 1.8022           |
| Total Economic Impact to Miami-Dade County (Earning multiplier applied)                | \$1,148,170,379  |
| Total Personal Income in Miami-Dade County, 2009 <sup>(b)</sup>                        | \$90,915,774,000 |

(a) Source: BEA 2009.

(b) Source: BEA 2011.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-6**  
**In-migrating Construction Worker Wages by Year, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

| Year         | Construction Months | Total Annual Wages <sup>(a)</sup> | Dollar Impact to County (earnings multiplier applied) <sup>(b)</sup> | Percentage of Miami-Dade County Personal Income, 2009 <sup>(c)</sup> |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Year 1       | -39 to -28          | \$2,700,896                       | \$4,867,555  | 0.01%  |
| Year 2       | -27 to -16          | \$16,901,989                      | \$30,460,764   | 0.03%  |
| Year 3       | -15 to -4           | \$36,749,299                      | \$66,229,586   | 0.07%  |
| Year 4       | -3 to 9             | \$46,196,325                      | \$83,255,017   | 0.09%  |
| Year 5       | 10 to 21            | \$58,662,000                      | \$105,720,656  | 0.12%  |
| Year 6       | 22 to 33            | \$99,480,975                      | \$179,284,613  | 0.20%  |
| Year 7       | 34 to 45            | \$115,478,591                     | \$208,115,517  | 0.23%  |
| Year 8       | 46 to 57            | \$108,891,338                     | \$196,243,968  | 0.22%  |
| Year 9       | 58 to 69            | \$93,920,306                      | \$169,263,176  | 0.19%  |
| Year 10      | 70 to 81            | \$54,751,200                      | \$98,672,613   | 0.11%  |
| Year 11      | 82 to 84            | \$3,360,844                       | \$6,056,913  | 0.01%  |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | —                   | \$637,093,763                     | \$1,148,170,379  | 1.26%  |

(a) Source: [Table 4.4-4](#).

(b) Source: BEA 2009. Construction earnings multiplier is 1.8022.

(c) Source: BEA 2011 ([Table 4.4-5](#)).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-7 (Sheet 1 of 2)**  
**In-Migrating Operations Worker Wages by Month, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

| Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce (c) |
|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|
| -39                | 0   | 0   | -3                 | 0   | 0   | 34                 | 0   | \$0   | 70                 | 350   | \$2,387,668                                       |
| -38                | 0   | 0   | -2                 | 0   | 0   | 35                 | 0   | \$0   | 71                 | 358   | \$2,445,737                                       |
| -37                | 0   | 0   | -1                 | 0   | 0   | 36                 | 0   | \$0   | 72                 | 366   | \$2,500,390                                       |
| -36                | 0   | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 0   | 37                 | 0   | \$0   | 73                 | 374   | \$2,555,043                                       |
| -35                | 0   | 0   | 2                  | 0   | 0   | 38                 | 0   | \$0   | 74                 | 383   | \$2,613,113                                       |
| -34                | 0   | 0   | 3                  | 0   | 0   | 39                 | 0   | \$0   | 75                 | 391   | \$2,667,766                                       |
| -33                | 0   | 0   | 4                  | 0   | 0   | 40                 | 0   | \$0   | 76                 | 399   | \$2,725,835                                       |
| -32                | 0   | 0   | 5                  | 0   | 0   | 41                 | 8   | \$54,653  | 77                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -31                | 0   | 0   | 6                  | 0   | 0   | 42                 | 17  | \$112,723   | 78                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -30                | 0   | 0   | 7                  | 0   | 0   | 43                 | 25  | \$167,376   | 79                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -29                | 0   | 0   | 8                  | 0   | 0   | 44                 | 33  | \$225,445   | 80                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -28                | 0   | 0   | 9                  | 0   | 0   | 45                 | 41  | \$280,098   | 81                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -27                | 0   | 0   | 10                 | 0   | 0   | 46                 | 50  | \$338,168   | 82                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -26                | 0   | 0   | 11                 | 0   | 0   | 47                 | 58  | \$392,821   | 83                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -25                | 0   | 0   | 12                 | 0   | 0   | 48                 | 66  | \$450,890   | 84                 | 403   | \$2,753,162                                       |
| -24                | 0   | 0   | 13                 | 0   | 0   | 49                 | 74  | \$505,543   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -23                | 0   | 0   | 14                 | 0   | 0   | 50                 | 82  | \$560,197   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -22                | 0   | 0   | 15                 | 0   | 0   | 51                 | 91  | \$618,266   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -21                | 0   | 0   | 16                 | 0   | 0   | 52                 | 99  | \$672,919   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -20                | 0   | 0   | 17                 | 0   | 0   | 53                 | 115   | \$785,642   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -19                | 0   | 0   | 18                 | 0   | 0   | 54                 | 132   | \$898,364   | —                  | —   | —   |
| -18                | 0   | 0   | 19                 | 0   | 0   | 55                 | 148   | \$1,011,087                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -17                | 0   | 0   | 20                 | 0   | 0   | 56                 | 165   | \$1,123,809                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -16                | 0   | 0   | 21                 | 0   | 0   | 57                 | 181   | \$1,236,532                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -15                | 0   | 0   | 22                 | 0   | 0   | 58                 | 198   | \$1,349,254                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -14                | 0   | 0   | 23                 | 0   | 0   | 59                 | 214   | \$1,461,977                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -13                | 0   | 0   | 24                 | 0   | 0   | 60                 | 231   | \$1,574,699                                       | —                  | —   | —   |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-7 (Sheet 2 of 2)**  
**In-Migrating Operations Worker Wages by Month, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

| Construction Month                                  | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce(c) | Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce(c) | Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce (c) | Construction Month | Number of Operations Workers In-migrating (a),(b) | Earnings of In-migrating Operations Workforce (c) |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---|--|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|
| -12   | 0   | 0  | 25                 | 0   | 0  | 61                 | 247   | \$1,684,006                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -11   | 0   | 0  | 26                 | 0   | 0  | 62                 | 263   | \$1,796,728                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -10   | 0   | 0  | 27                 | 0   | 0  | 63                 | 280   | \$1,909,451                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -9  | 0   | 0  | 28                 | 0   | 0  | 64                 | 296   | \$2,022,173                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -8  | 0   | 0  | 29                 | 0   | 0  | 65                 | 309   | \$2,107,569                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -7  | 0   | 0  | 30                 | 0   | 0  | 66                 | 317   | \$2,162,223                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -6  | 0   | 0  | 31                 | 0   | 0  | 67                 | 325   | \$2,220,292                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -5  | 0   | 0  | 32                 | 0   | 0  | 68                 | 333   | \$2,274,945                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| -4  | 0   | 0  | 33                 | 0   | 0  | 69                 | 342   | \$2,333,014                                       | —                  | —   | —   |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                  |   |  |                    |   |  |                    |   |   |                    |   | <b>\$72,251,707</b>                               |
| <b>Operations Earnings Multiplier<sup>(d)</sup></b> |   |  |                    |   |  |                    |   |   |                    |   | <b>1.788</b>                                      |

(a) Table 4.4-1.

(b) The number shown represents 50 percent of the operations workforce on site during construction, because that is the percentage assumed to be migrating into Miami-Dade County (Table 4.4-1).

(c) Source: BLS 2010. This column equals the number of in-migrating workers times the average monthly wage of \$6,832 (average annual wage of \$81,980 divided by 12).

(d) Source: BEA 2009.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-8**  
**In-migrating Operations Worker Wages, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| In-Migrating Operations Workforce Wages over 123-month Construction Period<br>(Table 4.4-7) | \$72,251,707     |
| Earnings Multiplier for Construction Industry Sector <sup>(a)</sup>                         | 1.7880           |
| Total Economic Impact to Miami-Dade County (Earning multiplier applied)                     | \$129,186,052    |
| Total Personal Income in Miami-Dade County 2009 <sup>(b)</sup>                              | \$90,915,774,000 |

(a) Source: BEA 2009.

(b) Source: BEA 2011.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-9**  
**In-migrating Operations Worker Wages by Year, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

| Year         | Construction Months | Total Annual Wages <sup>(a)</sup> | Total Dollar Impact to County (earnings multiplier applied) <sup>(b)</sup> | As a percentage of Miami-Dade County Personal Income in 2009 <sup>(c)</sup> |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Year 1       | -39 to -28          | \$0                               | \$0  | 0.000%  |
| Year 2       | -27 to -16          | \$0                               | \$0  | 0.000%  |
| Year 3       | -15 to -4           | \$0                               | \$0  | 0.000%  |
| Year 4       | -3 to 9             | \$0                               | \$0  | 0.000%  |
| Year 5       | 10 to 21            | \$0                               | \$0  | 0.000%  |
| Year 6       | 22 to 33            | \$0                               | \$0  | 0.000%  |
| Year 7       | 34 to 45            | \$840,295                         | \$1,502,447  | 0.002%  |
| Year 8       | 46 to 57            | \$8,594,237                       | \$15,366,495   | 0.017%  |
| Year 9       | 58 to 69            | \$22,896,331                      | \$40,938,640   | 0.045%  |
| Year 10      | 70 to 81            | \$31,661,359                      | \$56,610,510   | 0.062%  |
| Year 11      | 82 to 84            | \$8,259,485                       | \$14,767,959   | 0.016%  |
| <b>Total</b> | —                   | <b>\$72,251,707</b>               | <b>\$129,186,052</b>   | <b>0.142%</b>   |

(a) [Table 4.4-7](#).

(b) Source: BEA 2009. The multiplier is 1.7880.

(c) Source: BEA 2011.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-10**  
**In-Migrating Construction and Operations Worker Wages, Miami-Dade County,**  
**Construction Period**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Combined Workforce Total Wages over 120-month Construction Period<br>(Tables 4.4-5 and 4.4-8) | \$709,345,469    |
| Total Economic Impact to Miami-Dade County (Earning multiplier applied) <sup>(a)</sup>        | \$1,277,356,430  |
| Total Personal Income, Miami-Dade County, 2009 <sup>(b)</sup>                                 | \$90,915,774,000 |

- (a) This row is the sum of construction worker wages with construction sector earnings multiplier (1.8022) applied (see Table 4.4-5), plus operations worker wages with operations sector earnings multiplier (1.7880) applied (see Table 4.4-8).
- (b) Source: BEA 2011.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-11  
In-migrating Construction and Operations Worker Wages by Year, Miami-Dade County,  
Construction Period**

| <b>Year</b>  | <b>Construction Months</b> | <b>Total Annual Wages</b> | <b>Total Dollar Impact to County (earnings multipliers applied) <sup>(a)</sup></b> | <b>As a percentage of Miami-Dade County Personal Income in 2009<sup>(b)</sup></b> |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| Year 1       | -39 to -28                 | \$2,700,896               | \$4,867,555  | 0.01%   |
| Year 2       | -27 to -16                 | \$16,901,989              | \$30,460,764   | 0.03%   |
| Year 3       | -15 to -4                  | \$36,749,299              | \$66,229,586   | 0.07%   |
| Year 4       | -3 to 9                    | \$46,196,325              | \$83,255,017   | 0.09%   |
| Year 5       | 10 to 21                   | \$58,662,000              | \$105,720,656  | 0.12%   |
| Year 6       | 22 to 33                   | \$99,480,975              | \$179,284,613  | 0.20%   |
| Year 7       | 34 to 45                   | \$116,318,886             | \$209,617,965  | 0.23%   |
| Year 8       | 46 to 57                   | \$117,485,574             | \$211,610,464  | 0.23%   |
| Year 9       | 58 to 69                   | \$116,816,637             | \$210,201,815  | 0.23%   |
| Year 10      | 70 to 81                   | \$86,412,559              | \$155,283,123  | 0.17%   |
| Year 11      | 82 to 84                   | \$11,620,329              | \$20,824,872   | 0.02%   |
| <b>Total</b> | —                          | <b>\$709,345,469</b>      | <b>\$1,277,356,430</b>   | <b>1.40%</b>  |

(a) This column is the sum of construction and operations worker wages with applicable multiplier applied (Tables 4.4-6 and 4.4-9).

(b) Source: BEA 2011.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-12**  
**Not Used**

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-13  
Estimated Sales Tax Impacts, Miami-Dade County and Florida,  
Construction Period**

| Sales Tax Scenarios   | Low Construction Cost Estimate | High Construction Cost Estimate |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Total Estimated Project Costs, 12-year period <sup>(a)</sup>                                    | \$12,811,684,100               | \$18,694,287,838                |
| Portion of construction costs subject to Florida and Miami-Dade County sales tax <sup>(b)</sup> | 22.78%                         | 22.78%                          |
| Construction costs subject to Florida and Miami-Dade County sales tax                           | \$2,918,501,638                | \$4,258,558,769                 |
| Miami-Dade County Total Sales Tax Revenue, 2011 <sup>(c)</sup>                                  | \$57,559,000                   |                                 |
| Miami-Dade County Sales Tax Rate <sup>(d)</sup>   | 1.0%                           | 1.0%                            |
| Miami-Dade County Sales Tax Revenue Resulting from Units 6 & 7 Construction                     | \$29,185,016                   | \$42,585,588                    |
| Average per year (12 years)   | \$2,432,085                    | \$3,548,799                     |
| as % of 2011 Miami-Dade County Sales Tax Revenues   | 4.2%                           | 6.2%                            |
| Florida Sales Tax Revenue, 2011 <sup>(e)</sup>  | \$19,352,980,000               |                                 |
| Florida Sales Tax Rate <sup>(f)</sup>   | 6.0%                           | 6.0%                            |
| Florida Sales Tax Revenue Resulting from Units 6 & 7 Construction                               | \$175,110,098                  | \$255,513,526                   |
| Average per year (12 years)   | \$14,592,508                   | \$21,292,794                    |
| as % of 2011 Florida Sales Tax Revenues   | 0.08%                          | 0.11%                           |

- (a) Source: FPL Undated: FPL uses a 12-year period that encompasses licensing, pre-construction, and construction activities.  
(b) FPL Undated: Labor and services = 34% of construction costs; 67% would be from MDC providers, Therefore, 23% (67 percent x 34 percent) would generate sales tax.  
(c) Source: MDC 2012.  
(d) Source: FDOR 2012a.  
(e) Source: FDOR 2011.  
(f) Source: FDOR 2012b.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-14**  
**Potential Sales Tax Impacts, Miami-Dade County and Florida**

|   | <b>Miami-Dade<br/>County</b> | <b>Florida</b>   |
|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| Year 2011 — Actual Sales Tax Revenues <sup>(a)(b)</sup> | \$57,559,000                 | \$19,352,980,000 |
| 5% of total   | \$2,877,950                  | \$967,649,000    |
| 10% of total  | \$5,755,900                  | \$1,935,298,000  |
| 20% of total  | \$11,511,800                 | \$3,870,596,000  |
| Tax rate <sup>(c)(d)</sup>                              | 1.0%                         | 6.0%             |

- (a) Source: MDC 2012.
- (b) Source: FDOR 2011.
- (c) Source: FDOR 2012a.
- (d) Source: FDOR 2012b.



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-15**  
**Population Increases Related to In-migrating Workers, Miami-Dade County**  
**and the Homestead and Florida City Area, Construction Period**

| <b>Population Impacts, adjusted for In-migrants, ROI and Comparison Areas, Construction Period</b>  |            |
|---|------------|
| Population Increase during construction period (In-migrating construction and operations workers and families) <sup>(a)</sup> (Table 4.4-1) | 5,139      |
| Florida Population, 2005-2009 <sup>(b)</sup>  | 18,222,420 |
| Percentage increase from in-migrating workers and families  | 0.03%      |
| Miami-Dade Population, 2005-2009 <sup>(b)</sup> (Table 2.5-3)   | 2,457,044  |
| Percentage increase from in-migrating workers and families  | 0.21%      |
| Expected percentage of in-migrating persons expected to locate in Homestead and Florida City Area <sup>(a)</sup> (Table 4.4-1)              | 42.78%     |
| Expected number of in-migrating persons to locate in Homestead and Florida City Area  | 2,199      |
| Homestead and Florida City Area Population, 2005-2009 <sup>(b)</sup> (Table 2.5-3)  | 64,844     |
| Percentage increase from in-migrating workers and families  | 3.39%      |

(a) Source: Table 4.4-1.

(b) Source: USCB 2010a.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-16a**  
**FPL Tangible Personal Property Taxes for Turkey Point Plant, Miami-Dade County, School District, and Special Tax Districts, 2010**

| Taxing Entity  | TPP Taxes Paid by FPL | Percent of FPL Payments | Taxing Entity's Total Property Tax Revenue | FPL Payments as Percent of Taxing Entity's Total Property Tax Revenues |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Miami-Dade County School District <sup>(a)(b)</sup>    | \$6,594,526           | 40.3%                   | \$1,890,151,904                            | 0.35%  |
| Miami- Dade County <sup>(a)(c)</sup>                   | \$8,833,578           | 54.0%                   | \$976,737,000                              | 0.90%  |
| State and Others                                       |                       |                         |  |  |
| Florida Inland Navigation District <sup>(d)</sup>      | \$27,580              | 0.2%                    | \$23,948,384                               | 0.12%  |
| South Florida Water Management District <sup>(e)</sup> | \$427,377             | 2.6%                    | \$442,168,909                              | 0.10%  |
| Everglades Construction Project <sup>(f)</sup>         | \$71,469              | 0.4%                    | \$5,087,359                                | 1.40%  |
| Children's Trust Authority <sup>(g)</sup>              | \$399,717             | 2.4%                    | \$104,402,410                              | 0.38%  |
| Subtotal   | \$926,144             | 5.7%                    | \$575,607,062                              | 0.16%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$16,354,248</b>   | —                       | —  | —  |

(a) Source: [Table 2.5-19](#).

(b) Source: FDOE 2011 ([Table 2.5-19](#)). Revenues for Miami-Dade County School District includes all local funds and, thus, includes revenues other than property taxes.

(c) Source: MDC 2012.

(d) Source: FIND 2010.

(e) Source: SFWMD 2010.

(f) Source: SFWMD 2011.

(g) Source: TCT 2010.

Note: Values reflect taxes levied, FPL paid taxes prior to November 30, 2011 and secured a 4 percent reduction in taxes due.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-16b**  
**Existing Traffic Conditions (peak hour) for U.S. Highway 1 and Florida's Turnpike**

| <b>Roadway</b>     | <b>Existing Traffic</b> | <b>Capacity</b>      | <b>Reserved Trips</b> |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| U.S Highway 1      | 2,893                   | 4,068 <sup>(a)</sup> | 1,175                 |
| Florida's Turnpike | 3,967                   | 6,500 <sup>(b)</sup> | 2,533                 |

Source: Traf Tech 2009.

(a) The capacity of U.S. highway 1 was obtained from Miami-Dade County's Concurrency Management System.

