

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
UNRC

As of: 4/28/15 9:35 AM
Received: April 27, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8ijd-bb18
Comments Due: May 22, 2015
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

2015 APR 28 AM 9:46

Docket: NRC-2009-0337
Notice of Receipt and Availability of Application for a Combined License

RECEIVED

Comment On: NRC-2009-0337-0020
Combined License Application for Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 6 and 7; Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Document: NRC-2009-0337-DRAFT-0079
Comment on FR Doc # 2015-05099

3/15/2015
8 FR 12043

Submitter Information

Name: Ed Griffith
Submitter's Representative: Ed Griffith
Organization: New Progressive Alliance
Government Agency Type: Federal
Government Agency: NRC

65

General Comment

See attached file(s)

Attachments

15-04 Florida Nuclear Plants

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM - 013
E-RIDS= ADM -03

Add= *A. Williamson (ARW)*

npa

new progressive alliance

NewProgs.org

April 27, 2015

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

The New Progressive Alliance at <http://newprogs.org/> urges you to reject Florida Power and Light's plan to build two new nuclear reactors on the shores of Biscayne Bay. The two nuclear plants are poorly placed, are a clear and present danger to the water supply, and are a bad risk in light of over 50 years of history on the use of nuclear power.

The two nuclear plants are poorly placed because the massive new reactors are adjacent to Biscayne National Park – one of the nation's largest marine parks. There are also three sets of massive power lines going inside Everglades National Park at the heart of Everglades restoration. The vented hot steam will likely contain household chemicals, pharmaceuticals, bacteria and viruses that end up in the county's wastewater. Even in small amounts, these can affect human health and terrestrial and marine environments like mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reefs. The aerosol mist can be dispersed widely by wind and water currents. Within just six miles of the proposed site there are a state-managed aquatic preserve, expansive wetland habitat preserve, two national parks and a national wildlife refuge. These two new nuclear plants would also threaten other sensitive marine resources such as dozens of federally protected species to include the American crocodile, Florida manatee and five species of sea turtle. Power lines from the expanded plant could also be run across the eastern side of Everglades National Park.

The two new reactors are a clear and present danger to the water supply. With two new reactors, Turkey Point would become one of the largest nuclear facilities in the country. They will require 90 million gallons a day of Miami-Dade's treated wastewater for cooling. The project would be highly water-intensive, potentially threatening both the Biscayne Bay and the Biscayne Aquifer. If there is insufficient treated wastewater for cooling the reactors, the radial wells used for back-up cooling would become one of the largest well-fields in the Southeast and could lead to further saltwater intrusion into the Biscayne Aquifer, already a major problem impinging on South Florida's limited freshwater supply.

The two nuclear plants are a bad risk in light of over 50 years of history on the use of nuclear power. Over half a century of experience throughout the world indicates nuclear energy is not the answer. It is the most expensive, the most delayed, and dangerous. No nuclear plant has yet been built that is not over budget and behind schedule. It is also carbon intensive in uranium mining, uranium processing where fracking is used just as for natural gas, building the nuclear plant, and transportation of uranium to and used radioactive waste away from the nuclear plant.

The half-life of the main fuel, U-235, is 703.8 million years. Plutonium is also routinely created in the process of running a nuclear plant. It is highly toxic and its various isotopes have half-lives ranging from about 25,000 to 80 million years. These extremely dangerous substances will require secure storage and protection for a very long period of time and we do not have an agreed upon place to store or agreed way to transport nuclear waste. This is especially a problem for these two nuclear plants because they are in an area likely to be hard hit by increasing sea-level rise, storm surges and hurricanes.

For verification see references 65, 70, 89, 103, 125, 126, 131, 223, 274, 344, 364, 378 - 380, 406 - 408, 412, 435 - 439, 484, 485, 519, 520, 558 - 565, 582 - 585, 603, 604, 692 - 705, 719, 720, 747 - 749, 834 - 836, 847, 848, 891, 942 - 963, 1072 - 1077, 1175 - 1196, 1320, 1364 - 1382, 1584-1591, 1690-1692, 1774, 1789, 1823-1832 of this article: "The Environment" at http://www.newprogs.org/the_environment_under_the_democratic_republican_uniparty

We at the New Progressive Alliance ask you to do the right thing because these two nuclear plants are poorly placed, are a clear and present danger to the water supply, and are a bad risk in light of over 50 years of history on the use of nuclear power.

Sincerely,

Ed and Harriet Griffith
New Progressive Alliance
eh.griffith@yahoo.com
215 Piedmont Ave. NE, #1106
Atlanta, GA 30308-3335
404-500-1538