

- Cars
- Auto Financing
- Event Tickets
- Jobs
- Real Estate
- Online Degrees
- Business Opportunities
- Shopping

Search

How do I find it?

Weekly Ad
Great deals this week only at your Fort Worth store.

\$1
6-qt. box

View this week's



- Home
- News
- Travel
- Money
- Sports
- Life
- Tech
- Weather

Money

- Markets
- Economy
- Companies/Execs
- Personal Finance
- Taxes
- Media
- Cars
- Real Estate

GET A QUOTE:

Enter symbol(s) or Keywords




▪ **DJIA** 7,776.18 ▼ -148.38 ▪ **NASDAQ** 1,545.20 ▼ -41.80

Proposed nuclear power plants

Seventeen companies are seeking federal licenses to build 26 nuclear reactors in the USA, the first applications since the 1979 Three Mile Island accident. 2007 portion of electricity generation by state, and for the nation:

Sources: U.S. Dept. of Energy, Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Graphic by Robert W. Ahrens, Paul Davidson, George Petras and Julia Schmalz. USA TODAY



Nuclear power inches back into energy spotlight

Updated 8h 41m ago | Comments

76 | Recommend 10

E-mail | Save | Print | Reprints & Permissions | **RSS**

By **Paul Davidson**, USA TODAY

The nation's nuclear power industry — stuck in a decades-long deep freeze — is thawing.

Utilities are poised to build a new generation of nuclear plants 30 years after the Three Mile Island accident, whose anniversary was Saturday, halted new reactor applications. The momentum is being driven by growing public acceptance of relatively clean nuclear energy to combat global warming.

Several companies have taken significant steps that will likely lead to completion of four reactors by 2015 to 2018 and up to



Enlarge

Artist's rendering of a nuclear facility in the Tennessee Valley.

Rela

Scott
\$7 On
Online
www.S

Stocl
Make
More.
Steph

Mixx it

Other ways to share:

Yahoo! Buzz

Digg

Newsvine

Reddit

Facebook

What's this?

eight by 2020. All would be built next to existing nuclear plants.

Southern Co. (SO) says it will begin digging an 86-foot-deep crater this June in Vogtle, Ga., to make way for two reactors after recently winning state approval, though it won't pour concrete until it gets a federal license, likely in 2011. At least five power companies have signed contracts with equipment vendors. And Florida and South Carolina residents this year began paying new utility fees to finance planned reactors.

The steps signal that a nuclear renaissance anticipated for several years is finally taking shape. Seventeen companies have sought U.S. federal approval for 26 reactors since late 2007. All have enhanced safety features.

FIND MORE STORIES IN: [Congress](#) | [Barack Obama](#) | [Colorado](#) | [Georgia](#) | [Maryland](#) | [South Carolina](#) | [Las Vegas](#) | [Columbia](#) | [Finland](#) | [Moody](#) | [Nuclear Regulatory Commission](#) | [Investors Service](#) | [Gallup Poll](#) | [Yucca Mountain](#) | [The](#) | [Three Mile Island](#) | [Steven Chu](#) | [Nuclear Energy Institute](#) | [Electric Power Research Institute](#) | [John Reed](#) | [Steve Kerekes](#)

"The resurgence of nuclear energy is underway," says Steve Kerekes of the Nuclear Energy Institute, an industry trade group.

Whether it will yield a flood of new reactors or a trickle will largely depend on the success — or failure — of the initial wave.

Nuclear a 'better option' now?

The industry believes it can avoid the billions in cost overruns and years of delays that marred nuclear construction in the 1970s and 1980s. Licensing has been streamlined. Utilities are seeking firmer costs and schedules. And designs are more detailed.

Still, some hurdles are emerging. Some companies are submitting incomplete applications or seeking design changes at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), possibly delaying approval. At least two utilities recently said they're switching to different reactor models because they couldn't receive assurances on costs and the timetable. And since several models are new, problems could emerge as they're built in the USA for the first time. The type of reactor planned for Maryland is being built in Finland, where it's three years behind schedule and \$2 billion over budget.

"We're talking about a new generation of technology," says John Reed, CEO of Concentric Energy Advisors. "You have to demonstrate to (lenders) that you can make money with these."

Nuclear plants are hugely expensive, and the credit crisis has all but sealed lenders' wallets. The success of the resurgence also hinges on companies' ability to obtain financing.