(b) The capacity of Florida's Turnpike was obtained from FDOT's generalized tables.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-16c  
Construction PM Peak Link Analysis**

| Miami-Dade<br>County Traffic<br>Count Station | Location  | Previous Peak<br>Hour Available<br>Capacity <sup>(a)</sup> | Construction Trips<br>During Peak<br>Hour <sup>(b)</sup> | New Available Peak<br>Hour Capacity |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 9956  | SW 344th Street/Palm<br>Drive west of SW 137th<br>Avenue/Tallahassee Road           | 2,799  | 1,227  | 1,572                               |
| 9952  | SW 328th Street/North<br>Canal Drive west of SW<br>137th Avenue/Tallahassee<br>Road | 2,346  | 488  | 1,858                               |
| 9944  | Campbell Dr. E of Florida's<br>Turnpike   | 1,289  | 856  | 433                                 |

(a) See [Table 2.5-16](#).

(b) Traf Tech 2009, based on traffic patterns of existing workforce.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-16d**  
**Level of Service (LOS) Achieved at Affected Intersections During Peak Construction Period, with Improvements**

| Intersection   | LOS AM<br>Peak Travel<br>Hour | LOS PM<br>Peak Travel<br>Hour | Improvements  |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive /SW 137th Avenue/ Tallahassee Road | C                             | D                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signal or police control</li> <li>• One additional southbound left- turn lane</li> <li>• One additional westbound through lane</li> <li>• Two westbound right-turn lanes</li> </ul>  |
| SW 328th Street/North Canal Drive /SW 117th Avenue                   | C                             | D                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signal or police control</li> <li>• Two northbound left-turn lanes</li> <li>• One eastbound right-turn lane</li> <li>• Restripe eastbound through lane to a shared through/ right-turn lane</li> </ul>   |
| SW 344th Street/Palm Drive/ SW 137th Avenue/ Tallahassee Road (W)    | C                             | B                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signal or police control (pm only)</li> <li>• One separate eastbound through lane</li> <li>• One additional westbound left-turn lane</li> </ul>  |
| SW 344th Street/Palm Drive/ SW 137th Avenue/ Tallahassee Road (E)    | B                             | B                             | <p>This would be a new intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signal or police control (pm only)</li> <li>• Two eastbound right-turn lanes</li> <li>• Two northbound approach lanes (one as an exclusive left-turn lane and one as a shared left-turn/ right-turn lane)</li> </ul>   |
| SW 344th Street/Palm Drive/ SW 117th Avenue                          | C                             | C                             | <p>Signal or police control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One eastbound left-turn lane</li> <li>• One eastbound right-turn lane</li> <li>• One westbound right-turn lane</li> <li>• One northbound left-turn lane</li> <li>• Two northbound through lanes</li> <li>• One southbound left-turn lane</li> <li>• One southbound through lane</li> </ul> |
| SW 359 Street/ SW 117th Avenue                                       | C                             | D                             | <p>This would be a new intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signal or police control</li> <li>• Two eastbound approach lanes</li> <li>• One westbound through lane</li> <li>• One westbound right-turn lane</li> <li>• Two southbound approach lanes</li> </ul>  |

Source: Traf Tech 2009.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-17**  
**Public Water: Change in Use and Capacity with Population Increase and Construction**

| Major Suppliers   | Service Area Population, 2007 | 2007 Daily Average Demand (mgd) | Available Facility Capacity (mgd) <sup>(a)</sup> | Daily Demand as Percent of Capacity, 2007 | Adjusted Population during Construction | Daily Average Annual Demand with Adjusted Population (0.5139) and Onsite Use (0.8136) | Demand as Percent of Capacity during Construction | Total Percent Increase, Demand of Capacity, Current vs. Construction |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Public Water: Total ROI: Use and Capacity with Population Increase (5139) and Construction (8136)</b>                  |                               |                                 |  |   |   |   |   |  |
| Total Miami-Dade County ROI   | 2,621,700                     | 398.03                          | 532.55   | 74.74%                                    | 2,626,839                               | 399.36  | 74.99%  | 0.25%  |
| Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department (WASD) <sup>(a)(b)</sup>   | 2,250,944                     | 347.81                          | 470.35   | 73.95%                                    | 2,256,083                               | 349.14  | 74.23%  | 0.28%  |
| Florida City <sup>(c)</sup>   | 15,000                        | 2.33                            | 4.00   | —   | —                                       | —   | —   | —  |
| Homestead <sup>(c)</sup>  | 71,252                        | 12.47                           | 16.90  | —   | —                                       | —   | —   | —  |
| North Miami <sup>(c)</sup>  | 97,504                        | 8.50                            | 9.30   | —   | —                                       | —   | —   | —  |
| North Miami Beach <sup>(c)</sup>  | 187,000                       | 26.93                           | 32.00  | —   | —                                       | —   | —   | —  |
| <b>Public Water: Homestead and Florida City: Use and Capacity with Population Increase (2199) and Construction (8136)</b> |                               |                                 |  |   |   |   |   |  |
| Combined Homestead and Florida City   | 86,252                        | 14.79                           | 20.90  | 70.79%                                    | 88,451                                  | 15.83   | 75.73%  | 4.94%  |
| Florida City <sup>(c)</sup>   | 15,000                        | 2.33                            | 4.00   | —   | —                                       | —   | —   | —  |
| Homestead <sup>(c)</sup>  | 71,252                        | 12.47                           | 16.90  | —   | —                                       | —   | —   | —  |

(a) Includes 20 mgd for South Miami Heights water treatment plant scheduled to come online in 2012.

(b) Source: MDWASD 2008, Table 5-4.

(c) Source: SFWMD 2010a, Chapter 2.6 and footnote to Exhibit C-4.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-18  
Wastewater Capacity in the Miami-Dade County**

| <b>System Name (Facility ID#)</b>        | <b>Plant Capacity (MGD)</b> | <b>Annual Average Flow (MGD)<sup>(a)</sup></b> | <b>Current Flow as percent of Design Capacity</b> | <b>Flow as percent of Design Capacity during Peak Construction of Units 6 &amp; 7</b> | <b>Total Change in Percent of Capacity Used During Peak Construction of Units 6 &amp; 7</b> |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Total in Miami-Dade County               | 374                         | 298.62   | 79.85%  | 79.98%  | 0.14%   |
| City of Homestead (FLA013609)            | 6                           | 6.13   | 102.20%   | —   | —   |
| MDWASD South District WWTP (FL0042137)   | 112.5                       | 88.36  | 78.54%  | —   | —   |
| MDWASD North District WWTP (FL0032182)   | 112.5                       | 87.63  | 77.89%  | —   | —   |
| MDWASD Central District WWTP (FLA024805) | 143                         | 116.5  | 81.47%  | —   | —   |

(a) Average for running 12-month period.  
Source: MDWASD 2009

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.4-19**  
**Law Enforcement Needs, Adjusted for Workforce Related Increases in Population, Miami-Dade County and the Homestead/Florida City Area, Construction Period**

| Area                            | Population 2005-2009 <sup>(a)</sup> | Population adjusted for Workforce related Increases, Peak Construction <sup>(b)</sup> | Law Enforcement Officers (2010) <sup>(c)(d)</sup> | Ratio of Residents per Law Enforcement Officer 2005-2009 | Law Enforcement Officers Needed During peak Construction | Additional Law Enforcement Officers Needed |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Miami-Dade County               | 2,457,044                           | 2,462,183   | 2,980   | 825  | 2,986  | 6  |
| Homestead and Florida City Area | 64,844                              | 67,043  | 135   | 480  | 140  | 5  |

(a) Source: USCB 2010a.

(b) Source: [Table 4.4-15](#).

(c) Source: FBI 2010a and FBI 2010b ([Table 2.5-39](#)).

(d) Source: Miami-Dade County number of law enforcement officers excludes officers employed by municipalities within the county.

**Table 4.4-20**  
**Fire Protection Needs, Adjusted for Workforce Related Increases in Population, Miami-Dade County and the Homestead/Florida City Area, Construction Period**

| Area  | Population 2005-2009 <sup>(a)</sup> | Population Adjusted for Workforce Related Increase, Peak Construction <sup>(b)</sup> | Active Firefighters (2010) <sup>(c)</sup> | Ratio of Residents per Active Firefighters, Currently | Active Firefighters Needed During Peak Construction | Additional Active Firefighters Needed |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Miami-Dade County   | 2,457,044                           | 2,462,183  | 3,500                                     | 702   | 3,507   | 7                                     |
| Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue service area (includes Homestead and Florida City) <sup>(d)</sup> | 64,844                              | 67,043   | 2,070                                     | N/A   | N/A   | N/A                                   |

(a) Source: USCB 2010a.

(b) Source: [Table 4.4-15](#).

(c) Source: USFA 2010 ([Table 2.5-40](#)).


(d) The Homestead and Florida City area is served by the Miami-Dade Fire and Rescue Department; ratio of residents to firefighter is not available.

N/A — Not Available



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report


**Figure 4.4-1 Wage Impact by Year (Multiplier Applied)**



Source: Table 4.4-11.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
 COL Application  
 Part 3 — Environmental Report

Figure 4.4-2 Traffic Study of Construction Entrance



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.5 RADIATION EXPOSURE TO CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

During the construction of Units 6 & 7, workers would be exposed to several potential sources of radiation. This section identifies the potential sources of radiation and estimates the doses that workers would receive during the construction of Units 6 & 7 as a result of the operation of Units 3 & 4. In addition, with Unit 6 scheduled to be operational one year earlier than Unit 7, Unit 6 would be a source of radiation for Unit 7 construction workers during that year. Therefore, the dose contribution from Unit 6 sources of radiation is also evaluated.

Three types of sources are considered: liquid effluents, gaseous effluents, and direct radiation. [Subsection 4.5.1](#) presents the site layout. [Subsection 4.5.2](#) identifies the specific sources of each type while [Subsection 4.5.3](#) estimates the maximum annual doses to the individual worker as well as the entire workforce.

##### 4.5.1 SITE LAYOUT

The layout of the Units 6 & 7 plant area is shown in [Figure 2.1-1](#). For the purpose of calculating doses to construction workers, it was assumed that all Unit 7 construction activity would take place inside the Unit 7 power block area. More specifically, it was assumed that over the course of the year that Unit 7 workers would be exposed to radiation from Unit 6, the average location of the Unit 7 worker would be at the center of the Unit 7 reactor.

##### 4.5.2 RADIATION SOURCES

While the new units are being constructed, there would be a potential for construction workers to be exposed to liquid and gaseous effluents as well as direct radiation.

As described in [Subsection 3.3.2.3](#), potable water for Units 6 & 7 would be supplied from the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD). Therefore, the drinking water exposure pathway is not considered for the construction workers. Liquid effluents from Units 3 & 4 released into the industrial wastewater facility present a potential source of contamination for workers coming in contact with the wastewater or with soils that come in contact with the wastewater. However, these pathways would be managed to ensure that doses are negligible.

Sources of gaseous effluents at Units 3 & 4 include releases from gas decay tanks, containment purges, and incidental releases from plant operation. Based on the annual effluent reports from 2004 to 2008 (FPL 2004, FPL 2005, FPL 2006, FPL 2007a, FPL 2008), the composite maximum annual release is 35 Curies, primarily as a result of tritium, krypton, and xenon.

The primary sources of gaseous effluents from the operation of Unit 6 would be released from the gaseous radwaste system, the condenser air removal system, and building ventilation systems. The estimated annual isotopic activities in gaseous effluents from an AP1000 unit are shown in [DCD Table 11.3-3](#) (WEC 2011).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Sources of direct radiation at Units 3 & 4 include tanks, filters, and demineralizers associated with fuel and waste storage and handling. However, these components are stored within shielded buildings, rendering dose rates outside to very near background levels and therefore making them negligible (FPL 2007d). Liquid effluents from Units 3 & 4 are released into the industrial wastewater facility, which are a potential source of direct radiation. There is a plan to add an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) east of Units 3 & 4 at a distance of approximately 3000 feet from the Units 6 & 7 construction area. The impact of all sources of direct radiation is assessed in [Subsection 4.5.3.2](#).

Contained sources of radioactive material from Unit 6, including the refueling water storage tank, will be shielded such that the direct dose rate to Unit 7 is negligible (WEC 2011).

#### 4.5.3 CONSTRUCTION WORKER DOSES

Construction worker doses are estimated from the gaseous effluent and direct radiation pathways. It is assumed that workers are at the construction site for 40 hours per week for 52 weeks a year for an exposure time of 2080 hours per year.

##### 4.5.3.1 Gaseous Effluent Doses

The annual effluent reports for Units 3 & 4 show doses at the Turkey Point plant property boundary from gaseous effluents. Based on the reports from 2004 to 2008 (FPL 2004, FPL 2005, FPL 2006, FPL 2007a, FPL 2008), [Table 4.5-1](#) shows the maximum dose rates at the Turkey Point plant property boundary as a result of inhalation, ground deposition, and plume pathways. These dose rates are based on an atmospheric dispersion factor (X/Q) of  $5.8E-07 \text{ sec/m}^3$  (FPL 2007c), while the X/Q from the existing units to the Units 6 & 7 plant area is  $2.9E-06 \text{ sec/m}^3$  (FPL 2007c). Since dose is proportional to X/Q, the site boundary dose rates are multiplied by the X/Q ratio of 5.0 ( $2.9E-06$  divided by  $5.8E-07$ ) to estimate the dose rates in the construction area, as shown in [Table 4.5-1](#).

The NRC-endorsed GASPAR II computer program (PNL 1987) is used to calculate the doses to construction workers from Unit 6 gaseous effluents. This program implements the radiological exposure models described in RG 1.109, "Calculation of Annual Doses to Man from Routine Releases of Reactor Effluents for the Purpose of Evaluating Compliance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I," and RG 1.111, "Methods for Estimating Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion of Gaseous Effluents in Routine Releases from Light-Water-Cooled Reactors," to estimate the radioactivity releases in gaseous effluents and the subsequent doses. The following exposure pathways are considered in GASPAR II:

- External exposure to airborne plume
- External exposure to contamination deposited on ground

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

- Inhalation of airborne activity

The input parameters for the Unit 6 gaseous pathway are presented in [Table 4.5-2](#) and the resulting doses are shown in [Table 4.5-3](#).

The doses from Units 3 & 4 and Unit 6 are summed in [Table 4.5-4](#) to obtain the total gaseous effluent doses. This table also shows the total effective dose equivalent (TEDE), calculated by multiplying the thyroid dose by a weighting factor of 0.03 and adding the product to the total body dose (ICRP 1979). The table indicates that doses from Units 3 & 4 are negligible compared to those from new Unit 6. This is because the doses from Units 3 & 4 reflect realistic operational measurements while those from Unit 6 are based on conservative theoretical calculations.

#### 4.5.3.2 Direct Radiation Doses

Direct radiation measurements at the site indicate exposure rates that are consistent with those observed during the preoperational surveillance program (FPL 2007b). This is supported by an evaluation by the NRC of all existing light water reactors (LWRs), which concludes that: "...because the primary coolant of an LWR is contained in a heavily shielded area, dose rates in the vicinity of light water reactors are generally undetectable and are less than 1 mrem per year at the site boundary" (NUREG-1437, "Generic Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants," Section 4.6.1.2, 1996).

For conservatism, the dose rate in the Unit 7 construction area from Units 3 & 4 is assumed to be 1 mrem per year. Compared to this, the calculated dose rate of 0.009 mrem per year from a fully loaded ISFSI is negligible. When adjusted for an occupancy time of 2080 hours per year, the direct radiation dose from Units 3 & 4 is as follows:

$$(1 \text{ mrem/yr-unit})(2 \text{ units})(2080/8760) = 0.47 \text{ mrem}$$

As stated in [Subsection 4.5.2](#), the direct radiation dose from Unit 6 would be negligible.

#### 4.5.3.3 Total Doses

The doses to Unit 7 construction workers are summarized in [Table 4.5-5](#). As indicated in [Table 3.10-2](#), the peak workforce during any month that Unit 6 is operational and Unit 7 is under construction is no more than 2800 people. Although this peak is anticipated to last for less than a year, it is conservatively assumed that the peak is maintained over the course of an entire year for the purpose of calculating the maximum annual workforce dose.

Although construction workers would not need to be classified as radiation workers, [Table 4.5-6](#) shows that construction worker doses meet the occupational limits of 10 CFR 20.1201. [Tables 4.5-7](#) and [4.5-8](#) demonstrate that worker doses are also in compliance with the limits in 10 CFR 20.1301 and 40 CFR 190.10, respectively, for members of the public. [Table 4.5-9](#) shows

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

that the doses would not meet the design objectives of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I, for gaseous effluents if the construction area is considered to be an unrestricted area and the construction workers are considered to be members of the public. However, the construction area will not have unrestricted access by the public.

Units 3, 4, and 6 could be operational during the construction of Unit 7. The site would be monitored during the construction period, as described in [Section 6.2](#), and appropriate actions would be taken as necessary to ensure that doses to the construction workers are as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA).

Given that doses to the Unit 7 construction workers meet the public dose criteria of 10 CFR Part 20 and 40 CFR Part 190, it is concluded that the radiological impact on construction workers would be SMALL and no additional mitigation is required.

#### **Section 4.5 References**

FPL 2004. *Annual Radioactive Effluent Report*, January 2004 through December 2004, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

FPL 2005. *Annual Radioactive Effluent Report*, January 2005 through December 2005, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

FPL 2006. *Annual Radioactive Effluent Report*, January 2006 through December 2006, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

FPL 2007a. *Annual Radioactive Effluent Report*, January 2007 through December 2007, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

FPL 2007b. *2007 Annual Radiological Environmental Operating Report*, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

FPL 2007c. *Offsite Dose Calculation Manual for Gaseous and Liquid Effluents from the Turkey Point Plant Units 3 and 4*, Revision 14.

FPL 2007d. *Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 Updated FSAR*, Revision 16.

FPL 2008. *Annual Radioactive Effluent Report*, January 2008 through December 2008, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

ICRP 1979. International Council on Radiological Protection, Limits for Intakes or Radionuclides by Workers, Publication 30, Part 1, 1979.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

PNL 1987. Pacific Northwest Laboratory, *GASPAR II — Technical Reference and User Guide*, NUREG/CR-4653, April 1987.

