### AT: Status Quo Solves

#### Uncertainty makes the plan take years longer at best

Bagnal & Kadak, MIT Nuclear Prof, ’10

[Andy Kadak, Former Professor of the Practice Nuclear Science and Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Charles Bagnal, General Electric, “RISK‐INFORMED AND PERFORMANCE‐BASED LICENSING FOR SMRs,” INTERIM REPORT OF THE ANS PRESIDENT’S SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SMR GENERIC LICENSING ISSUES, July 2010]

The DC process, typically lasting several years (and in many cases more than a decade) from preapplication meeting to eventual DC issuance, takes too long to be commercially viable for many SMR developers. However, to promulgate and rely on new regulations specifically tuned to SMRs may add uncertainty to licensing schedules, which would delay SMR construction in the United States. It has been suggested that SMRs might be licensed more directly under new regulations that are more specifically tuned to the advances in technology that they represent, including the potential for mass production of reactor modules in a factory assembly line. Examples include the proposed 10 CFR 53 (Ref. 3), which would establish a new risk‐informed and performance‐based framework, or regulations that would focus on integral LWR systems, or gas‐cooled or liquid metal reactor technology. However, unless there is a significant change in rulemaking methods for new regulations, establishing 10 CFR 53 or technology‐specific rules would entail 5 to 10 years of concerted effort before the review of specific designs could begin. This would defer the potential benefits that SMRs can provide in the near term and delay their timely construction.

#### **NRC doesn’t solve now**

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]

The NRC staff planning process for resolving SMR licensing issues appears to be transparent and methodical, with provision for participation by interested parties. However, a more focused, prioritized, and accelerated process likely will be needed to achieve the goal of a commercial U.S. SMR industry in the 2020 timeframe. For example, by seeking to address a very broad scope of issues affecting not only SMRs but also other advanced reactors, the NRC staff may not be able to give appropriate attention or priority to those issues of greatest importance to near-term SMR commercialization. In addition, the proposed sequencing of the white papers does not reflect any specific set of regulatory or SMR business priorities. Finally, the NRC staff plans would defer consideration of SMR issues affecting engineering design and economics, such as off-site emergency planning, decommissioning funding, and use of probabilistic risk assessment, until the stage of projectspecific COLAs. Another key SMR licensing issue, namely, the determination of the need for and value of licensing an SMR manufacturing plant, would be postponed until FY 2013 or later. The current NRC staff schedule would not permit full resolution of the inventory of SMR licensing issues in a timeframe to support SMR vendor development schedules. For example, both SMR vendors anticipate submitting DC documents to the NRC late in 2013, with the submission of COLAs as early as 2013. Preparation of NRC staff white papers in FY 2010 or FY 2013 would not provide the needed guidance to the vendors on a timely basis. Thus, meeting the objectives set forth in this strategic business plan will require some combination of an accelerated schedule, and a modified process that, as described above, will allow for case-bycase exemptions absent new regulations and guidance.

### AT: Hurts Safety

#### Domestic nuclear industry key to prevent global accidents

Wallace and Williams, Senior Adviser on U.S. Nuclear Energy Project at CSIS and Nuclear Policy Analyst at Partnership for Global Security, 12

(Nuclear Energy in America:Preventing its Early Demise, csis.org/files/publication/120417\_gf\_wallace\_williams.pdf)

Second, setting global norms and standards for safety, security, operations, and emergency response. As the world learned with past nuclear accidents and more recently with Fukushima, a major accident anywhere can have lasting repercussions everywhere. As with nonproliferation and security, America’s ability to exert leadership and influence in this area is directly linked to the strength of our domestic industry and our active involvement in the global nuclear enterprise. A strong domestic civilian industry and regulatory structure have immediate national security significance in that they help support the nuclear capabilities of the U.S. Navy, national laboratories, weapons complex, and research institutions. Third, in the past, the U.S. government could exert influence by striking export agreements with countries whose regulatory and legal frameworks reflected and were consistent with our own nonproliferation standards and commitments. At the same time, our nation set the global standard for effective, independent safety regulation (in the form of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission), led international efforts to reduce proliferation risks (through the 1970 NPT Treaty and other initiatives), and provided a model for industry self-regulation. The results were not perfect, but America’s institutional support for global nonproliferation goals and the regulatory behaviors it modeled clearly helped shape the way nuclear technology was adopted and used elsewhere around the world. This influence seems certain to wane if the United States is no longer a major supplier or user of nuclear technology. With existing nonproliferation and safety and security regimes looking increasingly inadequate in this rapidly changing global nuclear landscape, American leadership and leverage is more important and more central to our national security interests than ever. To maintain its leadership role in the development, design, and operation of a growing global nuclear energy infrastructure, the next administration, whether Democrat or Republican, must recognize the invaluable role played by the commercial U.S. nuclear industry and take action to prevent its early demise.

### AT: SMRs Slow

#### 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.”

#### Streamlining NRC regs speeds up the timeline

Hopf, Senior Nuclear Engineer, ’11

[Jim Hopf, Senior Nuclear Engineer, Member of the American Nuclear Society’s Public Information Committee, “[Roadblock in Congress for SMR Development,”](file:///C:/Users/Abhik/AppData/Roaming/Microsoft/Word/Roadblock%20in%20Congress%20for%20SMR%20Development,) October 25th 2011, http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2011/10/25/congress-smr/]

As many have observed, the main barrier to the deployment of SMRs may not be a lack of government financial or R&D support, but instead the enormous amount of time and money required to get new reactor designs licensed by the NRC. Reactor licensing processes have been taking many years and costing more than a $100 million dollars. Even approving an exact copy of an already-licensed reactor design (for a new site) is projected to take more than two years. Even SMRs that deploy conventional light-water technology (such as NuScale or mPower) can expect a long (~ 5 year) licensing process (starting in late 2012 or 2013). For non-conventional technologies like Hyperion, who knows how long it will take? The NRC has stated that non-conventional SMRs like Hyperion are not on its priority list right now, and that it will only consider such an application when a serious customer has been found (thus setting up a chicken-egg problem). Other issues that may hold back SMRs include security and emergency planning/evacuation requirements, and per-reactor NRC fees. If the NRC is not willing to consider the SMRs’ lower potential radioactivity release, as well as the lower probability of such release, in setting these requirements, as well as scaling fees with reactor capacity, it may destroy SMRs’ economic viability. Perhaps a more effective way for the government to support SMRs is for it to do something to reduce the licensing-related barriers discussed above, as opposed to outright financial support of SMR development. Possible options include making sure the NRC has sufficient resources to handle the entire volume of incoming license applications, somehow limiting the scope of review, or requiring the NRC to complete reviews within some fixed, reasonable time period.

