### Certainty Key

#### CP is necessarily uncertain – main warrant in the Hopf card is that licenses are a key prerequisite to certainty and therefore investor interest

#### more evidence:

#### Certainty key

Cuttino, ’12 Phyllis, Director of Pew Clean Energy Program, 7/5, "Investment Will Follow if Congress Renews the Production Tax Credit", www.huffingtonpost.com/phyllis-cuttino/investment-will-follow-if\_b\_1638790.html

Congress has historically preferred to implement energy policy through a series of tax incentives rather than mandates. Although the efficacy of those different approaches are subject to debate, it is clear that the lack of a consistent energy policy hinders private investment, causes the loss of American jobs, and stymies business growth in the sector. Further, it is essential for Congress to provide certainty about the long-term availability of an incentive. One such tax policy that demonstrates the impact of uncertainty is the Production Tax Credit (PTC). This tax credit has been wildly successful, helping to fuel 400 wind manufacturing facilities in 43 states and twelve-fold growth in domestic manufacturing of wind turbine components in the past six years alone. However, the credit could expire this year for the fourth time in two decades. This uncertainty has put off investors and led to boom-and-bust cycles in the industry: Wind installations have declined by 73 to 93 percent in years without a PTC. Because of the long timelines (wind projects can take 9 to 16 months from groundbreaking to power generation), investors seeking new wind projects must look two to three years into the future to decide whether the costs and benefits warrant investment. As we've seen in the past, investors are wary of supporting new projects if the availability of the tax credit is uncertain. With the PTC's future once again in doubt, factories are already seeing a sharp decline in new orders for 2013 -- when the credit will have expired -- and layoffs have begun. Transparency, longevity, and consistency -- TLC -- are critical signals to investors and essential factors to increase American jobs, support businesses, and create renewable power. While we dither, other countries are moving ahead, providing strong policy signals and incentivizing the growth of the clean energy sector in their countries. Even oil-rich Saudi Arabia understands the opportunity and has announced its intention to become the "kingdom of sustainable energy." It also has set an ambitious renewable-energy goal. As a result of our indecision, America could again lose its leadership position in a sector that we helped invent, innovate, and engineer. Why turn our back on a slice of the global economy that has experienced growth of 600 percent (excluding R&D) since 2004? Congress should act now to extend the PTC rather than wait for an already over-packed lame-duck session after the 2012 election or a new legislative session in 2013. It would hardly be controversial. The PTC enjoys widespread, bipartisan support from groups as diverse as the National Governors Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Farm Bureau Federation, environmentalists, labor unions, and others. Members of the House and Senate have indicated their agreement that the PTC should be renewed. Intermittent policies hurt the ability of the United States to consistently compete and turn clean energy innovation into manufacturing, deployment, and export opportunities. Congress should act now -- not wait -- to provide investors with the assurance that they need to fuel American investment, job, and business growth and to assure our global leadership in a rapidly emerging new sector.

### SMR Fast

#### Takes 24 months to build

Rosner & Goldberg, Physics Prof @ U Chicago, ’11

[Robert Rosner, William E. Wrather, Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and Physics at The University of Chicago, Director, Energy Policy Institute, Harris School of Public Policy, Stephen Goldberg, Professor of Law Emeritus at Northwestern Law, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.,” Energy Policy Institute at The University of Chicago, November 2011]

SMRs could potentially mitigate such a risk in several ways. First, SMRs have lower precompletion risk due to shorter construction schedules (24-36 months as compared with 48 months). Second, because of their smaller size, SMRs have lower market risk because there is significantly less power than needs to be sold as compared with GW-level plants. Finally, the modular nature of SMRs affords the flexibility to build capacity on an as-needded basis. In the case of unsubsidized financing, particularly relevant to merchant markets, utility decision makers that have significant aversion to risk of future natural gas spikes (i.e., gas prices rising to about $7/Mcf or one standard deviation above the recent average behavior of natural gas prices) would possibly view alternatives to gas-fired generation as attractive options, particularly if the investment requirements are comparable – SMRs could potentially “fit the bill.”

## Politics

### AT: Warming

#### **No impact – their evidence says**

#### **SMRs solve warming**

Rosner & Goldberg, Physics Prof @ U Chicago, ’11

[Robert Rosner, William E. Wrather, Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and Physics at The University of Chicago, Director, Energy Policy Institute, Harris School of Public Policy, Stephen Goldberg, Professor of Law Emeritus at Northwestern Law, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.,” Energy Policy Institute at The University of Chicago, November 2011]

As stated earlier, SMRs have the potential to achieve significant greenhouse gas emission reductions. They could provide alternative baseload power generation to facilitate the retirement of older, smaller, and less efficient coal generation plants that would, otherwise, not be good candidates for retrofitting carbon capture and storage technology. They could be deployed in regions of the U.S. and the world that have less potential for other forms of carbon-free electricity, such as solar or wind energy. There may be technical or market constraints, such as projected electricity demand growth and transmission capacity, which would support SMR deployment but not GW-scale LWRs.