WEC 2011. Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC, *AP1000 Design Control Document*, Document No. APP-GW-GL-700, Tier 2 Material, Rev 19, June 2011.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.5-1**  
**Units 6 & 7 Construction Area Dose Rates from Units 3 & 4 Gaseous Effluents**

| Organ      | Dose Rate (mrem/yr)          |        |        |                                  |
|------------|------------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------------|
|            | Site Boundary <sup>(a)</sup> |        |        | Construction Area <sup>(b)</sup> |
|            | Unit 3                       | Unit 4 | Total  |                                  |
| Total Body | 9.3E-4                       | 9.2E-4 | 1.9E-3 | 9.3E-3                           |
| Thyroid    | 9.4E-4                       | 9.3E-4 | 1.9E-3 | 9.3E-3                           |
| Skin       | 1.4E-3                       | 1.3E-3 | 2.6E-3 | 1.3E-2                           |

(a) Bounding values from 5 years of effluent reports (FPL 2004, FPL 2005, FPL 2006, FPL 2007a, FPL 2008)

(b) Site boundary total dose rate adjusted for construction area atmospheric dispersion factor (FPL 2007c)

**Table 4.5-2**  
**Unit 6 Gaseous Effluent Pathway Parameters**

| Parameter                                     | Value   | Basis/Source(s)   |
|---|---|---|
| Release Source Terms                          | See AP1000 DCD <sup>(a)</sup><br>Table 11.3-3 | The DCD table shows the activity releases by isotope.   |
| Atmospheric Dispersion and Deposition Factors | See Table 2.7-16                              | Table 2.7-16 shows the dispersion and deposition data at Unit 7 for releases from Unit 6, based on the centerline distance between the two reactors. This represents the average distance from the Unit 6 release point to the construction worker over the course of a year. |
| Worker Breathing Rates                        | 8000 m <sup>3</sup> /yr                       | This is the maximum adult breathing rate from RG 1.109, Table E-5.  |

(a) Source: WEC 2011

**Table 4.5-3**  
**Unit 7 Construction Area Dose Rates from Unit 6 Gaseous Effluents**

| Pathway    | Dose Rate (mrem/yr) |         |      |
|------------|---------------------|---------|------|
|            | Total Body          | Thyroid | Skin |
| Plume      | 12                  | 12      | 60   |
| Ground     | 8.7                 | 8.7     | 10   |
| Inhalation | 1.3                 | 13      | 1.3  |
| Total      | 22                  | 33      | 72   |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.5-4  
Gaseous Effluent Doses to Unit 7 Construction Workers**

| Source                     | Annual Dose (mrem) |         |        |                     |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|---------------------|
|                            | Total Body         | Thyroid | Skin   | TEDE <sup>(c)</sup> |
| Units 3 & 4 <sup>(a)</sup> | 0.0022             | 0.0022  | 0.0031 | 0.0023              |
| Unit 6 <sup>(b)</sup>      | 5.2                | 7.9     | 17     | 5.5                 |
| Total                      | 5.2                | 7.9     | 17     | 5.5                 |

- (a) Construction area dose rates from [Table 4.5-1](#) are adjusted for occupancy of 2080 hr/yr.  
 (b) Construction area dose rates from [Table 4.5-3](#) are adjusted for occupancy of 2080 hr/yr.  
 (c) TEDE – Total effective dose equivalent calculated by multiplying the thyroid dose by 0.03 and adding it to total body dose.

**Table 4.5-5  
Total Doses to Unit 7 Construction Workers**

| Pathway   | Annual Worker Dose (mrem) <sup>(a)</sup> |         |      |                     |
|---|--|---------|------|---------------------|
|   | Total Body                               | Thyroid | Skin | TEDE <sup>(b)</sup> |
| Direct Radiation                                  | 0.47                                     | 0.47    | 0    | 0.47                |
| Gaseous Effluents                                 | 5.2                                      | 7.9     | 17   | 5.5                 |
| Total   | 5.7                                      | 8.4     | 17   | 6.0                 |
| Annual Workforce Dose (person-rem) <sup>(c)</sup> |  |         |      |                     |
| Total   | 16                                       | 23      | 48   | 17                  |

- (a) Doses from [Subsection 4.5.3.2](#) and [Table 4.5-4](#) are added  
 (b) TEDE — Total effective dose equivalent  
 (c) Workforce dose is the product of worker dose and 2800 workers

**Table 4.5-6  
Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 10 CFR 20.1201  
Criteria for Occupational Doses**

| Organ                            | Annual Dose (rem) |       |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------|
|                                  | Worker            | Limit |
| TEDE <sup>(a)</sup>              | 0.0060            | 5     |
| Organ other than lens of the eye | 0.0084            | 50    |
| Lens of the eye <sup>(b)</sup>   | —                 | 15    |
| Skin                             | 0.017             | 50    |

- (a) TEDE - Total effective dose equivalent  
 (b) Dose to the lens of the eye is not available.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.5-7**  
**Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 10 CFR 20.1301**  
**Criteria for Members of the Public**

| Criteria  | Worker | Limit |
|---|--------|-------|
| Annual Dose (mrem TEDE) <sup>(a)</sup>                  | 6.0    | 100   |
| Unrestricted area dose rate <sup>(b)</sup><br>(mrem/hr) | 0.0029 | 2     |

(a) TEDE — Total effective dose equivalent

(b) Dose rate is obtained by dividing the dose by the occupancy time of 2080 hr/yr

**Table 4.5-8**  
**Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 40 CFR 190.10**  
**Criteria for Members of the Public**

| Organ              | Annual Dose<br>(mrem) |       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
|                    | Worker                | Limit |
| Total Body         | 5.7                   | 25    |
| Thyroid            | 8.4                   | 75    |
| Other Organ — Skin | 17                    | 25    |

**Table 4.5-9**  
**Comparison of Construction Worker Doses with 10 CFR Part 50,**  
**Appendix I Criteria for Individuals in an Unrestricted Area**

| Criteria  | Annual Dose<br>(mrem) |       |
|---|-----------------------|-------|
|   | Worker                | Limit |
| Whole body dose from liquid effluents   | 0                     | 3     |
| Organ dose from liquid effluents  | 0                     | 10    |
| Whole body dose from gaseous effluents  | 5.2                   | 5     |
| Skin dose from gaseous effluents  | 17                    | 15    |
| Organ dose from radioactive iodine and radioactive material in<br>particulate form from gaseous effluents | 8.4                   | 15    |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.6 MEASURES AND CONTROLS TO LIMIT ADVERSE IMPACTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

Sections 4.1 through 4.5 and 4.8 describe potential environmental impacts that could result from construction of Units 6 & 7. In accordance with NUREG-1555, potential adverse environmental impacts from construction activities are identified and addressed in this section, as well as the specific measures and controls to limit those adverse impacts. Some examples of measures and controls to limit such adverse environmental impacts are:

- Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal ordinances, laws, and regulations intended to avoid and minimize the adverse environmental effects of construction activities on air, water and land, workers, and the public.
- Compliance with existing permits and licenses for the existing Turkey Point units.
- Compliance with existing Turkey Point procedures and processes applicable to construction projects.
- Incorporation of environmental requirements of permits in construction contracts.

Table 4.6-1 summarizes the environmental impacts and corresponding measures and controls presented in Sections 4.1 through 4.5 and 4.8 along with the significance of potential impact. The significance of impact (SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE) was determined by evaluating the potential effects after any controls or mitigation measures had been implemented. The significance levels used in the evaluation were developed using Council on Environmental Quality guidance, 40 CFR 1508.27, and those identified in 10 CFR 51, and in NUREG-1555. These standards establish three significance levels for characterizing environmental impacts: SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. The definitions of the significance levels are as follows:

- SMALL – Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.
- MODERATE – Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.
- LARGE – Environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

In addition to the cumulative impacts attributable to the construction of the entire Units 6 & 7 facility that are summarized in Table 4.6-1, a breakdown or separation of “construction” and “preconstruction” environmental impacts has been estimated in Table 4.6-2 for the purpose of

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

assessing impacts attributable specifically to construction activities as defined in 10 CFR 50.10(a)(1).

**Table 4.6-2** provides estimates of the percentage of impacts attributable to “construction” and to “preconstruction,” as well as a summary of the basis for the estimates. The estimated construction related impacts presented in the table were based primarily on two factors, namely the area associated with the construction of SSCs and the labor hours associated with the construction of SSCs. Information related to these two factors is provided as follows:

- **Construction Area** — The total area that would be developed for Units 6 & 7 is estimated to be approximately 600 acres, exclusive of electric transmission lines. Of these developed areas, approximately 30 acres would be developed for the Units 6 & 7 powerblock (equated with the SSCs). The area that would be developed for the construction of SSCs, therefore, represents approximately 5 percent of the total area that would ultimately be developed (excluding electric transmission lines). Because this estimate does not include electric transmission lines, it is conservative. For the purposes of this assessment, the impacted area associated with SSCs is less than 5 percent.
- **Labor Hours** — Based on preliminary construction estimates for all phases of development for Units 6 & 7, the estimated labor hours associated with the construction of SSCs is approximately 36 percent of the total labor hours associated with the development of the entire project. For the purpose of this assessment, the labor hours associated with SSC construction is less than 35 percent.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 1 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact   | Description of Potential Impact   | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program   |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>4.1 Land-Use Impacts</b>                    |   |                                       |   |
| 4.1.1 The Site and Vicinity                    | Potential impacts from ground-disturbing activities including clearing, grubbing, grading, excavating, backfilling, and stockpiling soils on previously disturbed land  | S                                     | Site preparation and construction activities would be conducted in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Environmental controls such as storm water management systems, erosion control, fugitive dust control, and spill containment controls would be implemented. Construction practices including controlled plant access for personnel and vehicular traffic, and restriction of construction activities to specified areas to minimize impacts.   |
| 4.1.2 Transmission Corridors and Offsite Areas | Potential impacts from constructing new transmission lines in both existing and new corridors (land disturbance includes the loss of some wetland acreage)  | S                                     | Restrictive land-clearing processes, in forested wetland areas for right-of-way clearing and preparation would be used. Turbidity screens and erosion control devices in areas of wetlands and water resources for access road/structure pad construction would be used. Existing access roads for ingress and egress to rights-of-way would be used where available. Standard industry construction practices would be used for the transmission line construction, including use of existing right-of-way, to the extent practicable, and environmental management, including such things as erosion control devices, matting to reduce compaction caused by equipment, use of wide-track vehicles when crossing wetlands, and restoration activities after construction. |
|  | Potential impacts from permanently disturbing agricultural land to meet borrow material requirements (using FPL-owned property for borrow material would permanently disturb approximately 300 acres of land classified as agricultural land) | S                                     | This land disturbance represents a small portion of the available agricultural land in the surrounding area, thus no mitigation would be required.  |
|  | Potential impacts from disturbing offsite land to install reclaimed water pipelines along both existing and new rights-of-way   | S                                     | Clearing of new and/or expansion of existing rights-of-way would include use of environmental best management practices such as those controls listed in <b>Subsection 4.1.1</b> to minimize impacts to sensitive habitats. Existing rights-of-way and work within previously impacted areas (e.g., road) to the extent practicable would also minimize impacts from land disturbance.  |
|  | Potential impacts from disturbing offsite land to expand substations  | S                                     | Stormwater retention systems would be installed for expansions.   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 2 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact   | Description of Potential Impact  | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program   |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| 4.1.2<br>Transmission<br>Corridors and<br>Offsite Areas<br>(cont.) | Potential impacts from access road improvements  | S                                     | Access road improvements would include the following installation of silt fences, shoulders would be appropriately sloped, and surface water runoff would be managed with the installation of swales and culverts at suitable locations.  |
| 4.1.3 Historic<br>Properties                                       | Potential impacts from constructing on previously disturbed land   | S                                     | Work plans have been prepared for onsite and offsite areas and contain recommendations for development of an Unanticipated Finds Plan and a Contractor Training Program.  |
| <b>4.2 Water-Related Impacts</b>                                   |  |                                       |   |
| 4.2.1 Hydrology<br>Alterations                                     | Potential impacts from hydrological alterations onsite including excavation, filling, creation of reservoir, and elevating land surface                            | S                                     | Alterations would be limited by the presence of the industrial wastewater facility and the berm to the east of the return canal, and, therefore, would not result in impacts to down stream surface water bodies or resources.  |
| 4.2.2 Water Use<br>Impacts and<br>4.2.3 Water<br>Quality           | Potential impacts from the alteration of groundwater flow beneath Units 6 & 7 construction site due to placement of engineering fill, filling of 2 remnant canals, | S                                     | A slurry diaphragm wall would be installed to a depth of approximately –65 ft NAVD around the power blocks during dewatering and excavating subsurface materials. The impacts would be limited to the vicinity of the slurry wall. The use of the slurry wall would allow dewatering of the power block areas with minimal impacts to groundwater directly outside of the slurry wall. No mitigation would be required.   |
|  | Potential impacts from hydrological alterations due to offsite construction of transmission lines, reclaimed water pipelines, and potable water pipeline           | S                                     | Construction activities would comply with federal and state regulations to site and construct the transmission lines and pipelines. Environmental best management practices would be used (including use of existing rights-of-way to the extent practicable, erosion control devices, matting to reduce compaction and restoration activities after construction). A storm water pollution prevention plan would be developed (SWPPP) for the construction activities or work would be performed under existing permits/plans.   |
|  | Potential impacts from erosion from borrow area and establishment of spoils areas  | S                                     | Onsite: Berms would be installed to direct runoff to industrial wastewater treatment system.<br>Offsite: A perimeter berm could be used to restrict the flow of surface water onto the property. The berm could also be used in association with detention basins and a truck wash facility to reduce surface water runoff from the site and prevent soils from being unintentionally spread to offsite areas. Drainage ditches could be used to direct surface water flow away from the site and could be reconnected to any drainage features that once flowed through the property to maintain surface flow. |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 3 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact  | Description of Potential Impact   | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program  |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 4.2.1 Hydrology Alterations<br>4.2.2 Water Use Impacts and<br>4.2.3 Water Quality (cont.) | Potential impacts from enlargement of equipment barge unloading area would introduce sediment   | S                                     | Curtain wall technology would be used to isolate the affected area from the waters of the Biscayne National Park. The modification would be performed using cutoff wall technology (sheet piles) to isolate the equipment barge unloading area from the turning basin. Activities would be performed under a permit issued by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers.   |
|   | Potential impacts from hydrological alterations to surface water flow and filling to raise elevation due to construction of roads and bridges | S                                     | Existing roads would be used to the extent practicable. Ditches and the use of culverts would allow stormwater drainage to be maintained along the road route. During onsite construction, stormwater runoff would be directed to retention basins before being discharged to the industrial wastewater facility. Should modification to the existing draining ditches or drainage features be required, the impacts would be temporary and the disturbed areas would be returned to preconstruction conditions. All work would be performed in accordance with site-obtained permits. During offsite construction, surface water would be routed to areas that could accept the additional surface flow that would then alter the flow in the vicinity of the road. |
|   | Potential impacts from excavation dewatering could impact surface water, groundwater, and wetlands  | S                                     | Cutoff wall technology including the use of a slurry wall could be used to limit potential impacts during construction dewatering activities. The water from dewatering activities would be discharged into the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility.  |
|   | Potential impacts from the installation of radial collector wells   | S                                     | The construction activities would be performed in accordance with the required local, state, and federal guidelines and accepted industry practices. The necessary permits would be obtained before beginning construction activities. The delivery pipeline routes would be recontoured afterward. Excavated material would be stockpiled in designated spoils areas. Sedimentation barriers would be installed to limit potential impacts to surface water bodies. Sedimentation basins would also be used to minimize the potential for surface water runoff impacts to nearby water bodies in accordance with FDEP regulations. Once construction activities are complete, the drainage would be restored to preconstruction conditions.                         |
|   | Potential impacts from the installation of radial collector wells could alter groundwater flow primarily as a result of dewatering            | S                                     | Sheet piles could be used to limit potential impacts during construction dewatering activities. Water from dewatering activities would be added to the industrial wastewater facility.   |
|   | Potential impacts from the installation and use of deep injection wells   | S                                     | The deep injection wells and the required monitoring wells would be installed in accordance with an FDEP injection well permit and any local permit requirements. During the construction of the deep injection wells and associated equipment, any surface water runoff would be directed to the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility.  |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 4 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact  | Description of Potential Impact  | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup>             | Planned Control Program   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 4.2.1 Hydrology Alterations<br>4.2.2 Water Use Impacts and<br>4.2.3 Water Quality (cont.) | Potential impacts associated with accidental spills which could adversely impact surface waters and groundwater  | S   | The necessary construction activities would be performed under a new SWPPP or under a modification of an existing Turkey Point SWPPP and associated spill prevention plan that could include oil and fuel containment. Any minor spills of diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, lubricants, or other construction-related pollutants during construction of the project would be cleaned up quickly to prevent them from moving into the groundwater or flowing to a nearby surface water.   |
| <b>4.3 Ecological Impacts</b>   |  |   |   |
| 4.3.1 Terrestrial Ecosystems  | Potential impacts from construction activities could reduce the regional diversity of plants or plant communities                                      | S   | Threatened species would be avoided to the maximum extent practical.  |
|   | Potential impacts to nesting crocodiles and listed species could be disturbed by construction activities   | M: American crocodiles<br>S: other listed species | A project-specific management plan for crocodiles and other listed species has been created for this construction activity. Mitigation measures may include warning signs and education material (for construction personnel) as to the presence and status of crocodiles and restrictions of nocturnal activities. Traffic access at the north end of the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility may pose a threat to crocodiles crossing this road and would be mitigated by installation of a wildlife corridor to provide pathways for crocodiles to travel between wetlands on either side of this road. Construction of transmission facilities within the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility may avoid known crocodile nests and be conducted between nesting seasons. |
|   | Potential impacts from equipment barge unloading area enlargement activities, increased barge traffic, and dredging, if needed, could disturb manatees | S   | A management plan for in-water activities to minimize potential impacts to manatees would be implemented. This plan would include use of observers to spot manatees during in-water activities and reduction of in-water activities if manatees were observed within the basin.   |
|   | Potential impacts to wetland habitat   | M   | Impacts to wetlands would be mitigated by active mitigation (e.g., installation of culverts under existing road beds to allow sheet flow of water), “land swapping”, and/or purchase of wetland credits from the Everglades Mitigation Bank or other regional mitigation opportunities.   |
|   | Potential impacts from construction noise and vibration could displace some wildlife   | S   | Measures to reduce noise and vibration levels during construction may include staggering work activities, and use of noise dampeners and noise control equipment on vehicles and equipment.   |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 5 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact                               | Description of Potential Impact   | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 4.3.1 Terrestrial Ecosystems (cont.) | Potential impacts from new tall structures and the use of cranes could lead to avian collisions   | S                                     | No mitigation measures would be required.  |
|                                      | Potential impacts from light pollution during facility construction and operation can alter behavior of birds and bats  | S                                     | To the extent practicable, unnecessary lights would be turned off at night, lights turned downward or hooded directing light downward, and lower-powered lights used during construction to minimize impacts on wildlife.  |
|                                      | Potential impacts from the construction of new transmission corridors (Wood storks have nested in four colonies near Everglades National Park and the proposed transmission corridors. The transmission corridors are located in the core foraging area of nine wood stork colonies.) | S                                     | Impacts to wetlands within the core foraging area would be mitigated as prescribed by regulatory agencies. To mitigate the potential for collisions or electrocutions, avian friendly design standards would be used as provided for in the Avian Protection Plan.   |
| 4.3.2 Aquatic Ecosystems             | Potential impacts from accidental spills associated with construction activity could adversely impact surface waters and aquatic ecosystems   | S                                     | Spill prevention techniques would include locating storage areas for petroleum products at a safe distance from surface waters. Any spills of diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, or lubricants during construction would be cleaned up to prevent spilled fuel or oil from impacting aquatic resources. A Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan would be implemented in accordance with EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 112). Spills would be attended to and not allowed to flow to nearby surface water. |
|                                      | Potential impacts associated with the enlargement of the equipment barge unloading area and facilities and dredging, if needed, would temporarily increase suspended sediments and disturb the immediate area   | S                                     | The modification would be performed using cutoff wall technology (sheet piles) to isolate the equipment barge unloading area from the turning basin. Dredging, if necessary, will conform to guidance provided by the Army Corp of Engineers and dredging permit conditions.   |
|                                      | Potential impacts from the construction of radial collector wells and supporting infrastructure could impact red mangroves and subsequently the mangrove rivulus, a state and federal species of special concern.   | S                                     | Construction activities would be controlled so as to minimize any impacts to red mangroves or mangrove rivulus.  |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 6 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact                            | Description of Potential Impact  | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>4.4 Socioeconomic Impacts</b>  |  |                                       |  |
| 4.4.1 Physical Impacts            | Potential impacts associated with noise during construction activities   | S                                     | Noise surveys indicate that noise generated from construction activities would be attenuated by distance from the source and, therefore, would not significantly affect offsite areas. Thus, no mitigation would be required.  |
|                                   | Potential impacts from fugitive dust and fine particulate matter emissions   | S                                     | Specific mitigation measures such as stabilizing construction roads and unsuitable spoils piles, limiting speeds on unpaved construction roads, using water for dust control, covering haul trucks, and revegetating road medians and slopes would be implemented in a dust control plan.  |
|                                   | Potential impacts from emissions from construction activities  | S                                     | Phase construction to minimize daily emissions. Perform proper maintenance of construction vehicles to maximize efficiency and minimize emissions.   |
|                                   | Potential impacts from Greenhouse Gas emissions from construction activities   | S                                     | Phase construction to minimize daily emissions. Perform proper maintenance of construction vehicles to maximize efficiency and minimize emissions.   |
|                                   | Potential aesthetic impacts from the construction of transmission corridors  | M                                     | Impacts to the natural and built environment would be minimized to the extent feasible through the selection process (i.e., to the extent practicable follow existing corridors), engineering options, and construction techniques used.   |
|                                   | Potential impacts from the delivery of construction materials and from workers commuting to the site that would increase peak hourly traffic on area roads             | M                                     | A new entrance and access roads would be constructed to access Units 6 & 7 and existing roads would be improved.   |
| 4.4.2 Social and Economic Impacts | Potential impacts from the increase in population due to in-migration of peak workers during construction  | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                     | No mitigation would be required.   |
|                                   | Potential impacts from the loss of construction jobs, population, wage income, and income due to the out-migrating construction workforce as construction is completed | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S-M                   | Out-migration would occur gradually over the last few years of the construction phase, and the loss of construction workers would be partially offset by the higher-income incoming operations workers. Timely communication would be maintained with municipal and county government authorities and nongovernmental organizations to disseminate project information that could have socioeconomic impacts in the community. Timely information would be provided to the local media, enabling businesses and individuals to make informed decisions and economic choices. |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 7 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact                                    | Description of Potential Impact   | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup>   | Planned Control Program   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.4.2 Social and Economic Impacts (cont.) | Potential impacts from indirect jobs reducing the unemployment in the region of interest  | S, positive                             | The assumption is that all indirect jobs would be filled by people currently residing within the region of interest. No mitigation would be required.   |
|   | Potential impacts from workers' wages on the local economy  | MDC: S, positive<br>H&FC: S, positive   | No mitigation would be required.  |
|   | Potential impacts from the collection of taxes during the construction period of Turkey Point Units 6 & 7                           | MDC: S, positive<br>H&FC: S-M, positive | No mitigation would be required.  |
|   | Potential impacts from new residential or commercial development  | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                       | Communication would be maintained with local and regional governmental and nongovernmental organizations, including but not limited to the Department of Planning and Zoning and Department of Community and Economic Development, to disseminate project information in a timely manner. This would allow these organizations to be given the opportunity to plan accordingly. |
|   | Potential impacts from increased traffic on roads due to deliveries of fill and construction materials to Units 6 & 7               | S                                       | Fill deliveries would not coincide with the peak commuting hour and construction materials deliveries would be made throughout the day and not be concentrated during the peak hour of travel.  |
|   | Potential impacts from increased traffic on the roads in the vicinity as a result of construction workers                           | MDC: S<br>H&FC: M                       | A new entrance and access roads with three lanes would be constructed. Existing roads would be widened and turning lanes added.   |
|   | Potential impacts from increased traffic on roads in the vicinity as a result of outage workers                                     | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                       | Impacts are small and temporary. The refueling schedule for Unit 6 would occur after the peak construction period.  |
|   | Potential aesthetic impacts from onsite construction structures, and noise and vehicle exhaust impacts from construction activities | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                       | No mitigation would be required.  |
|   | Potential impacts from the increased use of recreational facilities due to the increase in population                               | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                       | No mitigation would be required.  |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 8 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact                                    | Description of Potential Impact   | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program  |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 4.4.2 Social and Economic Impacts (cont.) | Potential impacts from the decrease in available housing due to the population increase associated with construction  | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                     | The current housing inventory is sufficient to accommodate 100 percent of the in-migrating workforce.  |
|   | Potential impacts from the additional water demand due to in-migrating workers  | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                     | The increased demand from the estimated increase in population as a result of the construction-related workforce would not exceed the available capacity of the municipal water supplies. Communication would be maintained with local and regional governmental planning organizations such as the Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning, the Miami-Dade Water & Sewer Department (MDWASD), and South Florida Water Management District. Information could be shared such as project activity scheduling, and projected workforce in-migration, thereby giving the organizations time to prepare for demands on services.   |
|   | Potential impacts from additional wastewater requiring treatment due to in-migrating workers' water usage             | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                     | The increased demand from the estimated increase in population as a result of the construction-related workforce would not exceed the available capacity of the Homestead WWTF and the MDWASD South District Wastewater Treatment Plant. Early communication would be maintained with local and regional governmental organizations, including planning commissions and local and regional economic development agencies, such as the Miami-Dade Planning and Zoning Department, to disseminate construction-related information in a timely manner. Local governments and planning groups would have time to plan for the influx. Infrastructure upgrades and expansions could be funded, at least in part, by construction-related property and sales use tax payments.  |
|   | Potential impacts from the increase in the residents-per-law enforcement officer and residents-per-firefighter ratios | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                     | Increased property and sales/use tax revenues generated during construction could be used to fund additional law enforcement officers and firefighters. However, expanding fire suppression services, including the hiring of additional personnel, would likely begin before a sufficient amount of these tax revenues would be available to local governments. Therefore, local governments could access other funding sources or issue bonds until the tax revenues would become available. Also, the peak construction workforce would not be in place until month 42 of construction activities, giving local governments time to plan and budget accordingly. Additionally, communication would be held regularly with local and regional governmental officials about the proposed Units 6 & 7 construction and its schedules, allowing local and regional officials ample opportunity to plan for the population influx. |
|   | Potential impacts from the increased demand for medical services  | S                                     | No mitigation would be required.   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-1 (Sheet 9 of 9)**  
**Summary of Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts during Construction**