#### Can build SMRs in a couple years

Adams, Former Nuclear Submarine Engineer Officer and Founder of Adams Atomic Engines, Inc., ’11

[Adams, “Smaller nuclear reactors allow decentralized power – some critics not pleased,” http://atomicinsights.com/2011/07/smaller-nuclear-reactors-allow-decentralized-power-some-critics-not-pleased.html]

These days, the US is building small modular reactors in just 3-4 years – in factory settings and in a confined space. There was a time when we could decide to fund and build packaged reactors for installation in remote places like Greenland or Antarctica and have the plant up and running in its designated place in less than two years. It is physically possible, though today’s regulatory environment makes it far more challenging to demonstrate that reality.

### AT: No Econ Impact

#### US and global economic decline causes war –

#### US decline emboldens US enemies and scares US allies we aren’t committed to them anymore – causes major power war in East Asia & The Persian Gulf – Lieberthal & O’Hanlon

#### Global decline causes protectionism and belligerence of autocratic regimes which incites global conflict – also leads to collapse of new democracies – creates failed states with risk of terrorism and disease – Green & Schrage

### AT: No Price Volatility

#### 1) Long term increases in demand ensure volatility – even though gas is plentiful and cheap now, its use in heating, electricity production, industrial applications, and export will outpace supply.

#### 2) Low prices curb production – the current supply glut removes incentives for finding new fields – ensures a price rebound

#### 3) Inherent constraints – we don’t have the storage or pipeline capacity to keep up

#### 4) Prefer historical trends – natural gas prices are inherently cyclical - gluts have happened before and they’ve always been followed by periods of volatility.

#### That’s Perry, Spencer, and Bezdek

### AT: Exports

#### Manufacturing licenses solves export restrictions – creates interagency export standards

Campagna, Hyperion Chief Nuclear Officer, ’10

[Mark S. Campagna, Chief Operations Officer/Chief Nuclear Officer at Hyperion, “UTILIZATION OF NRC MANUFACTURING LICENSE FOR SMALL MODULAR REACTORS,” INTERIM REPORT OF THE ANS PRESIDENT’S SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SMR GENERIC LICENSING ISSUES, July 2010]

Outside the United States, the ML appears to offer an excellent vehicle to enable proper and well‐controlled export of U.S. technology and expertise. This issue is of substantial importance to small modular reactor‐NPP vendors who have business models that depend upon significant global sales/export. However, there must be extensive coordination with other U.S. export provisions to authorize proper delivery. For purposes of this discussion we assume that NPP shipments outside the United States will be allowed (with export permits) to a foreign site that may not have approval for NPP construction/operation. An export license should be able to be combined with an ML in a seamless fashion and cover all Federal export controls, not only from the NRC but also from the DOE, and the U.S. Departments of Commerce, Treasury, and State.

#### That resolves any export competition problems – this is the bottom of the report all of your evidence cites

Glasgow et al., Partner @ Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, October ’12

[James A. Glasgow, Elina Teplinsky, Stephen L. Markus, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, “Nuclear Export Controls: A Comparative Analysis of National Regimes for the Control of Nuclear Materials, Components and Technology,” October 2012]

Apart from needed changes to U.S. export law and regulations, a promising area for reform in the U.S. nuclear export control regime is establishment of new procedures and priorities to substantially reduce the time U.S. agencies require to process license applications. Although the current time frames for licensing stem in part from the inter-agency coordination and public notice-and-comment processes, U.S. agencies should be able to increase the efficiency of their license processing through stronger Executive Branch coordination and emphasis on adherence to the time periods currently specified in the Executive Branch procedures. By signaling to potential customers that U.S. exports may be licensed on a schedule comparable to those of foreign export control regimes, such an improvement could significantly “level the playing field” for U.S. exporters in the near-term.

### AT: Prolif Slow

#### New round of prolif will cause wildfire prolif – countries will actively try to become latent nuclear powers by procuring nuclear weapons tech from nuclear energy plants – that’s Macalister

#### That’s uniquely unstable and different from the Cold War – countries will not announce the pursuit of weapons until they finally have it which sets off nuclear arms races – that’s Below

#### Not Specific to ME – Multiple countries (Saudi Arabia, UAE, Jordan, Egypt) pursuing nuclear weapons through nuclear energy acquisition now – trying to counterbalance Iran

#### [ ] Will be unstable – pursuit of weapons by multiple different powers creates strategic uncertainty that causes normal deterrence patterns to fail – Russel & Krepenivich

### AT: States Incentive CP

#### No solvency – Only removal of NRC regulations can create a competitive SMR market – no private spillover because investors will not do anything with SMR’s until they think regulations are less costly – this is the fundamental barrier to SMR development now – cards citing industry prove. That’s Spencer & Loris and Wheeler– both advantages are based on widespread domestic SMR procurement – means they can’t solve

#### Perm do both

#### 50 state fiat is a voting issue –

#### Interpretation – the negative should not be able to fiat sub-national actors without a comparative solvency evidence

#### First, not logical – no precedent for uniform action – not real world

#### Second, literature base – no solvency advocate for the CP in terms of the plan – not predictable

#### Third, infinitely regressive – legitimizes any permutation of non-USFG actors – kills clash and forces substance crowdout

#### NRC regulations outweigh incentives

Hopf, Senior Nuclear Engineer, ’11

[Jim Hopf, Senior Nuclear Engineer, Member of the American Nuclear Society’s Public Information Committee, “[Roadblock in Congress for SMR Development,”](file:///C:/Users/Abhik/AppData/Roaming/Microsoft/Word/Roadblock%20in%20Congress%20for%20SMR%20Development,) October 25th 2011, http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2011/10/25/congress-smr/]

As many have observed, the main barrier to the deployment of SMRs may not be a lack of government financial or R&D support, but instead the enormous amount of time and money required to get new reactor designs licensed by the NRC. Reactor licensing processes have been taking many years and costing more than a $100 million dollars. Even approving an exact copy of an already-licensed reactor design (for a new site) is projected to take more than two years. Even SMRs that deploy conventional light-water technology (such as NuScale or mPower) can expect a long (~ 5 year) licensing process (starting in late 2012 or 2013). For non-conventional technologies like Hyperion, who knows how long it will take? The NRC has stated that non-conventional SMRs like Hyperion are not on its priority list right now, and that it will only consider such an application when a serious customer has been found (thus setting up a chicken-egg problem). Other issues that may hold back SMRs include security and emergency planning/evacuation requirements, and per-reactor NRC fees. If the NRC is not willing to consider the SMRs’ lower potential radioactivity release, as well as the lower probability of such release, in setting these requirements, as well as scaling fees with reactor capacity, it may destroy SMRs’ economic viability. Perhaps a more effective way for the government to support SMRs is for it to do something to reduce the licensing-related barriers discussed above, as opposed to outright financial support of SMR development. Possible options include making sure the NRC has sufficient resources to handle the entire volume of incoming license applications, somehow limiting the scope of review, or requiring the NRC to complete reviews within some fixed, reasonable time period.

