

**Brandy Butler**

---

**From:** Brandy Butler on behalf of Records Clerk  
**Sent:** Monday, August 21, 2017 8:38 AM  
**To:** 'rm@sunpine.us'  
**Cc:** Consumer Contact  
**Subject:** RE: Docket No. 20170009 - Oppose FPL's Unfair Request

Good morning Ross McCluney,

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20170009 and forwarding your comments to the Office of Consumer Assistance and Outreach.

Sincerely,

Brandy Butler  
Commission Deputy Clerk I  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
Phone: (850) 413-7123

-----Original Message-----

From: [rm@everyactioncustom.com](mailto:rm@everyactioncustom.com) [<mailto:rm@everyactioncustom.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 20, 2017 5:27 PM  
To: Records Clerk  
Subject: Docket No. 20170009 - Oppose FPL's Unfair Request

Dear FL PSC,

Dear Commissioners,

As a Graduate Student in physics at the University of Miami in 1972, I prepared a comment on FPL's EIS required before they could build the first two nuclear reactors at Turkey Point south of Miami. I wrote my comments at the request of Tropical Audubon Society and submitted by Bill Partington, Director of the Environmental Information Center. It was received on 3 April 1972 and assigned SPDC number 72-0799 by the State Planning and Development Clearinghouse. I addressed it to Donald Albright at 702 South Duval St and Homer E. Still, Jr. at 725 So. Bronough St., of SPDC in Tallahassee.

In it I described a number of things I believed could go wrong with the new plant, especially its many cooling canals. It addressed the effects of increasing siltation and water turbidity on the large volumes of water flowing through the cooling system on a daily basis, the effects of interruption of overland and subsurface flow of freshwater into Card Sound and Biscayne Bay, the sensitivities of some species to salinity gradient variations across the broad estuarine belt, the likely accumulation of biological and mineral deposits on the surfaces of the cooling tubes over time and their exposure over long time periods to low-level nuclear radiation over long time periods (a particular problem if the material becomes detached from the tubes and enters the Sound or the Bay, alterations of fresh-water overflow over long time periods that can affect fresh-water supplies used by nature and humans in the vicinity of the canals. I further made suggestions for alteration of some passages in the EIS to better protect these sensitive assets.

I specifically called attention to the evaporative loss of fresh water from the cooling system and the consequent increase in salinity in that water as make-up water is introduced from estuarine waters adjacent to the plant. I mentioned special emergency conditions that could cause FPL to release saline water in some quantity into the Sound and Lower Biscayne Bay.

A couple of years ago I was visited by an attorney for Tropical Audubon Society who informed me that many of the treats I outlined in my comments on the EIS are indeed occurring and legal actions are being taken or contemplated to force FPL to remediate the problems being caused and not to attempt expansion of nuclear power production at the site.

In particular, now, I ask you to reject FPL's request in Docket No. 20170009. It is not fair for the company to continue to heap the financial risk onto Florida customers like me to pursue new reactors at Turkey Point, a project for which there is no builder. I understand the builder, Westinghouse, filed for bankruptcy and is out of the nuclear construction business. Apparently FPL will not commit to actually build the reactors, nor will it commit to a price tag. Further, the company can't even show that the reactors are in the best economic interest of their customers.

If the reactor project is so speculative that FPL cannot provide you with evidence that the project remains a good deal for customers, how can FPL then ask your permission to incur even more costs pursuing the licenses for the project, which ultimately allows it to recover its costs plus interest from customers?

As an FPL customer, I have already paid too much, for too long, toward this phantom project, as have all other FPL customers. Enough is enough. Thank you in advance for considering customers' economic, environmental, and fresh water supply interests in this proceeding. Please reject FPL's heavy-handed and unprecedented request.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ross McCluney

219 Johnson Ave Cape Canaveral, FL 32920-3212 [rm@sunpine.us](mailto:rm@sunpine.us)