| Impact  | Description of Potential Impact   | Significance of Impact <sup>(a)</sup> | Planned Control Program   |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| 4.4.2 Social and Economic Impacts (cont.)             | Potential impacts from increased student enrollment in public schools   | MDC: S<br>H&FC: S                     | The peak workforce during construction would not be reached sooner than the third year of construction, giving the school district a few years to make accommodations for the additional students. Schools could install modular classrooms, and recruit additional teachers, as the school population would increase between the start of construction activities and the peak of construction in 2019. Local communities would be provided with timely information regarding the proposed activities at Units 6 & 7, giving the school district several years to make accommodations for the additional influx of students. |
| 4.4.3 Environmental Justice                           | Potential for disproportionately high adverse impacts to low-income and minority populations  | Not applicable                        | No mitigation would be required.  |
| <b>4.5 Radiation Exposure to Construction Workers</b> |   |                                       |   |
| 4.5 Radiation Exposure to Construction Workers        | Potential radiation exposure to Unit 6 & 7 construction workers due to the operation of Units 3 & 4 and from Unit 6 after it becomes operational. Estimated dose would be within public dose criteria of 10 CFR 20 and 40 CFR 190 | S                                     | The plant area would be monitored during the construction period, and appropriate actions would be taken as necessary to ensure the doses to the construction workers are as low as is reasonably achievable.   |
| <b>4.8 Nonradiological Health Impacts</b>             |   |                                       |   |
| 4.8.2 Occupational Health                             | Potential for occupational injuries or illnesses due to construction activities   | (b)                                   | (b)   |

(a) The assigned significance levels [(S)mall, (M)oderate, or (L)arge] are based on the assumption that for each impact, the associated proposed mitigation measures and controls (or equivalents) would be implemented (10 CFR 51, Appendix B, Table B-1, Footnote 3).

(b) Impact is potential and estimates are based on national and Florida rates; therefore, impact severity and potential mitigation measures are not assigned.

FDEP = Florida Department of Environmental Protection

H&FC = Homestead and Florida City (area)

MDC = Miami-Dade County

SWPPP = Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 1 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section  | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.1 Land-Use Impacts</b>                           |   |   |              |   |
| 4.1.1 The Site and Vicinity                           | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Impact caused by preparation of site for construction (e.g., clearing, grubbing) and, by definition, is not construction                                      |
| <b>4.1.2 Transmission Corridors and Offsite Areas</b> |   |   |              |   |
| 4.1.2.1 Proposed Transmission Corridors               | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction   |
| 4.1.2.2 Offsite Substations                           | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction  |
| 4.1.2.3 Fill Borrow Areas                             | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction  |
| 4.1.2.4 Makeup Water Systems                          | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction  |
| 4.1.2.5 Access Roadways                               | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction  |
| <b>4.1.3 Historic Properties</b>                      |   |   |              |   |
| 4.1.3.1 Onsite Facilities and Construction Areas      | S   | S (5)   | S (95)       | View offsite limited to large structures located in powerblock area. Preconstruction includes cranes erection and use. Construction work assembles buildings. |
| 4.1.3.2 Offsite Transmission Line Corridors           | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction   |
| 4.1.3.3 Other offsite areas                           | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Service facilities not included in definition of construction   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 2 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section   | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|
|  |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.2 Water-Related Impacts</b>   |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.2.1.1.1 Construction and Laydown Areas</b>  |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| <b>4.2.1.1.2 Spoils Area Establishment</b>   |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| <b>4.2.1.1.3 Access Roads, Heavy Haul Road, Bridges, and Equipment Barge Unloading Area Improvements</b> |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| <b>4.2.1.1.4 Security Facilities</b>   |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| <b>4.2.1.1.5 Construction Utilities</b>  |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 3 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section   | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|
|  |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.2.1.1.6 Construction Facilities and Preparation Activities</b>  |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| <b>4.2.1.1.7 Constructing FPL Reclaimed Water Treatment Facility</b> |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| <b>4.2.1.1.8 Constructing Radial Collector Wells</b>                 |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| <b>4.2.1.1.9 Deep Injection Wells</b>                                |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| <b>4.2.1.1.10 Onsite Connector Transmission Corridors</b>            |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |
| Groundwater  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                                    |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 4 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section                                 | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|
|  |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.2.1.1.11 Potable Water Pipelines</b>  |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water                              | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                  |
| Groundwater                                | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                  |
| <b>4.2.1.2 Offsite Facilities</b>          |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.2.1.2.1 Borrow Areas</b>              |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water                              | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction          |
| Groundwater                                | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction          |
| <b>4.2.1.2.2 Transmission Corridors</b>    | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction |
| <b>4.2.1.2.3 Reclaimed Water Pipelines</b> |   |   |              |   |
| Pipeline – Surface Water                   | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction          |
| Pipeline – Groundwater                     | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction          |
| Treatment Facility – Surface Water         | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                  |
| Treatment Facility – Groundwater           | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Disturbance area located outside powerblock area                  |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 5 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section                              | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.2.1.2.4 Offsite Roads</b>          |   |   |              |   |
| Surface Water                           | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| Groundwater                             | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| <b>4.2.1.2.5 Potable Water Pipeline</b> | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| <b>4.2.2 Water Use Impacts</b>          |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.2.2.1 Surface Water</b>            | None  | None  | None         | Analysis concludes no impacts because no use  |
| <b>4.2.2.2 Groundwater</b>              |   |   |              |   |
| 4.2.2.2.1 Onsite Areas                  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| 4.2.2.2.2 Offsite Areas                 | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| <b>4.2.3 Water-Quality Impacts</b>      |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.2.3.1 Surface Water</b>            |   |   |              |   |
| Onsite Areas                            | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| Offsite Areas                           | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| <b>4.2.3.1 Groundwater</b>              |   |   |              |   |
| 4.2.3.2.1 Onsite Areas                  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| 4.2.3.2.2 Offsite Areas                 | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 6 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section  | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.3 Ecological Impacts</b>   |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.3.1 Terrestrial Ecosystems</b>   |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.3.1.1 Potential Impacts to the Units 6 &amp; 7 Site and other Onsite Areas</b> |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.3.1.1.1 Plants and Plant Communities</b>                                       | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Impact caused preparation of site for construction (e.g., clearing, grubbing) and, by definition, is not construction   |
| <b>4.3.1.1.2 Threatened and Endangered Species</b>                                  |   |   |              |   |
| Crocodile   | M   | M (50)  | M (50)       | Impact significance based on combination of level of physical activity and proximity to habitat. 50/50 split is reasonable between preconstruction and construction |
| Wood storks   | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>   |
| Manatees  | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact, barge basin and channel, not in powerblock area   |
| Eastern Indigo Snake  | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact, uplands, not in powerblock area   |
| <b>4.3.1.1.3 Other Important Species</b>  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>   |
| <b>4.3.1.1.4 Wetlands</b>   | M   | M (100)   | S (0)        | Impact caused by preparation of site for construction (e.g., clearing, grubbing) and, by definition, is not construction  |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 7 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section   | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|
|  |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.3.1.1.5 Other Construction Impacts</b>              |   |   |              |   |
| Noise  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>     |
| Avian collisions   | S   | S (0)   | S (100)      | Impacts most likely limited to large structures located above ground in powerblock area |
| Light pollution  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>     |
| <b>4.3.1.2 Potential Impacts of Makeup Water Systems</b> |   |   |              |   |
| 4.3.1.2.1 Reclaimed Water Pipelines and Pipelines        | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                                |
| 4.3.1.2.1 Radial collector wells                         | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact not in powerblock area   |
| <b>4.3.1.3 Potential Impacts to Off-site Areas</b>       |   |   |              |   |
| 4.3.1.3.1 Transmission Corridors                         | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction                       |
| 4.3.1.3.2 Borrow material                                | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                                |
| 4.3.1.3.3 Access Roads and Potable Water Pipeline        | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                                |
| <b>4.3.2 Aquatic Ecosystems</b>                          |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.3.2.1 General Impacts to Aquatic Resources</b>      |   |   |              |   |
| 4.3.2.1.1 Sedimentation                                  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>     |
| 4.3.2.1.2 Turbidity                                      | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>     |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 8 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section   | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|
|  |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| 4.3.2.1.3 Petroleum Spills   | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| <b>4.3.2.1 General Impacts to Aquatic Resources (cont.)</b>                                      |   |   |              |   |
| 4.3.2.1.4 Habitat Disturbance  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| <b>4.3.2.2 Potential Impacts to the Units 6 &amp; 7 Site and Other On-Site Aquatic Resources</b> |   |   |              |   |
| 4.3.2.2.1 Equipment Barge Unloading Area   | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact, barge basin and access channel, not in powerblock area    |
| 4.3.2.2.2 Drilling deep injection wells  | None  | None  | None         | No aquatic habitats impacted  |
| 4.3.2.2.3 Parking and Laydown Areas  | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact not in powerblock area                                     |
| <b>4.3.2.3 Potential Impacts to Off-Site Aquatic Resources</b>                                   |   |   |              |   |
| 4.3.2.3.1 Reclaimed Water Pipelines  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| 4.3.2.3.2 Radial Collector Wells   | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact not in powerblock area                                     |
| 4.3.2.3.3 Transmission Corridors   | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction                   |
| 4.3.2.3.4 Roadway improvements   | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |
| 4.3.2.3.5 Borrow Material  | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction                            |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 9 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section                                    | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.4 Socioeconomic Impacts</b>              |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.4.1 Physical Impacts of Construction</b> |   |   |              |   |
| <b>4.4.1.1 Noise</b>                          |   |   |              |   |
| Onsite  | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>   |
| Transmission corridors                        | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction   |
| Offsite                                       | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Offsite areas not included in definition of construction  |
| Traffic                                       | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.1.2 Air</b>                            | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup>   |
| <b>4.4.1.3 Aesthetics</b>                     |   |   |              |   |
| Onsite  | S   | S (0)   | S (100)      | View offsite limited to large structures located in powerblock area. Preconstruction includes cranes erection and use. Construction work assembles buildings. |
| Offsite, eastern transmission corridors       | S   | S (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction   |
| Offsite, western transmission corridors       | M   | M (100)   | NA           | Transmission corridors not included in definition of construction   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 10 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section                                      | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |  |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation   |
| <b>4.4.1.4 Traffic</b>                          |   |   |              |  |
| Commuter  | M   | M (65)  | M (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>   |
| Fill movement                                   | M   | M (25)  | M (75)       | Fill for Units 6 & 7 plant area, most, estimated at 75 percent of work activity, for deepest excavation (powerblock area) to bring to finish grade |
| Barge   | S   | S (100)   | S (0)        | Area of potential impact, barge basin and access channel, not in powerblock area   |
| <b>4.4.2 Social and Economic Impacts</b>        |   |   |              |  |
| <b>4.4.2.1 Demography</b>                       | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>   |
| <b>4.4.2.2 Impacts to the Community</b>         |   |   |              |  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.1 Economy</b>                        |   |   |              |  |
| Unemployment in Region of Influence             | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>   |
| 4.4.2.2.1.1 Construction In-Migrants            | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>   |
| 4.4.2.2.1.2 Operations In-Migrants              | S   | S (0)   | S (100)      | Assumed that operations workers onsite during peak construction would be training for jobs in powerblock area                                      |
| 4.4.2.2.1.4 End of Construction Period          | S-M   | S-M (65)  | S-M (35)     | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>   |
| <b>4.4.2.2.2 Taxes</b>                          |   |   |              |  |
| 4.4.2.2.2.1 Personal and Corporate Income Taxes | S   | S (0)   | S (100)      | Unit 6 operating while Unit 7 construction finishing   |
| 4.4.2.2.2.2 Sales and Use Tax                   | S-M   | S-M (65)  | S-M (35)     | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 11 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section  | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.2 Taxes (cont.)</b>                            |   |   |              |   |
| 4.4.2.2.2.3 Other Sales and Use-Related Taxes             | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| 4.4.2.2.2.4 Property Taxes – County and Special Districts | S-M   | S (0)   | S-M(100)     | Plant book value based primarily on power block features  |
| 4.4.2.2.2.5 Property Taxes – Independent School District  | S   | S (0)   | S (100)      | Plant book value based primarily on power block features  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.3 Land Use</b>                                 |   |   |              |   |
| 4.4.2.2.3.1 Land Use                                      | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| 4.4.2.2.3.2 Construction-Related Population Growth        | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.4 Transportation</b>                           | M   | M (65)  | M (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.5 Aesthetics and Recreation</b>                |   |   |              |   |
| 4.4.2.2.5.1 Aesthetic Impacts to Recreation               | S   | S (5)   | S (95)       | View offsite limited to large structures located in powerblock area. Preconstruction includes cranes erection and use. Construction work assembles buildings. |
| 4.4.2.2.5.2 Use Impacts to Recreation                     | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.6 Housing</b>                                  | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.7 Public Services</b>                          |   |   |              |   |
| 4.4.2.2.7.1 Water Supply Facilities                       | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| 4.4.2.2.7.2 Wastewater Treatment Facilities               | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.6-2 (Sheet 12 of 12)**  
**Separation of Preconstruction and Construction<sup>(a)</sup> Impacts**

| ER Section  | Combined Preconstruction and Construction Impact Significance | Separation of Impacts; Significance and Percent |              |   |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
|   |   | Preconstruction                                 | Construction | Basis for Separation  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.7 Public Services (cont.)</b>                |   |   |              |   |
| 4.4.2.2.7.3 Law Enforcement, Fire, and Medical Services | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.2.2.8 Education</b>                              | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.4.3 Environmental Justice</b>                      |   |   |              |   |
| 4.4.3.1 Health and Environmental Impacts                | S   | S (95)  | S (5)        | Separation between preconstruction and construction based on acreage <sup>(b)</sup> |
| 4.4.3.2 Socioeconomic Impacts                           | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.5 Radiation Exposure to Construction Workers</b>   | S   | S (65)  | S (35)       | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |
| <b>4.8 Non-radiological Health Impacts</b>              | Not assigned  | (65)  | (35)         | Labor hours <sup>(c)</sup>  |

(a) "Construction," as defined in 10 CFR 50.2 "Definitions," refers to the construction of "safety-related structures, systems, or components (SSCs) of a facility."