#### Their CP text is ABSURD – there is no solvency for most of their planks –

#### Financial subsidies don’t solve – ignore systemic problems

Spencer & Loris, Nuclear Research Fellow @ Thomas Roe Institute, ’11

[Jack Spencer, Research Fellow in Nuclear Energy in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, Nicolas D. Loris is a Research Associate in the Roe Institute at The Heritage Foundation, “A Big Future for Small Nuclear Reactors?,” February 2nd 2011, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/a-big-future-for-small-nuclear-reactors]

Many politicians are attempting to mitigate these market challenges by offering subsidies, such as loan guarantees. While this approach still enjoys broad support in Congress and industry, the reality is that it has not worked. Despite a lavish suite of subsidies offered in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including loan guarantees, insurance against government delays, and production tax credits, no new reactors have been permitted, much less constructed. These subsidies are in addition to existing technology development cost-sharing programs that have been in place for years and defer significant research and development costs from industry to the taxpayer. The problem with this approach is that it ignores the larger systemic problems that create the unstable marketplace to begin with. These systemic problems generally fall into three categories: Licensing. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is ill prepared to build the regulatory framework for new reactor technologies, and no reactor can be offered commercially without an NRC license. In a September 2009 interview, former NRC chairman Dale E. Klein said that small nuclear reactors pose a dilemma for the NRC because the commission is uneasy with new and unproven technologies and feels more comfortable with large light water reactors, which have been in operation for years and has a long safety record.[11] The result is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a timeframe that would promote near-term investment. So, regardless of which attributes an SMR might bring to the market, the regulatory risk is such that real progress on commercialization is difficult to attain. This then leaves large light water reactors, and to a lesser extent, small ones, as the least risky option, which pushes potential customers toward that technology, which then undermines long-term progress, competition, and innovation. Nuclear Waste Management. The lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management solution is perhaps the greatest obstacle to a broad expansion of U.S. nuclear power. The federal government has failed to meet its obligations under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, to begin collecting nuclear waste for disposal in Yucca Mountain. The Obama Administration’s attempts to shutter the existing program to put waste in Yucca Mountain without having a backup plan has worsened the situation. This outcome was predictable because the current program is based on the flawed premise that the federal government is the appropriate entity to manage nuclear waste. Under the current system, waste producers are able to largely ignore waste management because the federal government is responsible. The key to a sustainable waste management policy is to directly connect financial responsibility for waste management to waste production. This will increase demand for more waste-efficient reactor technologies and drive innovation on waste-management technologies, such as reprocessing. Because SMRs consume fuel and produce waste differently than LWRs, they could contribute greatly to an economically efficient and sustainable nuclear waste management strategy. Government Intervention. Too many policymakers believe that Washington is equipped to guide the nuclear industry to success. So, instead of creating a stable regulatory environment where the market value of different nuclear technologies can determine their success and evolution, they choose to create programs to help industry succeed. Two recent Senate bills from the 111th Congress, the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act (S. 2052) and the Nuclear Power 2021 Act (S. 2812), are cases in point. Government intervention distorts the normal market processes that, if allowed to work, would yield the most efficient, cost-effective, and appropriate nuclear technologies. Instead, the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted, and provides capital subsidies that allow investors to ignore the systemic problems that drive risk and costs artificially high. This approach is especially detrimental to SMRs because subsidies to LWRs distort the relative benefit of other reactor designs by artificially lowering the cost and risk of a more mature technology that already dominates the marketplace. How to Fix a Broken System At the Global Nuclear Renaissance Summit on July 24, 2008, then-NRC chairman Dale Klein said that a nuclear renaissance with regard to small reactors will take “decades to unfold.”[12] If Members of Congress and government agencies do not reform their current approach to nuclear energy, this will most certainly be the case. However, a new, market-based approach could lead to a different outcome. Instead of relying on the policies of the past, Congress, the Department of Energy, and the NRC should pursue a new, 21st-century model for small and alternative reactor technologies by doing the following: Reject additional loan guarantees. Loan guarantee proponents argue that high up-front costs of new large reactors make them unaffordable without loan guarantees. Presumably, then, a smaller, less expensive modular option would be very attractive to private investors even without government intervention. But loan guarantees undermine this advantage by subsidizing the capital costs and risk associated with large reactors. A small reactor industry without loan guarantees would also provide competition and downward price pressure on large light water reactors. At a minimum, Congress should limit guarantees to no more than two plants of any reactor design and limit to two-thirds the amount of any expanded loan guarantee program that can support a single technology. Such eligibility limits will prevent support from going only to a single basic technology, such as large light water reactors.[13] Avoid subsidies. Subsidies do not work if the objective is a diverse and economically sustainable nuclear industry. Despite continued attempts to subsidize the nuclear industry into success, the evidence demonstrates that such efforts invariably fail. The nuclear industry’s success stories are rooted in the free market. Two examples include the efficiency and low costs of today’s existing plants, and the emergence of a private uranium enrichment industry. Government intervention is the problem, as illustrated by the government’s inability to meet its nuclear waste disposal obligations. Build expertise at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC is built to regulate large light water reactors. It simply does not have the regulatory capability and resources to efficiently regulate other technologies, and building that expertise takes time. Helping the NRC to develop that expertise now would help bring new technologies into the marketplace more smoothly.