Nuclear officials are taking comfort in some encouraging signals from the Obama administration. During his campaign, then-candidate Barack Obama seemed cool to nuclear energy, saying waste storage concerns must be solved before the nation builds new plants. Although the new administration has said Yucca Mountain northwest of Las Vegas is no longer a storage option for the waste, Energy Secretary Steven Chu told Congress this month that nuclear "has to be" part of "our energy future." Waste, he said, can be stored at reactor sites "for decades."

Unlike power plants fueled by coal and even cleaner natural gas, nuclear reactors emit none of the heat-trapping gases blamed for global warming. Obama strongly favors capping global-warming emissions from fossil fuel plants, which would boost nuclear's prospects. Renewable energy is popular but intermittent.

Today, 104 reactors supply 20% of the nation's electricity. Just to hold that share, all 26 proposed reactors would have to be completed by 2030. And to meet global-warming goals, 42 reactors should be built the next two decades, according to the Electric Power Research Institute. Reed says that's possible if the first wave goes well. A new Gallup Poll shows a record 59% of Americans favor nuclear energy.

Here's the rub: Nuclear reactor costs have doubled in the past three years to as much as about \$8 billion, Moody's Investors Service says. They're twice as expensive as coal-fired plants and triple the cost of natural-gas plants.



Mo

• T
F

• S

• N
A

• T
E

Fn

Se
op
yo

Fin

Qu
Re
fra
he



Sigt

• Tip
ma

• Lat
ne

• Jol
tax



Reactors also are far more complex, taking up to 10 years to license and build vs. a couple of years for gas-fired plants.

Yet, nuclear plants are far less costly to operate, and the fuel, uranium, is cheaper than coal and natural gas. South Carolina Electric & Gas chose nuclear instead of natural gas to meet some of its power needs because it could produce electricity at retail rates of about 8 cents a kilowatt hour vs. about 10 cents with gas. That's after figuring in subsidies such as production tax credits and before adding potential fees on gas plants for emitting CO₂.

"Nuclear came out to be a better option," says Stephen Byrne, nuclear chief for SCE&G, which plans two reactors near Columbia, S.C. "The cost of natural gas fluctuates pretty wildly."

Trying to avoid past mistakes

The industry is recovering from a harrowing past. After the Three Mile Island accident in central Pennsylvania — which led to no deaths or known injuries, but caused a small radiation leak from the plant — the NRC passed sweeping new safety rules. Inspectors forced utilities to rip out pipes and install back-up pumps or generators midconstruction. Since utilities didn't submit designs before building, each reactor was custom built, further burdening the NRC.

Companies built plants so quickly to meet rising power demand that blueprints were only about 20% complete when construction began. Contractors redid work on the fly, causing delays. Double-digit interest rates drove up already swollen costs.

Compounding the problem: The NRC first issued a license to build a reactor, then a separate license to operate it. Utilities that completed plants had to wait for an operating license before they could sell electricity and recoup their investments.

Nationwide, state regulators denied utilities' petitions to recover \$18 billion in cost overruns. Some went bankrupt.

Under new rules, power companies can apply for one license to both build and operate a nuclear reactor, streamlining the review. Designs must be approved separately before construction begins. And power companies are using just five blueprints. Regulators hope they'll churn out cookie-cutter versions of each design. Yet, even as they seek licenses, only two of the five designs have been certified.

"They're putting the cart before the horse," NRC Commissioner Gregory Jaczko says. "They should get the design done" before applying for a license. Also, he says, some reactor makers are proposing extensive modifications to their designs. Westinghouse, for instance, wants to make about 100 changes to its AP1000 reactor, says Vice President Ed Cummins. He says they're largely minor.

Other key challenges:

- On time, within budget** To avoid cost overruns, power companies want to lock in prices and put the onus on equipment vendors to pay added fees if a project is delayed. Vendors are reluctant to set prices because the reactors lack a track record, and it's impossible to predict the cost of labor and materials when construction starts in a few years.

NRG ([NRG](#)), an independent power producer that's building two reactors in Texas, has signed a contract with Toshiba that nails down most costs, says Steven Winn, CEO of the NRG unit building the plant. That's possible, he says, because Toshiba owns 12% of the venture and has already built four of the same model units, called an ABWR, in Japan.