(b) Acreage – Work on powerblock area is assumed to be nuclear safety related and, therefore, construction. As shown in **Table 3.9-2** and **Figure 3.9-1**, the powerblock area would occupy approximately 30 acres, or 5 percent, of a total 600 acres of disturbed land. Preconstruction would occupy the remainder, or 95 percent, of the acreage.

(c) Labor Hours - Work on powerblock area is assumed to be nuclear safety related and, therefore, construction. Preliminary construction estimates for a similar reactor facility (*Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 COL Application, Part 3, Environmental Report*), suggest labor hour breakdown would be as follows: preconstruction 65 percent and construction 35 percent.

L = LARGE — For the issue, environmental impacts are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

M = MODERATE — Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

NA = Not applicable.

S = SMALL — Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

For the purposes of assessing radiological impacts, impacts that do not exceed permissible levels in U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations are considered SMALL.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

#### 4.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

This section addresses cumulative impacts to the region's environment that could result from the construction of Units 6 & 7. A cumulative impact is defined in Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1508.7) as an "impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or nonfederal) or person undertakes such other actions."

To determine cumulative impacts, the impacts of the construction of Units 6 & 7, as described in Chapter 4, are combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions at and in the vicinity (within 6 miles of Units 6 & 7) that would affect the same resources, regardless of what agency (federal or nonfederal) or person undertakes such other actions. The cumulative impacts addressed in this section are those expected to overlap with the impacts of the proposed construction as a result of timing and geographic area. The geographic area that was used when considering cumulative impacts for the various resource areas is described in [Table 4.7-1](#). Not all of the impacts of the proposed construction would be cumulative with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. For example, impacts that would not extend beyond the boundaries of the Units 6 & 7 construction site (the Units 6 & 7 plant area) would not be cumulative with other projects. In addition, the impacts of Units 6 & 7 construction are based on existing environmental conditions, so the construction impact analyses have already accounted for present actions when the existing state of the resource is used as a comparison for impacts. For example, impact analysis for water quality and aquatic ecology resources uses existing conditions as the baseline for determining impacts. The baseline accounts for the discharges to surface and groundwater from the past as well as the present because discharges directly influence water quality parameters. The aquatic ecology resources baseline would account for past and present actions that play a role in the vitality of aquatic populations and their habitat's ability to sustain a viable population.

During the process of identifying potential projects that could contribute cumulative impacts, a detailed search was conducted for all federal, non-federal and private actions within a 50-mile radius of Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 that had requested either an air or water permit/license or had an environmental impact statement completed. The search was accomplished by searching federal (e.g. USCOE, USGS), state (e.g. FDEP, FDOT), and local (e.g. M-D DERM) websites. The list was refined to projects that were within a 6-mile radius of Turkey Point Units 6 & 7, then within the required time frame of preconstruction and construction activities of Turkey Point Units 6 & 7, excluding all brownfield and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) sites.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The time frame for potential projects that could contribute to cumulative impacts was 2013 to 2022. This time frame was determined using the schedule for preconstruction activities beginning in the third quarter of 2013 with completion of construction in the fourth quarter of 2022.

Other projects in the area considered for cumulative impacts but not retained for analysis are described in [Table 4.7-3](#). Distances listed in [Table 4.7-3](#) are from the Units 6 & 7 plant area unless otherwise noted.

#### 4.7.1 LAND USE

Onsite construction activities are planned for disturbed land and/or land with existing structures. In addition, protective measures are required during construction activities in accordance with applicable permits. Land use impacts to offsite areas as a result of the construction of transmission lines, substations, the reclaimed water pipelines, and potable water pipelines have been characterized as SMALL. Therefore, the impacts to land use from construction would be SMALL and would not require mitigation.

Projects in the vicinity of Homestead and Florida City were considered for cumulative land use impacts. A review of the adopted 2015-2025 Comprehensive Development Plan for Miami-Dade County indicates that land in the immediate vicinity of Turkey Point, in unincorporated Miami-Dade County, would remain protected land, open land, parkland, or agricultural land and would not be subject to development. Land farther to the west in the urban areas of Homestead and Florida City had land use designations that would allow development in accordance with local zoning restrictions (MDC Nov 2007).

The existing facilities at Turkey Point as well as the Units 3 & 4 uprate would not impact land use. The Units 3 & 4 Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) would be constructed on land among existing structures near Units 3 & 4 where the ground was disturbed during their construction. The INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility would be constructed at an existing landfill and would not impact land use. Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project would change the land use designation for a 120-acres plot from “agriculture” to “business and office”. However, the land is currently used for overflow parking during speedway events, and the impact on area land use would be minimal. The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) projects would restore wetlands in the vicinity, which would provide a land use benefit. Area parks, nature preserves, and the Everglades Mitigation Bank (EMB) would continue to preserve wetlands and forested areas and would not contribute or detract from land use impacts. The cumulative land use impacts would be SMALL.

The projects discussed above were considered for cumulative impacts to historical properties. Those projects that would disturb land that was not previously disturbed would have the potential for impacts to historical properties. The existing facilities at Turkey Point, including the Units 3 & 4

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

uprate and the EMB, do not involve land disturbance and would not involve new structures. The Units 3 & 4 ISFSI does involve land disturbance, but it would be constructed among existing structures so its existing location was previously disturbed. The INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project would also be constructed on previously disturbed land. The CERP projects involve land disturbance and, therefore, have the potential to impact historic or cultural sites during construction. The projects' construction activities would be focused in areas where the land is previously disturbed to install the cooling canals of the industrial wastewater facility, thereby decreasing the likelihood of impacts to historic or cultural sites. Should such impacts occur, they could be additions, but temporary, with those of Units 6 & 7 construction. Therefore, cumulative impacts to historic properties would not be more severe than the impact to historic properties posed by the construction of Units 6 & 7.

#### 4.7.2 HYDROLOGY AND WATER USE

##### 4.7.2.1 Surface Water

**Subsection 4.2** addresses hydrologic alterations affecting surface water as a result of the construction of onsite and offsite structures. The water bodies and areas that would be affected by the construction of Units 6 & 7 are the mudflats (consisting of wet organic soil material) in the plant area, the remnant canals in the plant area, a dead-end canal located northwest of the plant area, the nuclear administration building, training building, and parking area on land north of the Units 6 & 7 plant area consisting of mangrove swamps/wetlands, and the barge turning basin. Offsite canals, surface drainage features, and wetlands could be affected from crossing by the reclaimed water pipelines, potable water pipelines, transmission lines, access road, and bridges. The analysis concluded that impacts would be SMALL.

Units 1 through 4 use the industrial wastewater facility for heat dissipation. Unit 5 uses mechanical draft cooling towers for heat dissipation. These towers receive water from the Upper Floridan aquifer for use as makeup water and route their blowdown to the industrial wastewater facility. The operations of Units 1 through 5 do not impact surface water beyond the industrial wastewater facility. The construction activities for Units 6 & 7 would impact the industrial wastewater facility, but the impacts would not extend to offsite areas.

The Units 3 & 4 uprate involves construction activities conducted in the interior of existing structures, so hydrologic alterations would not be made and the cooling canals in the industrial wastewater facility would continue to be used after the uprate is completed. The Units 3 & 4 ISFSI would be incorporated into Turkey Point's stormwater management program and would not have the potential to impact surface water.

The INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project would be constructed at sites that have an existing stormwater management program.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The new facilities would be incorporated into the existing stormwater management program and would not have the potential to impact surface water. Area parks, nature preserves, and the EMB would continue to preserve wetlands and would not contribute or detract from surface water and water use impacts. The purpose of the CERP projects is to make beneficial hydrologic alterations that would have large beneficial surface water impacts. Accordingly, the cumulative impacts to surface water would be positive and LARGE owing to the EMB and CERP projects. The hydrologic alterations resulting from construction of Units 6 & 7 would be only a SMALL detractor to this overall beneficial impact of restoring wetlands in the area.

#### 4.7.2.2 Groundwater

**Section 4.2** describes hydrologic alterations as a result of the construction of onsite and offsite structures and their potential to affect groundwater in the Floridan and Biscayne aquifers and concludes that these alterations would have a SMALL impact to groundwater resources. In addition, the analysis considered impacts to groundwater from dewatering activities at both onsite and offsite construction locations. The impacts were characterized as localized, temporary, and SMALL.

The other Turkey Point facilities use water supplied by Miami-Dade County and, therefore, do not impact groundwater resources. The EMB and CERP would provide beneficial impacts to groundwater because of their preservation and restoration of wetlands providing recharge to subsurface waters. The INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project would be required to follow state and local guidelines to minimize impacts to groundwater resources. Therefore, these facilities and projects would not contribute to adverse groundwater impacts, so the cumulative impact including the construction of Units 6 & 7 would be SMALL.

#### 4.7.2.3 Water Use

The water needed for Units 6 & 7 construction activities would be supplied by Miami-Dade County from their potable water supply. No water would be withdrawn from surface water or groundwater wells for use in onsite or offsite construction activities. Therefore, there would be no impacts to water resources due to water use aside from the potential impact to public water supplies, which are considered as one aspect of the socioeconomic impacts.

#### 4.7.2.4 Water Quality

The clearing, excavating, filling, grading, dewatering, and soil stockpiling associated with the construction of Units 6 & 7 and offsite facilities (i.e., transmission lines, reclaimed water pipelines, potable water pipelines, the FPL-owned fill source) could potentially impact water quality. However, the impacts of constructing Units 6 & 7 would be minimized from the application of environmental controls that would be part of an erosion, sedimentation, and pollution control plan

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

and implementation of environmental best management practices, including structural and operational controls to prevent the movement of pollutants (including sediments) into wetlands and water bodies via stormwater runoff. The construction activities associated with the enlargement of the equipment barge unloading area would inevitably disturb sediments and soils that could increase turbidity immediately in the turning basin, which could migrate to Biscayne Bay. The water quality impacts that could result from the construction of Units 6 & 7 were characterized as SMALL ([Section 4.2](#)).

The other projects previously identified could also impact water quality. The area expected to be disturbed by the other projects is more than one acre. Therefore, those construction activities would also have to implement erosion, sedimentation, and pollution control plan and environmental best management practices in compliance with the EPA's Phase I stormwater regulations. The INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project would be required to follow state and local guidelines to minimize impacts to surface and groundwater resources. The application of the erosion and pollution prevention plans and environmental best management practices to the CERP projects would minimize impacts to water quality to those that are SMALL and temporary. The cumulative impact to surface water quality, should any of these individual SMALL, temporary impacts become additive, would also be SMALL given the application of control measures that protect water quality.

The projects were also assessed for cumulative impacts to groundwater quality. As stated above, the existing units, Units 6 & 7 construction activities, as well as the CERP, INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility, and the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project construction activities would be subject to pollution prevention plans. Implementation of such plans would ensure that the impact of any spills would be minimized by quick responses and the use of appropriate spill cleanup equipment. Therefore, cumulative impacts to groundwater quality would be SMALL.

#### 4.7.3 ECOLOGY (TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC)

##### 4.7.3.1 Terrestrial

Cumulative impacts to terrestrial resources were assessed for the Turkey Point plant property and offsite areas. The operation of the Units 3 & 4 ISFSI would not impact terrestrial resources. The EMB would have no negative impacts on terrestrial resources. The Units 3 & 4 uprate construction would be to the interior of existing structures, so this project would not contribute to cumulative impacts to terrestrial resources. Existing Turkey Point facilities and operations are subject to management/conservation plans designed to protect important species with a particular focus on the American crocodile. Some of the features of the management/conservation program are:

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

- Habitat preservation and creation of habitat suitable for crocodile nesting and basking
- Establishment of exclusion zones at known nesting sites (nest sanctuaries)
- Daytime and nighttime monitoring surveys to document nesting activity and use of the cooling canals
- Capture and tagging of hatchlings using Avid microchip technology
- Relocation of hatchlings to low-salinity habitat during early life stages to increase survival
- Recapture, monitoring, and release of individuals to document growth and survival

As described in [Subsection 2.4.1.2](#), Turkey Point's conservation efforts have contributed to the increase in population of the American crocodile. In addition, other species of special concern are protected with project-specific management plans ([Section 4.3](#)) (FPL Jan 2008).

Therefore, the existing Turkey Point facilities would have only a small contribution to the cumulative impact.

The portions of CERP projects that are adjacent to the Turkey Point plant property could potentially lead to temporary cumulative impacts to terrestrial resources. The objective of the project is to restore wetlands and, therefore, restore habitat for terrestrial species that inhabit wetlands. Portions of the CERP projects are in the area designated as critical habitat for the American crocodile (see [Figure 2.4-4](#)) and, therefore, would be subject to controls to ensure the protection of local populations. The CERP projects would serve to enhance wetland habitat and would ultimately provide a beneficial impact to local populations. As addressed in [Subsection 4.7.2.4](#), these projects would have to implement measures to protect water quality. Given the temporary nature of the impacts, the objective of the CERP projects to restore and enhance habitat, and the application of measures to protect water quality and crocodile populations, they would have a SMALL impact on terrestrial resources that would contribute to temporary cumulative impacts. The terrestrial impact of Units 6 & 7 construction was characterized as SMALL to MODERATE. The additive and possibly synergetic affect of both Units 6 & 7 construction and the CERP projects construction activities would be temporary. Therefore, the overall cumulative impact to terrestrial resources during Units 6 & 7 construction would be MODERATE.

#### 4.7.3.2 Aquatic

The projects described in [Table 4.7-2](#) were considered for cumulative impacts to the aquatic ecological resources to the north and west of the Turkey Point plant property, as well as the downstream points (i.e., Biscayne Bay and Card Sound). The impact to aquatic resources from

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

the construction of Units 6 & 7 and offsite facilities is characterized as SMALL in [Subsection 4.3.2](#).

Operation of the Units 3 & 4 ISFSI would not result in an impact to aquatic resources because it is a storage facility that does not use water and does not have environmental emissions that would be additive with construction of Units 6 & 7. Likewise, the interior construction activities of the Units 3 & 4 uprate would also not impact aquatic resources. The EMB would not have adverse impacts on aquatic resources. Operating the existing units would have impacts to aquatic ecology through their continued use of the industrial wastewater facility. However, the SMALL aquatic ecology impact from the construction of Units 6 & 7 would be isolated to impacted areas and would not be additive to the impacts of the existing facilities.

Impacts as a result of construction at offsite locations could be cumulative with impacts from the CERP projects, INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvements. However, as stated in [Subsection 4.7.2](#), these other projects would apply measures to protect surface water resources and aquatic ecological resources. Therefore, impacts would be temporary, occurring during construction activities. The objective of the CERP projects is to restore wetlands, so aquatic ecological resources would benefit from these projects in the long-term. The cumulative impacts to aquatic resources would be SMALL.

#### 4.7.4 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

Impacts to socioeconomic resources stem from the physical impacts of construction and from demands placed on the region by the workforces needing housing and public services, and also spending their salaries and paying taxes. The other facilities and projects considered for cumulative impacts are described in [Table 4.7-2](#). These facilities and projects would have both positive and negative socioeconomic impacts to the Homestead and Florida City area as well as the wider 50-mile region of influence. These positive and negative socioeconomic impacts stem from physical impacts (noise, air emissions, and visual intrusions), current spending of salaries, payment of taxes, and use of public services.

The offsite physical impacts of constructing Units 6 & 7 would be SMALL with the exception of traffic impacts ([Subsection 4.4.1](#)) which would be MODERATE. The other construction projects in the immediate area (i.e., the CERP Project, INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and Homestead-Miami Speedway improvements) would have physical impacts that are temporary and localized to their immediate area.

The facilities and projects described in [Table 4.7-2](#) were considered for their potential to result in cumulative socioeconomic impacts as a result of workforces. Because the socioeconomic analysis presented in [Subsection 4.4.2](#) uses existing socioeconomic conditions and forecasts based on existing conditions as a baseline, the impacts of the existing facilities would already



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

have been accounted for in the impact analysis that concluded the impacts would be SMALL with the exception of transportation, which would be MODERATE during Units 6 & 7 construction. In addition to normal operations of the existing units, the nuclear units, Units 3 & 4, would also have periodic outages. Previous outages have required 600 to 1000 employees (FPL Jan 2008). These additional workers could temporarily increase traffic and housing demands. As addressed in [Subsection 4.4.2.2.4](#), the existing units and new Units 6 & 7 would be using different entrances into Turkey Point, but would be using portions of the same feeder roadways. Outages could further impact these feeder roads if peak travel times for these workforces overlapped.