#### Federal signal key to investor confidence

Yurman 10

(Dan, consultant to firms in the global nuclear energy industry in the area of social media and marketing communications, "NEI seeks consensus on licensing small reactors," 8-18-10, http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2010/08/nei-seeks-consensus-on-licensing-small.html)

What NEI hopes to do, according to Genoa, "is to create a new regulatory paradigm for small reactors," and to do it in the next 18 months. NEI's priorities are laid out in remarks Genoa made to the SMR conference last February. In this interview, he ticks off the items at the top of the list including annual fees, decommissioning costs, emergency response, and modularity, e.g., how to manage multiple small reactors at a single site. Other issues include design certification, the licensing application process, and Price-Anderson liability issues. The last one will be tough, Genoa said. "It is hard any time you have to make a statutory change." That doesn't mean it will be easier to change the regulatory requirements to adapt them to SMRs. The NRC has a mature view of reactor safety issues especially for LWRs. Genoa said the NRC "is doing a good job to encourage the industry to organize itself to address the issues." Despite this assessment, the industry still has to make its case with the agency. Part of it is what the NRC calls a “chicken and egg” issue. The agency wants to see customers showing interest in SMRs before it commits itself to diving deep into the regulatory issues for them. In a speech to a Platts Energy conference in Washington DC June 28, 2010, NRC Commissioner William C. Ostendorff said: “On the one hand, you have the industry and vendors seeking a high level of certainty and assurance from the federal government that related legislation and regulations will provide for a future return on their investment. On the other hand, you have the federal government looking to the industry and vendors for actions and signals that indicate the existence of a market for SMR technology . . .”

#### [ ]

#### CP gets rolled back

Fentiman 1

(Audeen W., Associate Professor in Nuclear Engineering at The Ohio State University, "What Is an NRC Agreement State?" 2-6-01, <http://ohioline.osu.edu/rer-fact/rer_71.html-http://ohioline.osu.edu/rer-fact/rer_71.html>)

Under federal law, the commercial use of most types of radioactive materials in the United States is controlled by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). A company that wants to use radioactive materials obtains a license from the NRC. The NRC inspects each licensed facility periodically to ensure that it is complying with all applicable regulations and the requirements of its license. Federal law also permits a state to reach an agreement with the NRC allowing that state to regulate the use of the NRC-licensed radioactive materials within its borders. That state is then called an NRC Agreement State. Thirty states are now Agreement States, but Ohio is not. State statute permits Ohio to seek NRC Agreement State status. As an Agreement State, Ohio would assume most of the regulatory responsibilities that the NRC now has within the state, including regulating the construction and operation of Ohio's low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. Regulation of nuclear power plants cannot be delegated to a state, although Ohio participates with the NRC in a joint inspection and observation program at these plants. This fact sheet discusses how a state becomes an Agreement State, why Ohio is applying to become an Agreement State, and the status of Ohio's efforts to become an Agreement State. How a State Becomes an Agreement State A governor may notify the NRC by letter that his or her state wishes to become an NRC Agreement State. After being notified of a state's intent to pursue Agreement State status, the NRC works with the state government to develop the capability to perform the tasks required under the Agreement State program. Before the NRC transfers authority to a state, the state must show that it can properly regulate the use of radioactive materials. The state must write its own regulations governing the use of radiation and radioactive materials. When NRC Agreement State status is approved, these regulations will replace NRC regulations, Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), within the borders of the state. State regulations must conform to Federal regulations in certain areas which the NRC feels are key (such as allowable radiation exposure) and must be at least as strict as NRC regulations in all areas. In some cases, a state's regulations may be more stringent than Federal regulations. Prior to becoming an Agreement State, the state must hire and train a sufficient number of people to enforce the regulations. The competence of the technical staff must be maintained at a level acceptable to the NRC after Agreement State status has been granted. Once the regulations are written and the state is prepared to assume regulatory responsibility, a formal application, signed by the Governor, is forwarded to the NRC. The NRC then reviews the application package and announces in the Federal Register that the state wishes to become an Agreement State. The public will have an opportunity to send written comments to the NRC following the Federal Register announcement. If the NRC determines that the state is competent to take on Agreement State responsibilities, it will approve the application. When the Agreement State status is granted: The NRC turns over its files and delegates its regulatory authority to the state All organizations that currently have an NRC license retain that license until it expires The authority to enforce the NRC license is transferred to the Agreement State (except for the licenses of nuclear power plants) When a license expires, it is reviewed and renewed by the Agreement State (except for nuclear power plants) Why Ohio Wants to Become an Agreement State The Ohio Department of Health, Bureau of Diagnostic Safety and Personnel Certification, currently regulates radiation generating machines such as x-ray machines. The Department's Bureau of Radiation Protection regulates radiation from naturally-occurring and accelerator-produced radioactive materials which are commonly used in medicine and research. Regulating these sources of radiation has always been the responsibility of the State. If Ohio becomes an Agreement State, the Ohio Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Protection, would have responsibility for regulating many of the NRC-controlled facilities in the state, including the low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. The Ohio Department of Health has said that, with control of the additional facilities, it can develop a comprehensive radiation safety program that will serve Ohioans better than the current system for several reasons including: A state agency may be able to respond more quickly to radiological incidents and regulatory violations, since the investigators and responders are located in Ohio State government is in a position to be more aware of, and potentially more responsive to, its citizens' concerns than the Federal Government Licensing and inspection fees may be lower The State has increased control over activities related to radiation safety inside its own borders. Status of Ohio's Efforts to Become an Agreement State In 1991, the Governor of Ohio notified the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that Ohio might be interested in becoming an NRC Agreement State. In 1995, the state statute that provided for the location, construction, and operation of a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility in Ohio, designated the Department of Health as Ohio's Radiation Control Agency. It also required that the Department of Health use regulations compatible with and at least as stringent as NRC regulations. In addition, the Department of Health has begun to hire and train personnel necessary to meet the requirements to become an Agreement State. Regulating Nuclear Power Plants and Department of Energy Facilities Federal law does not permit the NRC to delegate its responsibility for regulating Ohio's nuclear power plants when Ohio becomes an Agreement State. In addition, the NRC will continue to regulate the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, now owned and operated by the United States Enrichment Corporation. Facilities such as the Fernald Environmental Management Project (near Cincinnati) and Mound Laboratories (near Dayton) are owned and operated by the Department of Energy (DOE) and have never been regulated by the NRC. As long as they continue to operate under DOE regulations, by the State of Ohio will have oversight through an Agreement in Principle with the Department of Energy. Loss of Agreement State Status The NRC will not allow Ohio to become an Agreement State unless it determines that Ohio can properly oversee the regulatory process. The NRC will then periodically monitor Ohio's work as an Agreement State. If the NRC determines that radioactive materials are not being controlled acceptably by the state, the NRC can take this authority back from the state. In addition, if Ohio decides that it no longer wants to be an Agreement State, it can request that the NRC resume its previous duties.

