



Physicians for
Social Responsibility



United States Affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War

Nuclear Subsidies in the House Climate bill (H.R. 2454) and Senate Energy bill (S. 1462)

Subsidy	House Climate Bill (American Clean Energy and Security Act, H.R. 2454)	Senate Energy Bill (American Clean Energy Leadership Act, S. 1462)*	Details
Clean Energy Deployment Administration (CEDA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 30% of value of CEDA could be used for new reactors; • Requires congressional authority for loan guarantees; • Authorizes guarantees for tax-equity and purchase power agreements that could be used for nuclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds new reactors; • Allows <u>unlimited</u> loan guarantees with no congressional authority needed; • Directly funds CEDA at \$10 billion with authorization for “such sums as necessary” • Merges Title XVII Loan Guarantee Program with CEDA 	The Senate version would put no limit on how much loan guarantees could be given out. The nuclear industry has requested \$122 billion in guarantees under Title XVII Loan Guarantees. The Congressional Budget Office estimates a default rate of 50%. For more details on CEDA, see http://www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/ceda-provisions.pdf
New nuclear excluded from RES baseline	Yes	Yes	Both bills exclude the production by new reactors as part of a state’s baseline, thereby reducing the renewable energy production requirement in states that build new reactors. The Senate bill also excludes uprates (increased energy production) of existing reactors from the baseline.
Profit from carbon- pricing	Yes	Yes	Exelon estimates that carbon pricing “will add \$700 to \$750 million to Exelon's annual revenues for every \$10 per metric ton increase in the price of CO2 allowances.” At \$15 per metric ton of CO2, this is equivalent to a windfall of \$1 billion per year.

Sense of Congress in favor of nuclear power	No	Yes	The Senate energy bill includes a Sense of Congress that it is the policy of the United State to “support the use and expansion of nuclear energy” for the production of energy and reduction of greenhouse gases. The statement also finds that it is the US government’s obligation to provide for the disposal of spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste; that reprocessing may reduce the burden on geologic repositories; that spent fuel should be stored in centralized facilities; and that State and local support for centralized storage should be encouraged by expediting a long-term management program.
Promotes reprocessing of radioactive waste	No	Yes	The Senate bill authorizes the design and evaluation of reprocessing facilities. It requires that DOE develop integrated process flow sheet for all steps involved in reprocessing, characterize waste streams for all steps, and develop waste stream process and designs for the disposal facilities. DOE must develop a generic environmental impact statement for reprocessing and develop firm cost estimates. It also requires the NRC and DOE to revise worker and public radiation standards for reprocessing facilities.
Authorizes funding for nuclear power R&D	No	Yes	The Senate bill authorizes \$5.17 billion from FY2010-FY2013 for nuclear energy research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized in EPACT 2005, including Generation IV, Nuclear Power 2010, reprocessing, and nuclear fellowships/ grants
Reauthorizes Nuclear Power 2010	No	Yes	The Senate bill reauthorizes this taxpayer-industry cost-share program to fund the licensing of new reactors and the certification of new designs. The program was intended to fund a couple of licenses and sunset in FY2011.
Report on thorium fuel	Yes	No	The House bill requires DOE to submit a report on thorium fuel to Congress by Feb 2011

Authorizes a Commission on Radioactive Waste	No	Yes	The Commission of 11 members will study alternatives for spent fuel and high-level waste management, including reprocessing, and alternative means of managing and financing the program. Recommendations are due in 2 years.
Nuclear workforce development and training	No	Yes	The Senate version includes energy career grants via States to elementary and secondary schools and community colleges, direct grants to community colleges for programs in energy utility trades and “sustainable” energy workforce training,” career counselor outreach, and a website on energy career opportunities. Nuclear is eligible under all of these programs. Authorizes an NAS study on the availability of skilled workers, including nuclear.
Financing nuclear parts manufacturing	Yes	Yes	The House bill establishes a Revolving Loan Fund Program; parts manufacturing for nuclear reactors is eligible. Both the House and Senate CEDA provisions include financing for manufacturing technologies, including nuclear parts.
International technology deployment	Yes	N/A	The House climate bill allocates allowances to funding international energy projects, including nuclear power, in developing nations through bilateral assistance and/or multilateral funds provides. A percentage of the annual vintage emissions allowances to international technology deployment: 1% from vintage years 2012 to 2021, 2% from vintage years 2022 to 2026 and 4% from vintage years 2027 to 2050. If the average annual cost of carbon is \$15 per ton, then the allocations would be nearly \$700 billion/year.
Increased DOE authority to enter into contracts	No	Yes	The Senate bill authorizes the DOE Secretary to “enter into transactions with public agencies, private organizations, or other persons on such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate,” including for research, development, or demonstration projects

* The Senate energy bill is planned be added to the pending Senate climate bill.

N/A – The Senate climate bill has not been released to the public yet.