### AT: No Investment

#### This is an add-on – plan spurs private investment –

#### a. SMRs are cheaper – avoids the crushing cost of current reactors – that’s Sanders

#### b. PPAs solve – gets utilities to invest because it reduces risk – that’s Madia

#### c. DOD action – first mover role demonstrates viability – that’s Andres and Breetz and Loudermilk

### AT: Sequestration DA

#### No possible link to their scenario – it’s about the Budget Control Act of 2011 which is what sequestration is based off of – says there will be 478 billion in cuts – plan is NOWHERE CLOSE to that number

#### No impact to sequestration

Singer, Defense Director @ Brookings, 9-23 --- Director, 21st Century Defense Initiative at Brookings (9/23/2012, Peter W., “Sequestration and What it Might Mean for American Military Power, Asia, and the Flashpoint of Korea,” http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2012/09/23-sequestration-defense-singer)

Part V: Conclusions: Sequestration would be Stupid, but the Sky is not Falling

There is an immense amount of concern over sequestration, not just inside DC, but also among our allies. Fortunately, for them and for US security, the rhetoric does not match the reality.By looking at the actual numbers in their context and even in a few worst case scenarios, we can see that the “gap between the U.S. military and our closest rivals” will not “collapse.” [32] The gap will close, which should worry us, but these rivals still have a long way to go. Nor will cuts “destroy” the US military upon which our allies’ security also depends. As Micah Zenko of the Council on Foreign Relations captured so well, “It is implausible that the entire U.S. military would be unable to function with just under $500 billion.”[33] Indeed, far from being in a situation of “utter failure,” the US forces available globally as well as in East Asia might be lessened, but would still be quite potent. And finally, it is hard to square how sequestration would “invite aggression.” A weaker US force would be available to deter and fight foes, but by no means fundamentally changed. Indeed, such a “paper tiger” would actually be supported by spending levels equivalent to the 2007 US military budget.

#### We internal link their impact, shut off of domestic bases collapses our troops deterrence signal – triggers Asian conflict

#### Massive military spending now to get power from renewables

Forbes 12

(2/19, U.S. Defense Contractors Are Hidden Investment Plays in Renewable Energy Initiatives, www.forbes.com/sites/genemarcial/2012/02/19/u-s-defense-contractors-are-hidden-investment-plays-in-renewable-energy-initiatives/

The Defense Department spends some $20 billion a year on energy, using about 300,000 barrels of oil a day, according to the Pew Project on National Security, Energy and Climate Control. And military spending on renewable energy rose 300% between 2006 and 2009, to $1.2 billion, notes Pew, and should exceed $10 billion per year by 2030.

#### Buying power from SMR’s will cost less

Rosner and Goldberg, Professor of Physics at U Chicago and Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory, 11

(Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S., https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf)

President Obama has sought to place federal agencies in the vanguard of efforts to adopt clean energy technologies and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Executive Order 13514, issued on October 5, 2009, calls for reductions in greenhouse gases by all federal agencies, with DOE establishing a target of a 28% reduction by 2020, including greenhouse gases associated with purchased electricity. SMRs provide one potential option to meet the President’s Executive Order. One or more federal agency facilities that can be cost effectively connected to an SMR plant could agree to contract to purchase the bulk of the power output from a privately developed and financed LEAD plant.A LEAD plant, even without the benefits of learning, could offer electricity to federal facilities at prices competitive with the unsubsidized significant cost of other clean energy technologies. Table 4 shows that the LCOE estimates for the LEAD and FOAK-1plants are in the range of the unsubsidized national LCOE estimates for other clean electricity generation technologies (based on the current state of maturity of the other technologies). All of these technologies should experience additional learning improvements over time. However, as presented earlier in the learning model analysis, the study team anticipates significantly greater learning improvements in SMR technology that would improve the competitive position of SMRs over time. Additional competitive market opportunities can be identified on a region-specific, technology-specific basis. For example, the Southeast U.S. has limited wind resources. While the region has abundant biomass resources, the estimated unsubsidized cost of biomass electricity is in the range of $90-130 per MWh (9-13¢/kWh), making LEAD and FOAK plants very competitive (prior to consideration of subsidies).