### Econ I/L

#### [ ] SMR’s key to the economy

Solan, Professor of Public Policy and Administration at Boise State, 10

(ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT IMPACTS OF SMALL MODULAR NUCLEAR REACTORS, Energy Policy Institute, http://www.nuclearcompetitiveness.org/images/EPI\_SMR\_ReportJune2010.pdf)

The development of a robust domestic SMR industry will result in significant economic benefits. Given the assumptions regarding the deployment of SMRs as outlined in the Moderate and High Nuclear Adoption cases, the manufacture and construction of SMRs in 2030 will be responsible for an estimated range of: 215,000 255,000 jobs,; $40 - $48 billion in sales; $19 - $23 billion in value-added; $12 - $15 billion in annual earnings; and $1.1 - $1.3 billion in indirect business taxes. From cumulative operations through 2030, SMRs will be responsible for: 52,000 80,000 jobs; $15 - $23 billion in sales; $10 - $15 billion in value-added; $4 - $6 billion in annual earnings; and $1.3 - $2 billion in indirect business taxes. Aggressive development of a domestic SMR industry, as outlined in the Disruptive Nuclear Adoption Case, roughly triples these estimated impacts and generates very significant economic benefits. In stark contrast, the conditions assumed in the Low Nuclear Adoption (also called the No Greenhouse Gas Legislation) case, result in approximately 1/10th of the economic benefits of the High and Moderate cases, with just a few SMRs manufactured domestically on an annual basis by 2030. The results of the Low Nuclear Adoption Case indicate a likely low probability for achieving a globally competitive and stable SMR manufacturing industry in the U.S. Based on the overall results of this study, a robust SMR market, both globally and nationally, will add to the U.S. manufacturing base and provide a significant number of high-paying jobs in manufacture and operations. This conclusion is based on a number of dependencies that temper the relative certainty of the results.

### AT: Obama Good Elections (Harvard)

#### The plan won’t pass before the election --- the affirmative only has to defend the most realistic and likely means of passage. Forcing the affirmative to defend abnormal means undermines political decision making skills.

#### A. Congress is in recess now for campaign --- nothing will be done until after election

#### B. Promotes best reasoning skills --- the politics disad is good because it teaches an understanding of the political process and policy tradeoffs but their interpretation of fiat bastardizes this because it forces an illogical, abnormal means of passage.

#### C. Improves debate content --- causes the negative to dispute why the expansion of SMRs is bad or read other political arguments --- like a lame duck or Obama 2nd term disad.

#### Obama will lose --- no President has won when trailing at this point

Stoddard, 10/18 --- associate editor of The Hill (10/18/2012, A.B., “Obama spinning toward a loss,”

http://thehill.com/opinion/columnists/ab-stoddard/262925-obama-spinning-toward-a-loss)

President Obama is losing. So says the latest Gallup poll, and so do those swelling numbers in key states like Wisconsin, Florida, Virginia and Ohio.

Democrats say wait, he won the second debate. They are holding their breath, hoping polls next week will show that this week's debate brought the herky-jerk of the campaign back full swing, with Obama back to his September lead in the swing states and poised to win. But with two weeks to go, a sudden surge in voter support for a president as unpopular as this one, in an economy this weak, is simply hard to believe. Conservatives like Karl Rove note that this late in October, no candidate with support higher than 50 percent (see Mitt Romney: Gallup) has ever gone on to lose.

Perhaps Obama lost the presidency weeks ago, on Oct. 3, when he sleepwalked and scribbled through the first debate and helped make Romney a new candidate overnight. It was Obama's night to finish Romney off; behind in the polls, even Romney likely woke up that morning thinking it was over. But Obama underestimated the task, the challenger and the electorate — all in 90 minutes. So a win this week was critical but perhaps not decisive. There is no obvious reason for Obama's performance to reverse the course of the campaign and blunt Romney now. And though there is one final debate next week, a back-and-forth on national security and foreign policy isn't likely to make the sale for anyone who still cannot make up his or her mind.

Romney is arguing Obama has still failed to articulate a reason, plan or purpose for a second term. He is correct. But Obama has indeed, late in the game, come up with a more forceful defense of his first term, and an argument about the economy growing from the middle out instead of the top down.

In addition, Democrats finally did their research and came up with some embarrassing changes in policy positions by Romney to debut at the debates and are cutting new flip-flop ads around the clock. Stunned by the loss of female support the Romney debate surge has cost him, Obama is focusing intently on shoring up the votes of suburban women and giving them binders full of reasons not to buy what Romney is selling.

Romney too is running new ads about his abortion flexibility, his support for contraception and the job losses among women in the last four years. He has been fortunate that Obama's campaign and the Twitterverse have ignored his giddy prediction of Tuesday night that "We're going to have to have employers in the new economy, in the economy I'm going to bring to play, that are going to be so anxious to get good workers they're going to be anxious to hire women." A clunker, one could argue, even worse than his comment about the "binder full of women" he compiled to locate qualified women for his Cabinet as governor of Massachusetts.

Indeed, though President Obama was deemed the debate winner by numerous snap polls this week, the polls show just how firm Romney's support has grown. In every poll he beat Obama by a wide margin on who is stronger on the economy.

Obama can expect, even if he wins another debate on Oct. 22, that this will remain a tight race or that Romney will begin to break away at the end. Obama's September surge resulted from an increase in Democratic enthusiasm, which is waning. As Romney has hardened his support among Republicans, he is also winning over new voters, leaving Obama with the task of exciting his base of Latinos, women, African-Americans and young voters. Without enough of them he loses. With less than three weeks to go it's hard to see where he finds that excitement.

#### Hurricane Sandy thumps the link

King, 10/26 (Bob, 10/26/2012, “Election in Sandy's shadow,” dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=938E15A3-DAB9-4528-8471-303B15DEC7CC)

4) The distraction: As with Hurricane Irene last year, Sandy is threatening the media epicenters of New York and Washington, guaranteeing that the networks will be in All Storm All the Time mode just as Obama and Romney are trying to make their final pitches to voters.

That leaves a lot less time for talking heads to parse the details of Obama’s jobs plans, the economic policy speech that Romney gave Friday in Iowa, Friday’s report on GDP growth or whether it was right for the president to call his opponent a “bull——er.”

This could mostly hurt Obama, who still trails in many national tracking polls and has been trying to recapture the momentum he had in September. Or it could keep Romney from closing the deal in states where he’s still behind, like Ohio.