Construction workers and delivery vehicles supporting the Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project would use portions of the same feeder roadways as those used for the existing units and construction of Units 6 & 7. However, the speedway improvements would be completed in the 4th quarter of 2013, just after preconstruction activities for Units 6 & 7 begin. Therefore, the cumulative impacts of the Units 3 & 4 uprate and Units 6 & 7 construction during the overlapping time period, spring to winter 2013, would be less than the impacts at the peak Units 6 & 7 construction activities, as described in previous sections of Chapter 4.

As presented in [Subsection 4.4.2.2.6](#), available housing in the Homestead and Florida City area is more than adequate to accommodate the in-migrating population projected to settle there. In addition, the area has 788 full-hookup recreational vehicle spaces and 1410 hotel/motel rooms ([Subsection 4.4.2.2.6](#)). The occupancy rate for hotel/motel rooms in the area varies widely, with 50 percent occupancy rate reported for October 2007 and 89 percent reported for February 2007 ([Subsection 2.5.2.6.4](#)). Therefore, the additional demand for temporary housing created by outage workers could be accommodated in the Homestead and Florida City area, but at times temporary housing could be scarce. Miami-Dade County has 41,728 hotel/motel rooms ([Subsection 2.5.2.6.4](#)). Although several large construction projects (Port of Miami Tunnel, SR826/SR836 Interchange, Highspeed Passenger Rail, and CERP projects) in the region have schedules that overlap with the Unit 6 & 7 construction activities, most of these projects would either be completed before the peak construction for Units 6 & 7 or they are very long-term projects that would employ a small temporary workforce. So even if hotel/motel rooms become scarce in the Homestead and Florida City area, the additional workers have temporary housing opportunities in the region of interest.

The socioeconomic impact of constructing the Units 3 & 4 ISFSI would peak well before the start of Units 6 & 7 construction because ISFSI construction would be complete in 2011. The operation of the Units 3 & 4 ISFSI would support Units 3 & 4 operations and may require only a limited number of additional workers. Similarly, the socioeconomic impact of construction activities for the Units 3 & 4 uprate would peak well before the start of Units 6 & 7 construction because the uprate would be complete in 2012 and no additional workers would be needed to operate the uprated Units 3 & 4.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

The EMB would have socioeconomic benefits to the area that are difficult to quantify as it preserves the natural state of the land. The more tangible socioeconomic benefits would include any taxes paid by FPL on the property and compensation to FPL employees that oversee it. However, these socioeconomic impacts would be accounted for in the baseline used for assessing Units 6 & 7 construction impacts and, therefore, EMB is not further considered for cumulative impacts.

Considering the two CERP projects in the immediate area, the SFWMD project managers indicated, when contacted in February 2009, that workforce estimates have not been developed to date. Given the schedule uncertainty and the lack of socioeconomic information on the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands project, it is not considered for cumulative socioeconomic impacts. The C-111 Spreader Canal project construction activities would take place east of U.S. Highway 1, with the exception of placement of culverts under this highway and Card Sound Road. The most direct route to the construction site for the activities other than the culvert placements and possibly filling activities would be to travel west on SW 344th Street/Palm Drive away from Turkey Point. The route for filling activities could use U.S. Highway 1, but entry points to reach the canals would likely be south of the U.S. Highway 1's junction with SR 997. Given that a worker estimate could not be developed and the transportation routes to these construction activities and Turkey Point would diverge at SW 344 Street/Palm Drive, the C-111 Spreader project is not considered further for cumulative impacts (USACE and SFWMD Aug 2002).

The socioeconomic impacts of the INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility and Homestead-Miami Speedway improvements would occur during their construction when supplies are being purchased and workers are in the area spending their salaries and being accommodated by temporary housing. Construction of these projects would be completed and they would be in service in 2011 long before the peak Units 6 & 7 construction activities.

The positive socioeconomic impacts would be additional local and state revenues from tax collections, both sales tax on construction materials and sales and property taxes paid by workers. These tax revenues would be cumulative with the Units 3 & 4-related tax revenues. In addition, the projects would infuse money into the general economy through the purchase of materials, supplies, fuel, energy, and services and workers spending their salaries.

Other socioeconomic impacts as a result of the additional population in-migration could put a potential strain on community services such as transportation infrastructure, recreational facilities, law enforcement and fire protection, medical services, water supplies, wastewater treatment, and schools.

As presented in [Subsection 4.4.3](#), environmental justice impacts were assessed for the construction of Units 6 & 7 and it was concluded that there were no construction-related impacts identified that would have disproportionately high and adverse effects on the human health,

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

environment, and socioeconomics of minority or low-income populations. Therefore, no cumulative environmental justice impacts are expected.

#### 4.7.5 SUMMARY

Cumulative impacts to land use, hydrology and water use, ecology, and socioeconomics as a result of the construction of Units 6 & 7 along with the operation and maintenance of the existing units, the Units 3 & 4 uprate, the Units 3 & 4 ISFSI, EMB, CERP projects, INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility, Homestead-Miami Speedway improvements, and other projects in the wider 50-mile region of influence were assessed. The cumulative impacts range from SMALL adverse to beneficially LARGE and are summarized in [Table 4.7-3](#).

#### Section 4.7 References

BCEPGMD Dec 2003 (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *American Whirlpool Products Corporation Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0112362-002-AV*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. December 1, 2003.

BCEPGMD Jun 2008 (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *Dusky Marine, Inc. Dania Beach Facility Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0112597-002-AV*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. June 6, 2008.

BCEPGMD Jan 2009 (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *Florida Power and Light Company Lauderdale Plant Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0110037-005-AV*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. January 1, 2009.

BCEPGMD Jun 2009 (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *Construction Permit for the Relocation of Midnight Express Powerboats Permit No. 0112714-001-AC*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. June 29, 2009.

BCEPGMD Dec 2009a (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *Wheelabrator South Broward, Inc. South Broward Waste-To-Energy Facility Final Title V Permit Revision No. 0112119-014-AV*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. December 11, 2009.

BCEPGMD Dec 2009b (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *Media Printing Corporation Final Air Construction Permit 0112363-009-AC*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. December 8, 2009.

BCEPGMD Feb 2010 (Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department). *Florida Power and Light Company Port Everglades Plant Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0110036-009-AV*. Pollution Prevention, Remediation and Air Quality Division, Plantation, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. February 1, 2010.

DOD Oct 2007 (Department of Defense). *Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for the Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida*. Headquarters Air Force Reserve Command, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia. October 2007. Available at <http://www.homestead.afrc.af.mil/library/susops/index.asp>, accessed August 13, 2010.

FDEP Oct 1996 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). Mitigation Bank Permit No. 132637449, issued October 21, 1996.

FDEP Jun 2000a (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Indian Key State Historic Site Unit Management Plan*, June 20, 2000. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Jun 2000b (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *San Pedro Underwater Archaeological Preserve Unit Management Plan*, June 20, 2000. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Dec 2000 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Lignumvitae Key Botanical State Park Unit Management Plan*, December 19, 2000. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Mar 2001 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Bill Baggs Cape Florida State Park Unit Management Plan*, March 15, 2001. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP May 2001 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *John U. Llyod Beach State Park Unit Management Plan*, May 17, 2001. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

FDEP May 2003 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Windley Key Fossil Reef Geological State Park Unit Management Plan*, May 23, 2003. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Aug 2003 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *The Barnacle Historic State Park Unit Management Plan*, August 15, 2003. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Oct 2003 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). FPL, Everglades Mitigation Bank, Phase II, Permit No. 0193232-001, issued October 17, 2003.

FDEP Sep 2004a (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Dagny Johnson Key Largo Hammock Botanical State Park Unit Management Plan*, September 1, 2004. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Sep 2004b (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *John Pennekamp Coral Reef State Park Approved Management Plan*, September 1, 2004. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Feb 2005 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Curry Hammock State Park Unit Management Plan*, February 11, 2005. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP Dec 2008 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Oleta River State Park Unit Management Plan*, December 12, 2008. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/parks/planning/plans.htm>.

FDEP 2009 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Minor Permit Revision for Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation*, June 19, 2009. Available at <http://publicfiles.dep.state.fl.us/SEC/LewisLongmanWalkerTurkeyPoint/FL0001562%20-%20Turkey%20Point%20Rev%20E.pdf>.

FDEP Aug 2010a (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Domestic Wastewater Facility List*, August 2, 2010. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wastewater/facinfo.htm>, accessed August 13, 2010.

FDEP Aug 2010b (Florida Department of Environmental Protection). *Industrial Wastewater Facility List*, August 2, 2010. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wastewater/facinfo.htm>, accessed August 13, 2010.

FDOT 2009 (Florida Department of Transportation). *Florida Aviation System Plan*. Available at [http://www.dot.state.fl.us/aviation/FASP\\_details.shtm#airport](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/aviation/FASP_details.shtm#airport), accessed June 2, 2010.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

FDOT May 2010 (Florida Department of Transportation). *High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program Application Form: Miami to Orlando Passenger High Speed Rail Corridor Investment Plan*. Available at [http://www.floridahighspeedrail.org/uploads/HSIPR\\_Application\\_Mimai-Orlando.pdf](http://www.floridahighspeedrail.org/uploads/HSIPR_Application_Mimai-Orlando.pdf), accessed June 2, 2010.

FGT Sep 2008 (Florida Gas Transmission Company, LLC). FGT Phase VIII Expansion Project PF08-14-000, Resource Report No.1, General Project Description, September 2008.

FHWA Undated (Federal Highway Administration). *FHWA Active Project Status Report*. Available at [http://fhwaapps.fhwa.dot.gov/foisp\\_publicActive.pdf](http://fhwaapps.fhwa.dot.gov/foisp_publicActive.pdf), accessed August 18, 2010.

FNAI 2008. Florida Natural Areas Inventory, FNAI GIS Data. Accessed July, 2010 at <http://www.fnai.org/gisdata.cfm>.

FPL Jan 2008 (Florida Power and Light Company). Turkey Point Uprate Project Site Certification Application. Submitted to Florida Department of Environmental Protection January 18, 2008.

FPL Nov 2010 (Florida Power and Light). *Request for Exemptions from 10 CFR 72.212 (b) (2) (i) (A), and 10 CFR 72.212 (b) (7) requiring compliance with NUHMOS HD Certificate of Compliance No. 1030 Amendment No. 0 for Spent Fuel Storage Casks, 10 CFR 72.48, 10 CFR 72.212 (a) (2) and 10 CFR 72.214*. November 5, 2010.

FSTEDC Mar 2010 (Florida Seaport Transportation and Economic Development Council). *A Five-Year Plan to Achieve the Mission of Florida's Seaports: 2009-2010/2013-2014*. Available at <http://www.flaports.org/docs/smp%20-%20final%20version%20-%20205-28-09%20-%20for%20website.pdf>, accessed June 2, 2010. March 2010.

HMS 2010 (Homestead-Miami Speedway, LLC). Notification of a Proposed Change to a Previously Approved Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Available at <http://www.sfrpc.com/dri/NOPC/Villages%20of%20Homestead.htm>, accessed August 15, 2010.

HRA Jun 2006 (Historical Research Associates, Inc.). *River of Interests: Water Management in South Florida and the Everglades, 1948-2000*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. June 2006. Available at [http://evergladesplan.org/about/river\\_interest\\_history.aspx](http://evergladesplan.org/about/river_interest_history.aspx), accessed May 11, 2010.

MDC Nov 2007 (Miami-Dade County). *Adopted 2015-2025 Comprehensive Development Master Plan Land Use Map*, November 2007. Available at [http://www.miamidade.gov/planzone/CDMP\\_landuse\\_map.asp](http://www.miamidade.gov/planzone/CDMP_landuse_map.asp), accessed on September 9, 2008.

M-D DERM Sep 1999 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Engelhard Hex Core Initial Title V Air Operation Permit 0250411-001-AV*. Air

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. September 30, 1999.

M-D DERM Jan 2006 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Miami Water and Sewer Department Hialeah/Preston Water Treatment Plant Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250281-010-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. January 3, 2006.

M-D DERM Feb 2006 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Aero Kool Corporation Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0250815-004-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. February 14, 2006.

M-D DERM Mar 2006 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Benada Aluminum of Florida, Inc. Initial Title V Air Operation Permit 0250488-008-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. March 20, 2006.

M-D DERM Jun 2006 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Ram Investments of South Florida, Inc. Sea Enterprise Adventures Initial Title V Air Operation Permit 0251178-002-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. June 27, 2006.

M-D DERM Dec 2006 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Angler Boat Corporation Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0251015-004-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. December 26, 2006.

M-D DERM Aug 2007 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Dyplast Products, LLC Initial Title V Air Operation Permit 0251104-006-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. August 15, 2007.

M-D DERM Mar 2008a (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Miami-Dade Solid Waste Management Miami-Dade County Resource Recovery Facility Final Title V Permit Revision No. 0250348-009-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. March 23, 2008.

M-D DERM Mar 2008b (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *CEMEX Construction Materials Florida, LLC Miami Cement Plant Title V Air*

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

*Operation Permit Revision 0250014-030-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. March 18, 2008.

M-D DERM Jul 2008 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department Alexander Orr Jr. Water Treatment Plant Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0250314-015-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. July 2, 2008.

M-D DERM Aug 2008 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Contender Boats Inc. Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0251105-004-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. August 5, 2008.

M-D DERM Sep 2008 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Titan America, LLC Pennsuco Complex Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0250020-021-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. September 22, 2008.

M-D DERM Oct 2008 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Nailite International, Inc. Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250407-012-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. October 24, 2008.

M-D DERM Nov 2008 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Blumberg Industries dba Fine Art Lamps Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250991-004-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. November 14, 2008.

M-D DERM Dec 2008 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *DM Industries, Ltd Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250828-006-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. December 26, 2008.

M-D DERM Feb 2009 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Florida Power & Light Company Cutler Plant Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0250001-004-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. February 13, 2009.

M-D DERM Mar 2009a (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Florida Power & Light Company Turkey Point Fossil Power Plant Title V Air*



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

*Operation Permit Revision 0250003-012-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. March 18, 2009.

M-D DERM Mar 2009b (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Flowers Baking Company of Miami, LLC Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250664-008-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. March 20, 2009.

M-D DERM May 2009a (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Homestead City Utilities G.W. Ivey Power Plant Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250013-003-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. May 19, 2009.

M-D DERM May 2009b (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Notice of Administratively Corrected Title V Air Operation Permit 0250407-012-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. May 13, 2009.

M-D DERM Jul 2009 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *AAR Landing Gear Services Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0250640-021-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. July 9, 2009.

M-D DERM Sep 2009 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Bertram Yacht, Inc. Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250580-005-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. September 8, 2009.

M-D DERM Jan 2010 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Eastern Aero Marine Initial Title V Air Operation Permit 0250814-005-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. January 7, 2010.

M-D DERM Feb 2010 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Cigarette Racing Team, LLC Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0251152-005-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. February 22, 2010.

M-D DERM Mar 2010 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Industrial Power Generating Company, LLC (INGENCO) Draft Prevention of*

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

*Significant Deterioration Permit PSD-FL-408*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. March 3, 2010.

M-D DERM Apr 2010 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *US Foundry & Manufacturing Corp. Inc. Title V Air Operation Permit Revision 0250022-011-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. April 26, 2010.

M-D DERM May 2010 (Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management). *Goodrich Landing Systems Services Proposed Title V Air Operation Permit Renewal 0250827-009-AV*. Air Quality Management Division, Miami, Florida. Available at <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/air/emission/apds/>, accessed July 1, 2010. May 11, 2010.

Miami Seaquarium 2009. *History of Miami Seaquarium*. Available at [http://www.miamiseaquarium.com\\_visitor\\_info\\_history.pdf](http://www.miamiseaquarium.com_visitor_info_history.pdf), accessed August 13, 2010.

NABA Undated (North American Butterfly Association). South Miami-Dade County, Mary Krome Bird Refuge. Accessed on July 28, 2010 at <http://www.miamiblue.org/SouthMiami-DadeCounty.php>.

NPS Jun 2009 (National Park Service). Big Cypress National Preserve Commercial Services Plan & Environmental Assessment, June 2009. Accessed June 4, 2010 at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/documentsList.cfm?parkId=352&projectId=15927>.

NPS Jul 2010a (National Park Service). Biscayne National Park Florida. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.nps.gov/bisc/index.htm>.

NPS Jul 2010b (National Park Service). Everglades. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.nps.gov/ever/index.htm>.

SFWMD Jun 2010 (South Florida Water Management District). *Expedited Everglades Restoration Projects*, June 2010. Accessed July 27, 2010 at [https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page/portal/xrepository/sfwmd\\_repository\\_pdf/expedited\\_projects\\_update.pdf](https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page/portal/xrepository/sfwmd_repository_pdf/expedited_projects_update.pdf).

Thomas Reuters 2009. Big Cut Seen in Florida's US Sugar Corp Land Deal, March 26, 2009. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN2648174220090326>.

USACE Undated (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). *CERP Projects*. Accessed July 29, 2010 at [http://www.evergladesplan.org/pm/projects/project\\_list.aspx](http://www.evergladesplan.org/pm/projects/project_list.aspx).

USACE Mar 2006 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). *Everglades National Park Seepage Management Project*, Jacksonville District, Mar 2006. Accessed July 27, 2010 at [http://www.evergladesplan.org/docs/fs\\_enp.pdf](http://www.evergladesplan.org/docs/fs_enp.pdf).

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

USACE May 2009 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). *C-111 Spreader Canal Western Project Facts & Information*, Jacksonville District, June 2010. Accessed July 27, 2010 at [http://www.sfeverglades.info/docs/fs\\_c111\\_may\\_2009.pdf](http://www.sfeverglades.info/docs/fs_c111_may_2009.pdf).

USACE Nov 2009 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). *Restoring the South Florida Ecosystem 2009 Integrated Delivery Schedule*, Jacksonville District, November 2, 2009. Accessed July 27, 2010 at [http://www.sfeverglades.info/pm/pm\\_docs/integrated\\_schedule/112009\\_ids\\_sfer\\_map\\_timetable.pdf](http://www.sfeverglades.info/pm/pm_docs/integrated_schedule/112009_ids_sfer_map_timetable.pdf).

USACE Jun 2010 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). *Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project Facts & Information*, Jacksonville District, June 2010. Accessed July 27, 2010 at [http://www.sfeverglades.info/docs/fs\\_bbcw\\_june\\_2010.pdf](http://www.sfeverglades.info/docs/fs_bbcw_june_2010.pdf).

USACE and SFWMD Aug 2002 (US Army Corps of Engineers and South Florida Water Management District). *Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project Management Plan (PMP) August 2002 - Final*. Available at <http://www.evergladesplan.org/pm/pmp/pmp28biscayne.aspx>, accessed on May 20, 2009.

USFWS Feb 2006 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). *Crocodile Lake National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan*, February 2008. Accessed July 28, 2010 at <http://www.fws.gov/southeast/planning/CCPFinalRefugesDocuments.html>.