#### Hurricane Sandy ensures an Obama win

Koebler, 10/25 (Jason, 10/25/2012, “Experts: Team Obama Should Root for Hurricane Sandy to Interrupt Election,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/10/25/experts-team-obama-should-root-for-hurricane-sandy-to-interrupt-election>)

**Note --- John Hudak is a governance studies fellow at Brookings**

Though those numbers appear to favor former governor Mitt Romney, Hudak says team Obama should be praying for rain.

“Obama has been effective at getting voters to vote early, so anything affecting turnout on Election Day is likely to be bad news for Romney," he says. Voting during a storm is also easier for urban voters—a group that overwhelmingly supports Obama—who often have a shorter distance to travel to polling sites than rural voters. "It would certainly set up a benefit to the president if a natural disaster did interrupt voting."

#### Energy decisions won’t swing votes

Freed & Fitzpatrick, October(Oct. 2012, Josh Freed and Ryan Fitzpatrick, “US Election Note: Energy Policy after 2012,” <http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Research/Americas/1012usen_energy.pdf>)

The growth in domestic shale oil and gas production seems inevitable. But the broader future of US energy faces much more uncertainty. There are enormous differences in how the two candidates would approach regulation of energy production and generation, climate change and America’s competition in the global clean energy race. Polling shows that these issues will have little impact on the decisions voters make.5 But they will have enormous implications for the price and source of the energy Americans consume, the success of America’s energy industries and the fate of international efforts to stem climate change.

#### Energy issues falling in importance to voters

Pew, 9/24 (Pew Research Center, 9/24/2012, “For Voters It's Still the Economy; Energy, Terrorism, Immigration Less Important Than in 2008,” <http://www.people-press.org/2012/09/24/for-voters-its-still-the-economy/>)

Energy Falls in Importance

Energy emerged as a major issue during the 2008 campaign. In August, as gas prices surged, 77% of voters said the issue of energy would be very important to their vote. Currently, just 55% view energy= as very important.

Just 52% of Republican voters now say energy is very important, down from 74% four years ago when the phrase “drill baby drill” became a political slogan at the 2008 GOP convention. The declines have been comparable among independents (25 points) and Democrats (20 points).

#### Single event won’t swing the election

Feldmann, 10/3 (Linda, 10/3/2012, “Why Mitt Romney trails in polls, as presidential debates begin,” <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2012/1003/Why-Mitt-Romney-trails-in-polls-as-presidential-debates-begin-video>)

Fully two-thirds of voters know that it was Romney who made the statement, and among those voters, 55 percent reacted negatively, versus 23 percent who saw it positively, according to Pew. Most damaging to Romney is the reaction of independent voters. Some 55 percent of independents who are aware of Romney’s comment say they had a negative reaction to it, while only 18 percent viewed it positively.

But Gallup asked voters if the 47 percent comment has made them more or less likely to vote for Romney, and a plurality said it made no difference.

Indeed, analysts say it’s nearly impossible to isolate an individual event or comment as being decisive in turning a race.

“Voters are confronting a big wide Mississippi River of information flowing at them, and as a consequence it’s difficult to isolate the effect of any one thing,” says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University in Washington. “That said, there’s no question it’s been several weeks of relatively bad news for the Romney campaign. It hasn’t enabled him to close the post-convention gap. If anything, that gap has grown.”

#### Winning allows Obama to build momentum and swing the reverse the tide

Creamer, 11 --- long-time political organizer and strategist (12/23/2011, Robert, “Why GOP Collapse on the Payroll Tax Could Be a Turning Point Moment,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/gop-payroll-tax\_b\_1167491.html)

The outcome of the battle was unambiguous. No one could doubt who stood up for the economic interests of the middle class and who did not. And no one could doubt who won and who lost.

National Journal reported that, "House Republicans on Thursday crumpled under the weight of White House and public pressure and have agreed to pass a two-month extension of the two percent payroll-tax cut, Republican and Democratic sources told National Journal."

In the end, Republican intransigence transformed a moment that would have been a modest win for President Obama into an iconic victory.

2) Strength and victory are enormous political assets. Going into the New Year, they now belong to the president and the Democrats.

One of the reasons why the debt ceiling battle inflicted political damage on President Obama is that it made him appear ineffectual -- a powerful figure who had been ensnared and held hostage by the Lilliputian pettiness of hundreds of swarming Tea Party ideological zealots.

In the last few months -- as he campaigned for the American Jobs Act -- he has shaken free of those bonds. Now voters have just watched James Bond or Indiana Jones escape and turn the tables on his adversary.

Great stories are about a protagonist who meets and overcomes a challenge and is victorious. The capitulation of the House Tea Party Republicans is so important because it feels like the beginning of that kind of heroic narrative.

Even today most Americans believe that George Bush and the big Wall Street banks -- not by President Obama -- caused the economic crisis. Swing voters have never lost their fondness for the President and don't doubt his sincerity. But they had begun to doubt his effectiveness. They have had increasing doubts that Obama was up to the challenge of leading them back to economic prosperity.

The narrative set in motion by the events of the last several weeks could be a turning point in voter perception. It could well begin to convince skeptical voters that Obama is precisely the kind of leader they thought he was back in 2008 -- a guy with the ability to lead them out of adversity -- a leader with the strength, patience, skill, will and resoluteness to lead them to victory.

That now contrasts with the sheer political incompetence of the House Republican leadership that allowed themselves to be cornered and now find themselves in political disarray. And it certainly contrasts with the political circus we have been watching in the Republican Presidential primary campaign.

3) This victory will inspire the dispirited Democratic base.

Inspiration is the feeling of empowerment -- the feeling that you are part of something larger than yourself and can personally play a significant role in achieving that goal. It comes from feeling that together you can overcome challenges and win.

Nothing will do more to inspire committed Democrats than the sight of their leader -- President Obama -- out-maneuvering the House Republicans and forcing them into complete capitulation.

The events of the last several weeks will send a jolt of electricity through the progressive community.

The right is counting on progressives to be demoralized and dispirited in the coming election. The president's victory on the payroll tax and unemployment will make it ever more likely that they will be wrong.

4) When you have them on the run, that's the time to chase them.

The most important thing about the outcome of the battle over the payroll tax and unemployment is that it shifts the political momentum at a critical time. Momentum is an independent variable in any competitive activity -- including politics.

In a football or basketball game you can feel the momentum shift. The tide of battle is all about momentum. The same is true in politics. And in politics it is even more important because the "spectators" are also the players -- the voters.

People follow -- and vote -- for winners. The bandwagon effect is enormously important in political decision-making. Human beings like to travel in packs. They like to be at the center of the mainstream. Momentum shifts affect their perceptions of the mainstream.

For the last two years, the right wing has been on the offensive. Its Tea Party shock troops took the battle to Democratic members of Congress. In the mid-terms Democrats were routed in district after district.

Now the tide has turned. And when the tide turns -- when you have them on the run -- that's the time to chase them.

We won't know for sure until next November whether this moment will take on the same iconic importance as Clinton's battle with Gingrich in 1995. But there is no doubt that the political wind has shifted. It's up to progressives to make the most of it.

#### No link – Obama avoids crises

Rogers, 9/17 (Ed, 9/17/2012, “Obama's 21st-century Teflon is working,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-insiders/post/obamas-21st-century-teflon-is-working/2012/09/17/82b05da8-00bf-11e2-bbf0-e33b4ee2f0e8_blog.html?wprss=rss_opinions> )

It is safe to say that America's outreach to the world under President Obama has been a complete failure. Does America enjoy more or less respect than it did four years ago? If you think more, please let me know where.

Last weekend was the end of Obama's foreign policy. Diplomats are being called in and troops are being sent out — at least to where our enemies will allow them. The likes of Sudan know they can refuse Obama's wish for more troops to protect our embassies. Obama will probably tell us the Sudanese promise to provide adequate protection for Americans was a hard-fought concession.

Anyway, for the first time since the 2012 campaign began, Obama might want to talk about the economy. The images of the fires burning and the angry crowds on the Arab streets all underscore the complete failure of Obama's foreign policy, reminding us of his naivete and the price we pay for his on-the-job-training. Remember, this is a man who thought he was worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize just for being who he was.

The planet would heal because of his desire for it to do so. His very presence meant tension in the Middle East would subside. And why not? He had some new ideas: Remember his instructions to his NASA administrator that there was no higher priority than to make Arabs feel better about themselves?

With the world mostly either disrespecting America or just sadly shaking its head and wondering where America has gone, perhaps the Obama campaign could use a few days of blaming George W. Bush for the Obama administration's economic failures.

Foreign policy can't win elections, but it can lose them. Obama is pushing his luck as it becomes more and more clear that he can't influence events that endanger America and American interests. Meanwhile, he has outsourced America's economic management to the Federal Reserve, an abdication of responsibility that will be the subject of books to come. By announcing another quantitative easing program, the Federal Reserve was irrefutably saying that Obama's policies are not working, that the economy is so weak it has to step in to do something to try and generate the jobs that Obama's policies haven't — and won't — deliver.

So as the campaign heads for the debates, voters must be asking themselves what a vote for Obama is really about. It's not about peace and prosperity. It's not about respect abroad and certainty at home. There is nothing about Obama's tenure in office that voters should want more of. So why is he winning? I'm not sure, but based on his record at home and the sorry state of affairs his foreign policy has produced, the fact that he isn't cratering suggests a 21st-century coat of Teflon that makes Reagan's legendary resilience look small-time.

[insert specific link defense]

#### Strong public support for federal nuclear power incentives – no effect from Fukushima

WNA 12

(September, World Nuclear Association, US Nuclear Power Policy, www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41\_US\_nuclear\_power\_policy.html)

Public opinion regarding nuclear power has generally been fairly positive, and has grown more so as people have had to think about security of energy supplies. Different polls show continuing increase in public opinion favourable to nuclear power in the USA. More than three times as many strongly support nuclear energy than strongly oppose it. Two-thirds of self-described environmentalists favour it. A May 2008 survey (N=2925) by Zogby International showed 67% of Americans favoured building new nuclear power plants, with 46% registering strong support; 23% were opposed. Asked which kind of power plant they would prefer if it were sited in their community, 43% said nuclear, 26% gas, 8% coal. Men (60%) were more than twice as likely as women (28%) to be supportive of a nuclear power plant. A March 2010 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed that strong public support for nuclear energy was being sustained, with 74% in favour of it11. In particular, 87% think nuclear will be important in meeting electricity needs in the years ahead, 87% support licence renewal for nuclear plants, 84% believe utilities should prepare to build more nuclear plants, 72% supported an active federal role in encouraging investment in "energy technology that reduces greenhouse gases", 82% agree that US nuclear plants are safe and secure, 77% would support adding a new reactor at the nearest nuclear plant, and 70% say that USA should definitely build more plants in the future. Only 10% of people said they strongly opposed the use of nuclear energy. In relation to recycling used nuclear fuel, 79% supported this (contra past US policy), and the figure rose to 85% if "a panel of independent experts" recommended it. Although 59% were confident that used reactor fuel could be stored safely at nuclear power plant sites, 81% expressed a strong desire for the federal government to move used nuclear fuel to centralised, secure storage facilities away from the plant sites until a permanent disposal facility is ready. Half of those surveyed considered themselves to be environmentalists. A February 2011 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed similar figures, and that 89% of Americans agree that all low-carbon energy sources – including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy – should be taken advantage of to generate electricity while limiting greenhouse gas emissions. Just 10% disagreed. Also some 84% of respondents said that they associate nuclear energy "a lot" or "a little" with reliable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with affordable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with economic growth and job creation; and 77% associate nuclear energy and clean air. A more general March 2010 Gallup poll (N=1014) on energy showed 62% in favour of using nuclear power, including 28% strongly so, and 33% against, the most favourable figures since Gallup began polling the question in 1994. However, only 51% of Democrat voters were in favour12. An early March 2011 Gallup poll just before the Fukushima accident showed 57% in favour and 38% against, and in March 2012 (N=1024) still 57% in favour with 40% against (men: 72%-27%, women 42%-51%). Regarding plant safety, the polls showed consistent 56-58% positive views over 2009-12, but men-women split similar. A survey conducted in September 2011 by Bisconti Research Inc. with GfK Roper showed that although support for nuclear power decreased following the Fukushima accident and compared with a year earlier (a survey carried out in March 2010 by Bisconti Research found 74% of Americans favoured nuclear power), 62% of the 1000 adults surveyed in the latest poll were supportive of utilizing nuclear power while 35% expressed opposition. The survey found that 82% of Americans believed that lessons had been learned from Fukushima and 67% of respondents considered US nuclear power plants safe (the same level as reported one month before the nuclear accident in Japan occurred). Also 85% of said that an extension of commercial operation should be granted to those plants that comply with federal safety standards, and 59% believed more nuclear power plants should definitely be built in the future, while 75% contend that “Electric utilities should prepare now so that new nuclear power plants could be built if needed in the next decade.” Finally, further expansion of the site of the nearest already operating nuclear power plant is supported by 67% and opposed by 28%.