USFWS Undated (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). *Florida Keys WEA*. Accessed July 28, 2010 at [http://www.fwc.state.fl.us/recreation/WMASites\\_FloridaKeys\\_index.htm](http://www.fwc.state.fl.us/recreation/WMASites_FloridaKeys_index.htm).

USGS 2005 (U.S. Geological Survey). *Mineral Active Mines and Mineral Processing Plants in the United States in 2003 - Broward and Miami-Dade Counties, Florida*. Available at <http://tin.er.usgs.gov/mineplant/>, accessed July 20, 2010.

Wallis Jul 2010. Wallis, S. *Port of Miami Tunnel Gets Underway*. Available at <http://www.tunneltalk.com/Miami-Port-Tunnel-Jul10-Groundbreaking.php>, accessed August 18, 2010.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-1  
Geographic Areas Used in Cumulative Analysis**

| Resource              | Geographic Area   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Land Use              | Homestead and Florida City area   |
| Hydrology & Water Use | Surface Water: Surface water at, adjacent to, or downstream of proposed action offsite areas and Turkey Point<br>Groundwater: Biscayne aquifer underlying south Miami-Dade County and the Floridan aquifer  |
| Ecology               | Terrestrial: immediate surrounding area<br>Aquatic: Surface water to the north of Turkey Point encompassing the reclaimed and potable water pipelines that are part of the proposed action and to the west to U.S. Highway 1 and the downstream points from this land area (i.e., Biscayne Bay and Card Sound). |
| Socioeconomics        | Local: Homestead and Florida City area<br>Regional: 50-mile radius of the Unit 6 & 7 project area   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 1 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name  | Summary of Project   | Location   | Status   | Reference          | Retained |
|---|--|--|--|--------------------|----------|
| <b>Energy Projects</b>  |  |  |  |                    |          |
| FPL - Cutler Power Plant                                      | Two-unit, 205-MW gas- and oil-fired plant  | 14 miles northeast of Turkey Point site  | Operational  | M-D DERM Feb 2009  | No       |
| FPL - Lauderdale Power Plant                                  | Two-unit, 884-MW gas- and oil-fired plant  | 45 miles northeast of Turkey Point site  | Operational  | BCEPGMD Jan 2009   | No       |
| FPL - Port Everglades Power Plant                             | Four-unit, 1205-MW oil- and gas-fired plant  | 47 miles northeast of Turkey Point site  | Operational  | BCEPGMD Feb 2010   | No       |
| FPL - Turkey Point Power Plant                                | Five-unit, 3,220-MW power plant. Units 1 & 2 are oil- and gas-fired, Units 3 & 4 are nuclear, Unit 5 is gas-fired. | Turkey Point site  | Operational  | M-D DERM Mar 2009a | Yes      |
| FPL - Turkey Point Power Plant Units 3 & 4 Uprate             | The project will increase the net electrical generation for Units 3 & 4 by 104-MW each.                            | Turkey Point site  | Proposed. Site Certification Application approved by FPSC in October 2008. Application to NRC submitted in 2010. Project completion expected 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter 2012. | FPL Jan 2008       | Yes      |
| Homestead City Utilities - Gordon W. Ivey Power Plant         | 16-unit, 60-MW oil-fired plant   | 9 miles northwest of Turkey Point site   | Operational  | M-D DERM May 2009a | No       |
| INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility                            | 24-unit, 8-MW landfill gas-fired power plant   | 6 miles northwest of Turkey Point site   | Proposed. Draft Air Construction Permit issued March 2010  | M-D DERM Mar 2010  | Yes      |
| Miami-Dade County Resource Recovery Facility                  | Four-unit 77-MW municipal solid waste-fired power plant  | 28 miles northwest of Turkey Point site  | Operational  | M-D DERM Mar 2008a | No       |
| Wheelabrator South Broward, Inc. - Waste to Energy Facility   | Three-unit 67.6-MW municipal solid waste-fired power plant   | 45 miles northeast of Turkey Point site  | Operational  | BCEPGMD Dec 2009a  | No       |
| Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase VIII Expansion Project | The FGT pipeline will be 6.5 miles long and parallel existing FGT pipelines and FPL transmission lines.            | The pipeline will be installed along SW 97 Avenue north of Turkey Point and travel south toward Turkey Point site. | Proposed. The pipeline is planned to be in service in 2010 to 2011   | FGT Sep 2008       | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 2 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                                     | Summary of Project   | Location                                | Status   | Reference    | Retained |
|--|--|---|--|--------------|----------|
| <b>Transportation Projects</b>                   |  |   |  |              |          |
| Dade-Collier Training and Transition Airport     | Precision instrument landing and training facility for commercial and general aviation.  | 46 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational. Future development unlikely.  | FDOT 2009    | No       |
| Fort Lauderdale/ Hollywood International Airport | Full service airport - commercial airlines, air cargo, and general aviation  | 46 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational. Expansion and construction would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents. | FDOT 2009    | No       |
| Homestead Air Reserve Base Airport               | Military airfield that is the home station to F-16C and F-15A aircraft.  | 5 miles northwest of Turkey Point site  | Operational. Limited development is likely.  | DOD Oct 2007 | No       |
| Homestead General Aviation Airport               | General aviation airport.  | 15 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational. Limited expansion would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents.          | FDOT 2009    | No       |
| Kendall-Tamiami Executive Airport                | General aviation airport.  | 17 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational. Limited expansion would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents.          | FDOT 2009    | No       |
| Miami International Airport                      | Full service airport - commercial airlines, air cargo, and general aviation. Third busiest international passenger airport in the U.S. | 26 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational. Completion of the \$6.2 Billion Miami Intermodal Center capital improvement program expected in 2011.     | FDOT 2009    | No       |
| North Perry Airport                              | General aviation airport.  | 40 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational. Expansion and construction would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents. | FDOT 2009    | No       |
| Opa Locka Executive Airport                      | General aviation and reliever airport for Miami International. The airport is also home to a U.S. Coast Guard Air/ Sea Rescue Station. | 33 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational. Limited expansion would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents.          | FDOT 2009    | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 3 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                                      | Summary of Project  | Location                                | Status   | Reference                     | Retained |
|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|----------|
| Port Everglades                                   | Large full-service deepwater seaport. Florida's main seaport for receiving petroleum products. Current annual throughput of 21.2 million tons of cargo and 128.8 million barrels of petroleum products. Cruise terminal serves 3.1 million passengers annually.   | 48 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational. Port expansion, dredging, and construction would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents. | FSTEDC Mar 2010               | No       |
| Port of Miami                                     | Large full-service deepwater seaport. Current annual cargo throughput of 6.8 million tons. Cruise terminal serves 4.1 million passengers annually.  | 26 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational. Port expansion, dredging, and construction would occur in the future, as described in state and local planning documents. | FSTEDC Mar 2010               | No       |
| Port of Miami Tunnel & Access Improvement Project | The project will improve access to and from the Port of Miami, serving as a dedicated roadway connector linking the Port with the MacArthur Causeway (SR A1A) and I-395. The project consists of three primary components: widening of the MacArthur Causeway Bridge; tunnel connections between Watson Island and Dodge Island (the Port of Miami); and connections to the Port of Miami roadway system. | 26 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Planned. Construction began in July 2010 and the project could be operational by 2014.   | FHWA Undated, Wallis Jul 2010 | No       |
| SR826/SR836 Interchange Reconstruction            | The project involves a major upgrade to the interchange. Capacity improvements include the reconstruction and widening along both SR826 (Palmetto Expressway) and SR836 (Dolphin Expressway), construction of a four-level interchange, and modifications of the Flagler Street/SR826 and the Milam Dairy Road/NW 72nd Avenue/SR836 interchanges.   | 26 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Planned. Construction began in October 2009 and is scheduled to be completed by late 2014  | FHWA Undated                  | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 4 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name  | Summary of Project  | Location                                | Status   | Reference     | Retained |
|---|---|---|--|---------------|----------|
| Tampa – Orlando – Miami High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail | This project would provide high-speed rail service from Tampa to Miami (through Orlando) with stops in West Palm Beach and Ft. Lauderdale. The termini for Orlando -Miami corridor are the Orlando International Airport (OIA) and the Miami Intermodal Center at the Miami Airport (MIA).  | 26 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Proposed. Phase 1 (Tampa-Orlando corridor) is ongoing. Project development for Phase 2 (Orlando-Miami corridor) began in May 2010. | FDOT May 2010 | No       |
| Big Cypress National Preserve                               | Over 729,000 acres of valuable habitat for a variety of threatened and endangered species, including the Florida panther, West Indian manatee, red cockaded woodpecker, and wood storks. Public recreational activities include bird watching, camping, canoeing, bicycling, off road vehicles, hunting, hiking, and wildlife observation.  | 44 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Development limited within property.   | NPS Jun 2009  | No       |
| Bill Baggs Cape Florida State Park                          | The upland areas of Cape Florida have undergone a phenomenal transformation since Hurricane Andrew in 1992. Native plant communities have been recreated through continuous staff and volunteer efforts of planting and exotic plant eradication and control. About three miles beach and shoreline are the main attraction for the majority of the park visitors and provides opportunities for picnicking, swimming, bicycling, fishing, primitive camping and nature appreciation. | 20 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Development limited within property.   | FDEP Mar 2001 | No       |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 5 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                            | Summary of Project  | Location   | Status  | Reference      | Retained |
|---|---|--|---|----------------|----------|
| Biscayne National Park                  | A meld of four distinct ecosystems (mangrove forests, Biscayne Bay, Florida Keys islands, and coral reefs) supporting diverse wildlife including threatened and endangered species such as the West Indian manatee, eastern indigo snake, piping plover, American crocodile, peregrine falcon, Schaus' swallowtail butterfly, least tern, and five species of sea turtle. Public recreational activities include picnicking, hiking, wildlife watching, snorkeling, scuba diving, canoe/ kayaking, and fishing. | Adjacent to eastern edge of Turkey Point site property | Development likely limited within property.   | NPS Jul 2010a  | No       |
| Crocodile Lake National Wildlife Refuge | The Refuge covers 6,700 acres of land, including 650 acres of open water. It contains a mosaic of habitat types, such as tropical hardwood hammock, mangrove forest, and salt marsh. These habitats are vital for hundreds of plants and animals including six federally listed species. The refuge is closed to the public however there is an interpretive butterfly garden adjacent.   | 12 miles south of Turkey Point site                    | Additional land acquisition is planned. Development likely limited within property.           | USFWS Feb 2006 | No       |
| Curry Hammock State Park                | The 970 acres represents the remaining example of the natural communities of the Middle Florida Keys and contains tropical hardwood hammocks, salt marshes, and mangrove wetlands. Public recreation activities include swimming, hiking, canoeing/kayaking, and camping.   | 26 miles southwest of Turkey Point site                | Additional 23 acre land acquisition is planned<br>Development likely limited within property. | FDEP Feb 2005  | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 6 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name   | Summary of Project   | Location                                | Status   | Reference                                     | Retained |
|--|--|---|--|---|----------|
| Dagny Johnson Key Largo Hammock Botanical State Park | The 2,454 acres of park contain the largest intact West Indian hardwood hammock in the US harboring an extensive list of threatened and endangered plants and animals. In addition a very rare coastal rock barren community, a shoreline dominated by marine tidal swamps, and significant wetland habitat. Public recreation activities include hiking, picnicking, guided nature walks, and educational programs. | 12 miles south of Turkey Point site     | Development likely limited within property.  | FDEP Sep 2004a                                | No       |
| Everglades National Park                             | Primarily comprised of internationally important wetlands that cover 1,508,533 acres and are home to rare and endangered species such as the American crocodile, Florida panther, and West Indian manatee.   | 29 miles west of Turkey Point site      | 181,000 acres of additional land acquisition is proposed. Development likely limited within property.            | NPS Jul 2010b, FNAI 2008, Thomas Reuters 2009 | No       |
| Florida Keys Wildlife and Environmental Area         | An archipelago of small sites totaling 3,089 acres containing some of the best examples of tropical hardwood hammocks remaining in Florida. These sites protect native plants and animals, many of which are found nowhere else in the US. Recreational facilities or trails have not been developed in order to protect the sites' sensitive natural resources.   | 31 miles southeast of Turkey Point site | Development of facilities for public use is constrained by the presence of many unique plant and animal species. | USFWS Undated                                 | No       |
| Indian Key Historic State Park                       | The 110 acre property consists mostly of wetland and water areas that attract boaters for snorkeling and fishing activities. The ruins of the historic settlement on the island are available to the public via guided or self-guided tours.   | 43 miles southwest of Turkey Point site | Development of facilities for public use limited within property.  | FDEP Jun 2000a                                | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 7 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                         | Summary of Project  | Location                            | Status   | Reference      | Retained |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|----------------|----------|
| John Pennekamp Coral Reef State Park | Submerged land covers over 98% of the 63,836 acres of the park. The water area contains the only living coral reef in the US and the land area consists of over 80,000 linear feet of shoreline with beaches and tropical hammocks. Public recreation activities include swimming, snorkeling, scuba diving, fishing, canoeing, glass bottom boat tours, hiking, camping, and nature appreciation.  | 17 miles south of Turkey Point site | Additional land acquisition is proposed. Development of facilities for public use limited within property. | FDEP Sep 2004b | No       |
| John U. Lloyd Beach State Park       | The park contains 311 acres on the Atlantic Ocean and Intercoastal Waterway and contains natural communities such as beach dunes, coastal strands, maritime hammocks, and tidal swamps. These provide habitat for 11 imperiled plant species and 20 imperiled animals. Public recreation facilities include two large beach use areas, seven large picnic pavilions, a two-lane boat ramp, a pavilion that provides nature study and environmental education opportunities, and a concession stand that provides; food services, and rentals. | 47 miles north of Turkey Point site | Development of facilities for public use limited within property.  | FDEP May 2001  | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 8 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name  | Summary of Project  | Location                                | Status  | Reference      | Retained |
|---|---|---|---|----------------|----------|
| Lignumvitae Key Botanical State Park                    | Lignumvitae Key is the only Florida Key that is still in its natural state and was chosen as the state's first botanical park. Its rare and delicate ecosystem primarily consists of subtropical hardwood hammock. The smaller island Shell Key is primarily a mangrove island and has been left undisturbed. Islands accessible only by private boat. Public recreation activities include boating, fishing, snorkeling, and diving. | 42 miles southwest of Turkey Point site | Development of facilities for public use limited within property. | FDEP Dec 2000  | No       |
| Mary Krome Bird Refuge                                  | 2.5 acre preserve is bordered on two sides by avocado groves. Public recreation activities include bird and butterfly watching  | 10 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Development unlikely in the future.                               | NABA Undated   | No       |
| Oleta River State Park                                  | The park's 1.7 miles of the Oleta River and its associated mangrove wetlands are important habitat for many species. The West Indian manatee and golden leather fern are among the 40 designated plant and animal species found in the 1033 acre park. Public recreation activities include picnicking, swimming, canoeing, fishing, bicycling/jogging, and primitive camping.  | 36 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Development of facilities for public use limited within property. | FDEP Dec 2008  | No       |
| San Pedro Underwater Archaeological Preserve State Park | The 644 acre preserve consists of the 1733 shipwreck "San Pedro" surrounded by a ring of sandy substrate and seagrass beds. Public recreation activities include snorkeling, scuba diving, and glass bottom boat tours.   | 45 miles southwest of Turkey Point site | Development unlikely in the future.                               | FDEP Jun 2000b | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 9 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                                  | Summary of Project   | Location  | Status                              | Reference  | Retained |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|----------|
| The Barnacle Historic State Park              | The historic structures in this 9 acre park were built in the late 1800s and include a boat house, carriage house, and the Barnacle house which was originally built as a wooden bungalow four feet off the ground on pilings. About half of the surrounding land supports a tropical hardwood hammock. The primary public activity on the site is visiting the historic home and touring the grounds. | 21 miles north of Turkey Point site                                 | Development unlikely in the future. | FDEP Aug 2003  | No       |
| Windley Key Fossil Reef Geological State Park | While the upland area at the 32 acre park contains one of the finest hardwood hammocks in the Florida Keys, the park's main attraction is the fossil coral reef exposed by the keystone quarry operations. Public recreation activities include education and interpretation programs, hiking, and nature appreciation.  | 36 miles southwest of Turkey Point site                             | Development unlikely in the future. | FDEP May 2003  | No       |
| Everglades Mitigation Bank (EMB)              | The EMB is a 13,249 acre site permitted by the state of Florida and the Army Corps of Engineers. The EMB consists of land located between U.S. Highway 1 and Card Sound Road and east of Card Sound Road extending to Card Sound, then north along the L-31E Canal. EMB activities would be in accordance with permit conditions.  | Just southwest of the Turkey Point site and east of U.S. Highway 1. | Development unlikely in the future. | FDEP Oct 1996, FDEP Oct 2003, USACE and SFWMD Aug 2002 | Yes      |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 10 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name   | Summary of Project   | Location                               | Status   | Reference                      | Retained |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) Projects</b> |  |  |  |                                |          |
| Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project - Phase 1                  | The project would expand and restore wetlands adjacent to Biscayne Bay, and enhance the ecological health of Biscayne National Park. Phase 1 incorporates most of the Deering Estate features, including a spreader canal, culverts, and canal improvements. The Cutler Wetlands features include culverts, a canal and restoration of the Lennar Flow-way. The L-31E Flow-way/ North Canal Flow-way features include a spreader canal and several culverts. | 1.5 miles west of Turkey Point site    | Proposed. Design and permitting of Phase 1 completed. Construction of L-31E culverts and Deering Estates Flow-way began in 2010. Construction of Cutler Wetlands scheduled to begin in 2011. | SFWMD Jun 2010, USACE Jun 2010 | Yes      |
| Broward County Water Preserve Areas                              | Project serves as a seepage control buffer between developed urban areas and the Everglades. Components include: Water Conservation Areas 3A/3B Levee Seepage Management, C-11 Impoundment, and C-9 Impoundment.   | 37 miles north of Turkey Point site    | Proposed. Basis of Design Report completed. Construction of C-11 Impoundment scheduled to begin in 2012.   | SFWMD Jun 2010, USACE Nov 2009 | No       |
| C-111 Spreader Canal Western Project                             | The project would establish more natural water flows in Taylor Slough to improve the timing, distribution and quantity of fresh water flowing into Florida Bay.  | 6 miles southwest of Turkey Point site | Proposed. Design testing completed. Construction began in 2010.  | SFWMD Jun 2010, USACE May 2009 | Yes      |
| Central Lake Belt Storage Area                                   | The project would store excess water from Water Conservation Areas 2 and 3 and provide environmental water supply deliveries to Northeast Shark River Slough, Water Conservation Area 3B, and to Biscayne Bay.   | 30 miles north of Turkey Point site    | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design.   | USACE Undated                  | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 11 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name  | Summary of Project   | Location                                | Status   | Reference                      | Retained |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------|----------|
| Everglades National Park Seepage Management Project | Project to improve water deliveries to Northeast Shark River Slough and restore wetland in Everglades National Park by reducing levee and groundwater seepage and increasing sheetflow. There are three components: L-31N Levee Improvements for Seepage Management, S-356 Structure Relocation and Bird Drive Recharge. | 22 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Proposed. Construction scheduled to begin in 2014.             | USACE Mar 2006, USACE Nov 2009 | No       |
| L-31N (L-30) Seepage Management Pilot Project       | Project evaluates the uncertainty and constructability of seepage management technology for possible full-scale use along Everglades National Park.  | 19 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Proposed. Project activities expected to be completed in 2012. | USACE Nov 2009                 | No       |
| Melaleuca Eradication and other Exotic Plants       | Project enhances efforts to control invasive exotic species in south Florida through mass clearing and controlled release of biological agents.  | Throughout the region                   | Proposed. Project is scheduled to begin in 2011.               | USACE Nov 2009                 | No       |
| Miccosukee Tribe Water Management Plan              | Project includes providing water storage capacity and water quality enhancement for Miccosukee Tribe's reservation discharge waters and conversion of 900 acres tribally owned cattle pasture into a managed wetland retention/detention area.   | 45 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design.                 | USACE Undated                  | No       |
| North Lake Belt Storage Area                        | Project will include an in-ground storage reservoir with a total capacity of approximately 90,000 acre feet and associated canals, pumps, and water control structures. It will store a portion of the stormwater runoff from the C-6, C-11, and C-9 basins.   | 34 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design.                 | USACE Undated                  | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 12 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name   | Summary of Project  | Location                            | Status   | Reference        | Retained |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|----------|
| Restoration of Pineland and Hardwood Hammocks in C-111 Basin | This project includes restoring south Florida slash pine and hardwood hammock species on a 200-foot wide strip on each side of two miles of Florida SR 9336 and the establishment of two, one acre hammocks alongside the road. The project will provide water quality treatment for runoff passing through the hammocks and demonstrate techniques required to re-establish native conifer and hardwood forests. | 14 miles west of Turkey Point site  | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design. | USACE<br>Undated | No       |
| South Miami-Dade Reuse                                       | Project will include an expansion in the existing South District Wastewater Treatment Plant to provide additional water supply to the South Biscayne Bay and Coastal Wetlands Enhancement Project at sufficient quantity and water quality to meet the ecological goals and objectives of Biscayne Bay. This will require construction of a pretreatment and membrane treatment system.                           | 6 miles north of Turkey Point site  | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design. | USACE<br>Undated | Yes      |
| Water Conservation Area 2B Flows to Everglades National Park | The project purpose is to store excess water from Water Conservation Area 2 in the Central Lake Belt Storage Area through control structures and conveyance features. Additionally, the project will supplement environmental water supply deliveries to North Shark River Slough, Water Conservation Area 3B and Biscayne Bay.   | 30 miles north of Turkey Point site | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design. | USACE<br>Undated | No       |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 13 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name   | Summary of Project   | Location                                | Status   | Reference      | Retained |
|--|--|---|--|----------------|----------|
| Water Conservation Area 3 Decompartmentalization and Sheetflow Enhancement Project | Construction of new water control structures and modification or removal of levees, canals, and water control structures in Water Conservation Areas 3A and 3B for reestablishment of the ecological and hydrologic connection with Everglades National Park.  | 25 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Proposed. EIS currently being drafted.   | USACE Nov 2009 | No       |
| West Miami-Dade Reuse  | The project includes a wastewater treatment plant expansion of a future West Miami-Dade Wastewater Treatment Plant to meet water demands from the Bird Drive Recharge Area, South Dade Conveyance System, and Northeast Shark River Slough.  | 21 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Proposed. Currently in preconstruction design.   | USACE Undated  | No       |
| Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park                              | Project restores the natural hydrologic conditions in Everglades National Park, which were altered by the construction of roads, levees, and canals. The project includes four major components: an 8.5 mile area flood mitigation, Tamiami trail modifications, conveyance and seepage control features, and a combined operation plan. | 22 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Construction underway. Project Completion anticipated in 2013.                                   | USACE Nov 2009 | No       |
| C-111 South Dade Project   | Project enhances freshwater wetlands and improves freshwater flows in the Southern Glades and in southern Miami-Dade County. It improves the hydrology of the coastal marshlands of northeastern Florida Bay.  | 6 miles southwest of Turkey Point site  | Proposed. Preliminary design of initial phase completed. Project completion anticipated in 2014. | USACE Nov 2009 | Yes      |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 14 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                         | Summary of Project     | Location                                | Status      | Reference | Retained |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------------|-----------|----------|
| <b>Mining Projects</b>               |                        |   |             |           |          |
| Card Sound Quarry                    | Crushed limestone mine | 8 miles southwest of Turkey Point site  | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Continental Florida Materials Pit #1 | Crushed limestone mine | 28 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| F.E.C. Quarry                        | Crushed limestone mine | 32 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Krome Quarry                         | Crushed limestone mine | 21 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Lake 6 Quarry                        | Crushed limestone mine | 33 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Miami Quarry                         | Crushed limestone mine | 26 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Pennsuco Quarry                      | Crushed limestone mine | 32 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| S.C.L. Quarry                        | Crushed limestone mine | 25 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Sawgrass Quarry                      | Crushed limestone mine | 37 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| Sunshine Rock Quarry                 | Crushed limestone mine | 25 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |
| White Rock Quarry                    | Crushed limestone mine | 36 miles north of Turkey Point site     | Operational | USGS 2005 | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 15 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name   | Summary of Project   | Location                                | Status   | Reference                     | Retained |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Other Actions/Projects</b>  |  |   |  |                               |          |
| Central and Southern Florida Flood Control Project                               | The C&SF Flood Control Project was intended to provide flood control, water supply, prevention of saltwater intrusion, and protection of fish and wildlife resources. It includes 1000 miles of canals, 720 miles of levees, and almost 200 water control structures. It covers 16 counties over an 18,000-square-mile area. The existing project provides water supply, flood protection, water management and other benefits to South Florida. The project has had unintended negative effects on the Everglades and the entire south Florida ecosystem. | Throughout the region.                  | Operational  | HRA Jun 2006                  | No       |
| Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility for Turkey Point Power Plant Units 3 & 4 | The Units 3 & 4 ISFSI will be a dry storage facility for spent nuclear fuel that would not have a liquid discharge and would only have limited operational activities.   | Co-located on the Turkey Point site     | Proposed. Facility currently under construction. Loading expected in 2011. | FDEP Jun 2009<br>FPL Nov 2010 | Yes      |
| AAR Landing Gear Center  | Repair and rebuild aircraft landing gears and brakes.  | 30 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Jul 2009             | No       |
| Aero Kool Corporation  | Overhaul aircraft air cycle equipment and heat exchangers and operation of degreaser baths and paint booths  | 27 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Feb 2006             | No       |
| American Whirlpool Products Corporation  | Acrylic and fiberglass bath and spa manufacturer   | 43 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | BCEPGMD Dec 2003              | No       |
| Angler Boat Corporation  | Fiberglass boat manufacturer   | 29 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Dec 2006             | No       |
| Benada Aluminum of Florida Inc   | Extruded aluminum products manufacturer  | 29 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Mar 2006             | No       |
| Bertram Yacht Inc  | Fiberglass boat manufacturer   | 26 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Sep 2009             | No       |
| Blumberg Industries -Fine Art Lamps  | Lamp manufacturer  | 33 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Nov 2008             | No       |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 16 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name                                  | Summary of Project  | Location                                | Status  | Reference                             | Retained |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|----------|
| CEMEX Miami                                   | Cement kiln   | 25 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Mar 2008b                    | No       |
| Cigarette Racing Team LLC                     | Fiberglass boat manufacturer  | 32 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Feb 2010                     | No       |
| Contender Boats Inc                           | Fiberglass boat manufacturer  | 6 miles northeast of Turkey Point site  | Operational   | M-D DERM Aug 2008                     | No       |
| DM Industries Ltd                             | Acrylic and fiberglass bath and spa manufacturer  | 34 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Dec 2008                     | No       |
| Dusky Marine Inc.                             | Fiberglass boat manufacturer  | 45 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | BCEPGMD Jun 2008                      | No       |
| Dyplast Products, LLC                         | Polystyrene and polyurethane products manufacturer  | 32 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Aug 2007                     | No       |
| Eastern Aero Marine, Inc.                     | Inflatable vest and raft manufacturer   | 28 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Jan 2010                     | No       |
| Englehard Hex Core                            | Nomex honeycomb board, and fiberglass honeycomb board and rotor manufacturer  | 28 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Sep 1999                     | No       |
| Exteria Building Products, LLC.               | Polypropylene siding manufacturer   | 35 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Oct 2008, M-D DERM May 2009b | No       |
| Flowers Baking Company of Miami               | Commercial bread bakery   | 36 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM Mar 2009b                    | No       |
| Goodrich Corporation Landing Systems Services | Landing gear refurbishing facility  | 35 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational   | M-D DERM May 2010                     | No       |
| Homestead-Miami Speedway                      | The 1087 acre speedway hosts a wide variety of national, regional and local motorsport events, including the final races for all three NASCAR national championship series and two Indy Car championship series. The facility has seating capacity for 67,612 spectators. | 5 miles northwest of Turkey Point site  | Operational   | HMS 2010                              | No       |
| Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvements.        | This project would expand the spectator area to include 120 acres currently used for overflow parking add 12,000 spectator seats.   | 5 miles northwest of Turkey Point site  | Proposed. If approved the project is scheduled to be completed in 2013. | HMS 2010                              | Yes      |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-2 (Sheet 17 of 17)**  
**Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects and Other Actions in the Vicinity of the Turkey Point Site During the Construction Period (2013-2022)**