#### No president can get anything done after the election

Dadush, et. al, 8/2---director of Carnegie’s International Economics Program (8/2/2012, Uri Dadush, Shimelse Ali --- economist in the International Economics Program, and Zaahira Wyne --- managing editor of Carnegie’s International Economic Bulletin, “What Does the U.S. Election Mean for the World Economy?” <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/08/02/what-does-u.s.-election-mean-for-world-economy/d5mp> )

Few things are certain, especially given the threat to the U.S. economy posed by the crisis in Europe. But some pundits have already begun forecasting that Obama will beat Romney by a fair number of electoral votes despite a dead heat in the popular vote. The FiveThirtyEight blog in the New York Times, one of the few outlets venturing a forecast for toss-up states, projects 294 electoral votes for Obama versus 244 for Romney and a one-percentage-point win for Obama in the popular vote. The Washington Post’s The Fix blog offers a more cautious assessment, one that nonetheless shows Obama winning and closer to the decisive 270 mark. However, Republicans are expected to easily retain control of the House of Representatives and may also regain control of the Senate by a small margin.

Two crucial points emerge. First, even if Obama wins and Democrats retain the Senate, the president will have to seek a compromise with a Republican House. Second, in no scenario, including a Romney win, would either party gain a filibuster-proof 60 seats in the Senate. This means that the victorious candidate, whoever he is, would have to try to compromise with senators of the opposite party, not to mention members of his own party whose views may differ on a particular issue, in order to pass meaningful legislation.

It follows that the implications of the U.S. elections for the global economy depend less on precise electoral platforms than on the shape of the compromise reached on the big issues, and, against a background of fraying consensus, whether compromise can be reached at all. Thus, the U.S. electoral outcome is likely far less predictive of policy than, say, the Socialists’ sweep in France in May or even last year’s Conservative/Liberal Democrat victory in the UK.

#### Their article concedes that there has been a constant flip flop of the gag rule between different administrations. The impact doesn’t assume Romney reinstituting it for 4 years --- we obviously survived 8 years of Bush.

Desert News, 2-10-2012 http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705399188/Romney-commits-to-defund-United-Nations-Population-Fund-Planned-Parenthood.html?pg=2-http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705399188/Romney-commits-to-defund-United-Nations-Population-Fund-Planned-Parenthood.html?pg=2

The Mexico City policy, also known as the "Global Gag Rule," was originally enacted by President Ronald Reagan, has been through a series of rescissions and adoptions in the past three decades — depending on the current US president's party affiliation. President Bill Clinton rescinded the policy; President George W. Bush adopted it again, but President Barack Obama, during his first week in office, rescinded it yet again.

#### The Gag Rule is easily circumvented – numerous loopholes exist now – everybody that wants family planning abortions gets them now

Human Events 3/24/03 “Abortion Groups Can Circumvent Mexico City Policy,” EBSCO

The "Mexico City" policy--a Reagan directive revived by President Bush to keep foreign aid out of the hands of abortion providers and promoters--has developed such enormous loopholes it is now practically meaningless, say congressional pro-lifers. Last October, ten conservative congressmen, including Reps. Chris Smith (R.-N.J.) and Roscoe Bartlett (R.-Md.), decried the ineffectual policy. The congressmen signed a letter to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) citing a grant of $65 million to a program run by the Population Council, the group that holds the patent on the abortion drug RU-486. A spokesman for USAID--the government's main foreign aid arm--agreed that abortion groups, while following the strict letter of the Mexico City role, can continue to collect government money without substantially changing their activities. The Mexico City policy forbids U.S. foreign aid designated for "family planning" from going to groups that provide or promote abortions. However, the policy does not prevent abortion groups from collecting other kinds of federal grants. Population Action International (PAI) has published a 16-page booklet instructing groups on how to circumvent the Mexico City policy (it is available on that PAI's website). PAI, which says it does not receive government funding, seeks to promote international family-planning NGOs--helping them to help themselves to federal money. Their booklet, "What You Need to Know about the Global Gag Rule Restrictions: the Unofficial Guide," explains that simply by altering its stated mission from "family planning" to other terms that cover the same activities a group can get U.S. tax dollars. For example, if a group says it does "birth spacing" instead of "family planning," or if it refers to condom distribution as "HIV prevention," it ceases to be a "family planning" operation and falls outside the Mexico City policy.

### AT: Adv CP

#### Perm – do both

#### Links to the net benefit – their link is based on any costly nuclear policy

#### Increases restrictions – means it can’t solve expansion of domestic industry – that’s the internal link to both advantages

#### Doesn’t solve in other countries – just suggests that the US does something

#### No solvency – non-nuclear weapons states hate fuel banks – think they create supplier cartels

Yudin 2009 – Senior Researcher at UNIDIR and manager of the Multilateral Approaches to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle project. Previously, he was Director of a Russian NGO, the Analytical Centre for Non-proliferation, and Senior Researcher at RFNC–VNIIEF, the Russian Federal Nuclear Centre—AllRussian Research Institute of Experimental Physics. He graduated from the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute as a nuclear physicist and holds a PhD in nuclear engineering. He has special expertise in nuclear engineering, nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament (Yury, “Multilateralization of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle: Assessing the Existing Proposals” http://unidir.org/pdf/activites/pdf2-act439.pdf)

IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei emphasized that multilateral mechanisms for assurance of supply were “not an attempt to divide the nuclear community into suppliers and recipients”. 95 However, it is notable that almost all proposals for multilateral approaches for the nuclear fuel cycle have emerged from current or potential nuclear suppliers. Many potential customer states have remained either indifferent or have voiced fears that a suppliers “cartel” might be created. The Minister of Minerals and Energy of the Republic of South Africa, Buyelwa Sonjica, most expressively summed up the views of these states: there is a need to guard against actions, which would merely serve to exacerbate existing inequalities, including through the creation of another kind of cartel that would exclude full participation, particularly by States in full compliance with their safeguards obligations. … Although prevailing proliferation concerns may prompt us to consider alternative arrangements on supply mechanisms, these may under no circumstances impose unwarranted restrictions and controls over the legitimate peaceful use of nuclear energy. … If we agree to such conditions, we may well be contributing to undermining the very bargains on which the NPT was founded and further disturb the delicate balance of rights and obligations under this instrument.