| Project Name   | Summary of Project   | Location                                | Status   | Reference                      | Retained |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------------|----------|
| Media Printing Corporation   | Commercial printer   | 29 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | BCEPGMD Dec 2009b              | No       |
| Miami Seaquarium   | The 38 acre marine park is an entertainment venue that is dedicated to education, wildlife conservation and community involvement.   | 23 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | Miami Seaquarium 2009          | No       |
| Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department - Alexander Orr Water Treatment Plant    | Water treatment plant also operates a 150 tpd rotary lime kiln   | 19 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Jul 2008              | No       |
| Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department - Hialeah/ Preston Water Treatment Plant | Water treatment plant also operates a 120 tpd rotary lime kiln and 64 air stripping towers   | 28 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Jan 2006              | No       |
| Midnight Express Powerboats  | Fiberglass boat manufacturer   | 46 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | BCEPGMD Jun 2009               | No       |
| Ram Investments of South Florida - Sea Enterprise Adventures                   | Fiberglass boat manufacturer   | 28 miles northeast of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Jun 2006              | No       |
| Titan America, LLC - Pennsuco Cement   | Cement kiln  | 31 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Sep 2008              | No       |
| US Foundry & Manufacturing Company   | Gray iron foundry and cast iron products manufacturer  | 30 miles northwest of Turkey Point site | Operational  | M-D DERM Apr 2010              | No       |
| Water Reclamation and Wastewater Treatment Plants                              | Numerous plants  | Within 50 miles of Turkey Point site    | Operational  | FDEP Aug 2010a, FDEP Aug 2010b | No       |
| Future Urbanization  | Construction of housing units and associated commercial buildings; roads, bridges and rail; construction of water and/or wastewater treatment facilities and associated pipelines. | Throughout the region.                  | Construction would occur in the future, as described in state and local land-use planning documents. | MDC Nov 2007                   | No       |

Note: All the projects listed in the table would have impacts on land use, water use, ecology, and socioeconomics within the 50-mile radius of the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 project.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-3 (Sheet 1 of 4)  
Summary of Adverse Cumulative Impacts**

| <b>Category</b>     | <b>Description of Cumulative Impact</b>  | <b>Potential Cumulative Impacts Significance</b> |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Land Use            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – construction on previously disturbed land, designated for industrial use</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – none</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – construction among existing structures, property is designated for industrial use</li> <li>5. EMB - none</li> <li>6. CERP – restore wetlands, providing a land use benefit</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – restore wetlands, providing a land use benefit</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - none</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project - change land use designation of 120 - acres from “Agriculture” to “business and office”</li> </ol> | Small  |
| Historic Properties | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – work plans submitted</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – none</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – not available</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – not available</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - none</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway improvement project - none</li> </ol>  | None   |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-3 (Sheet 2 of 4)  
Summary of Adverse Cumulative Impacts**

| Category              | Description of Cumulative Impact   | Potential Cumulative Impacts Significance   |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Hydrology & Water Use | <p><b>Surface water:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – hydrologic alterations on the Turkey Point plant property and offsite impacts as a result of crossing of canals, wetlands, and surface drainage features</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – none</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – beneficial hydrologic alterations to restore wetlands</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – beneficial hydrologic alterations to restore wetlands</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - - potential small, temporary</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - - potential small, temporary</li> </ol> <p><b>Water Use:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – none</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – none</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI - none</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – not available</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – not available</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - none</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - none</li> </ol> <p><b>Groundwater:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – hydrologic alterations at the construction site, dewatering</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – none</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none</li> <li>5. EMB – beneficial</li> <li>6. CERP – beneficial</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – beneficial</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - potential small, temporary</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - potential small, temporary</li> </ol> <p><b>Water quality:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – land disturbance activities could impact water quality as a result of runoff, potential for spills</li> <li>2. Existing Turkey Point facilities – potential for spills</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> </ol> | <p>Surface water: Large positive</p> <p>Water Use: None</p> <p>Groundwater: Small</p> <p>Water quality: Small</p> |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-3 (Sheet 3 of 4)  
Summary of Adverse Cumulative Impacts**

| Category            | Description of Cumulative Impact  | Potential Cumulative Impacts Significance |
|---------------------|---|---|
|                     | <p><b>Water quality (cont.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – land disturbance activities could impact water quality as a result of runoff, potential for spills</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – land disturbance activities could impact water quality because of runoff, potential for spills</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - land disturbance activities could impact water quality due to runoff, potential for spills</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - land disturbance activities could impact water quality due to runoff, potential for spills</li> </ul>   |   |
| Terrestrial Ecology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – land disturbance and construction traffic near crocodile population inside critical habitat area, would implement mitigation measures</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – operate under management/conservation plans</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – land disturbance in critical habitat area, subject to stormwater requirements to protect water quality and subject to critical habitat requirements to preserve crocodile populations</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – land disturbance in critical habitat area, subject to stormwater requirements to protect water quality and subject to critical habitat requirements to preserve crocodile populations</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - land disturbance activities outside critical habitat area</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - land disturbance activities outside critical habitat area</li> </ul> | Moderate                                  |



Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.7-3 (Sheet 4 of 4)  
Summary of Adverse Cumulative Impacts**

| <b>Category</b> | <b>Description of Cumulative Impact</b>   | <b>Potential Cumulative Impacts Significance</b>  |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Aquatic Ecology | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – hydrologic alterations at the construction site and offsite impacts as a result of crossing of canals, wetlands, and surface drainage features, dredging in equipment barge unloading area</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – none</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – beneficial hydrologic alterations to restore wetlands</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – beneficial hydrologic alterations to restore wetlands</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - potential small, temporary</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - potential small, temporary</li> </ol>   | Small   |
| Socioeconomic   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Units 6 &amp; 7 – physical impacts of construction and in-migrating population of 5139 – no environmental justice impacts</li> <li>2. Operation and maintenance of existing units – 600 – 900 outage workers</li> <li>3. Units 3 &amp; 4 Uprate – none (bounded by subsequent Units 6 &amp; 7 peak workforce)</li> <li>4. Units 3 &amp; 4 ISFSI – none (completed before preconstruction work)</li> <li>5. EMB – none</li> <li>6. CERP – estimated in-migrating population of 1950</li> <li>7. CERP C-111 Spreader Canal – Not available</li> <li>8. INGENCO Resource Recovery Facility - construction activities prior to Units 6 &amp; 7</li> <li>9. Homestead-Miami Speedway Improvement Project - construction activities completed during Units 6 &amp; 7 preconstruction</li> </ol> | Physical Impacts of Construction: Small<br>Socioeconomic (except transportation): Small;<br>Transportation: Moderate<br>Environmental Justice: None |

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

## 4.8 NONRADIOLOGICAL HEALTH IMPACTS

### 4.8.1 PUBLIC HEALTH

Potential nonradiological health impacts of Units 6 & 7 construction are addressed in this section. The potential impacts to the public from water discharges, air emissions, and noise are addressed in [Subsections 4.2.3](#) and [4.4.1](#).

### 4.8.2 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Constructing the units and associated transmission lines would involve risks to workers from accidents or occupational illnesses. These risks could result from such incidents as construction accidents (e.g., falls and burns), exposure to toxic or oxygen-replacing gases, and other causes.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains a statistical database that includes national and state-by-state total recordable cases, which is a measure of work-related injuries or illnesses that include death, days away from work, restricted work activity, and medical treatment beyond first aid. The 2008 nationwide total recordable cases rate published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for utility sector construction was 4.1 per 100 workers (BLS 2010a). The same statistic for Florida is 4.7 per 100 workers (BLS 2010b). These rates were used to estimate the number of total recordable cases for the construction of Units 6 & 7. The national and state total recordable case rates were multiplied by the number of workers ([Table 3.10-2](#)) and the resulting estimates are presented in [Table 4.8-1](#). The annual average total recordable cases for the period encompassing preconstruction and construction activities were estimated for both units as well as the peak annual (12 months) total recordable cases.

#### **Section 4.8 References**

BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics) 2010a. *Table 1. Incidence rates of nonfatal occupational injuries and illnesses, 2008*. Available at <http://www.bls.gov/iif/home.htm>, accessed July 6, 2010.

BLS 2010b. *Table 6. Incidence rates of nonfatal occupational injuries and illnesses by industry and case types, 2008, Florida*. Available at <http://www.bls.gov/iif/home.htm>, accessed July 6, 2010.

Turkey Point Units 6 & 7  
COL Application  
Part 3 — Environmental Report

**Table 4.8-1**  
**Estimated Total Recordable Cases (TRCs)**

| <b>Time Frame</b>                      | <b>TRC Incidence at US Rate<sup>(a)</sup></b> | <b>TRC Incidence at FL Rate<sup>(a)</sup></b> |
|--|---|---|
| Annual average                         | 86 <sup>(b)</sup>                             | 93 <sup>(b)</sup>                             |
| Peak 12-month period<br>(Months 31–42) | 161 <sup>(c)</sup>                            | 173 <sup>(c)</sup>                            |

- (a) Based on nonfatal incidence rates developed by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS 2010a, BLS 2010b).
- (b) Average of monthly TRCs for the preconstruction and construction period. Monthly TRCs = number of employees for month/100 x annual rate per 100 workers/12 months per year. Ex. 1000/100 x 4.1/12 = 3.417 TRCs.
- (c) Sum of monthly TRCs for 12-month period of greatest number of construction workers as presented in [Table 3.10-2](#). This 12-month period is Months 34–45.