Others are having mixed success at locking in terms. Exelon, for instance, recently said it was no longer going to use a General Electric Hitachi reactor because GE ([GE](#)) couldn't sufficiently guarantee fixed prices and a firm schedule. "We have to be careful and pragmatic" about risks, says GE Vice President Danny Roderick.

- Elusive financing.** With lenders hesitant to take chances on nuclear energy, 10 companies seek a total of \$93

billion in federal loan guarantees for new nuclear plants. But only \$18.5 billion is available — enough to finance three or four projects.

NEI President Marvin Fertel told Congress this month that independent power producers would likely abandon projects if the entire \$93 billion is not funded, slowing the nuclear revival.

Bill Wicker, spokesman for the Senate Energy committee, says guarantees are meant to bankroll only the maiden versions of new models. No more than another \$18 billion is likely to be funded, he says. "It's not like a bottomless cup of coffee."

Loan guarantees are less critical for regulated utilities, such as Southern and SCE&G, that have state clearances to recover some of their costs from ratepayers before construction is completed. In Florida, Progress Energy (PGN) customers began paying an extra \$14.53 a month in January to finance two reactors. Missouri is among states considering such cost-recovery legislation, but lawmakers are divided. Ameren says it won't build a new reactor without it. "You'd get laughed off Wall Street," says Senior Vice President Richard Mark.

•**Avoiding construction snafus.** Manufacturers are trying to avoid the missteps of the first construction era. Three-dimensional computer images tell engineers precisely where pipes should go. GE and Westinghouse say 70% to 80% of their designs will be done before they break ground. And makers are increasingly building modular parts in the factory, cutting costs and minimizing mistakes on site. Westinghouse says 30% of its AP1000 reactor is modular.

Still, "When you're building (a new model) for the first time, yes, there's risk," says Jone-Lin Wang of Cambridge Energy Research Associates.

The delays and cost overruns plaguing Areva's EPR unit in Finland were partly related to concrete that failed inspection. "We're quite confident we're learning from" the Finnish experience, says Michael Wallace, chairman of UniStar, the Constellation Energy (CEG) unit building an EPR in Lusby, Md.

•**Tight supplies.** Only one company, Japan Steel Works, builds the 600-ton steel forgings used to make reactor vessels. It can make only five or six a year. Southern, SCE&G, NRG and Constellation have spent tens of millions of dollars reserving such items. Those building reactors after the front-runners could face bottlenecks, Standard & Poor's says. But Japan Steel Works has said it's expanding its capacity by about a third, while others are entering the market. In the U.S., factories to make nuclear parts are being built in Virginia, Louisiana, Indiana and Tennessee.

•**Fewer workers.** New reactors are likely to strain a pool of nuclear workers depleted by the construction hiatus. About 100,000 new workers would be needed to build and staff the 26 proposed reactors. Meantime, 35% of the current workforce is eligible to retire in five years.

The NEI notes utilities have teamed with community colleges to train workers. Still, a likely shortage of specialized workers, such as nuclear welders, could drive up wages and construction costs, says consultant Steve Rus of Black & Veatch.

Overall, Reed says the risk of delays and cost overruns is "far less" now. Yet, some companies are waiting before deciding to build. In Texas, Luminant says it will monitor the status of natural gas prices and carbon caps. Ameren wants to see if the first plants are successful. That's why the utility didn't want "to be in that first wave of plants," says Ameren nuclear executive Scott Bond.

Share this story:

[Yahoo! Buzz](#)[Digg](#)[Newsvine](#)[Reddit](#)[Facebook](#) What's this?

Posted 11h 46m ago

Updated 8h 41m ago

E-mail | Save | Print | Reprints & Permissions | [RSS](#)


To report corrections and clarifications, contact Reader Editor **Brent Jones**. For publication consideration in the newspaper, send comments to letters@usatoday.com. Include name, phone number, city and state for verification. To view our corrections, go to corrections.usatoday.com.

Guidelines: You share in the USA TODAY community, so please keep your comments smart and civil. Don't attack other readers personally, and keep your language decent. Use the "Report Abuse" button to make a difference. [Read more.](#)



Post this comment to Facebook?

Comments: (76) Showing: Newest first New Most recommended!



DaysRnumbered (18 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 3m ago

Sgt Bob (7 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 1h 13m ago

The real downside that nobody wants to talk about with nuclear isn't the waste, it is the fact that it is another finite energy resource. It may help bridge the gap, but isn't really a long term solution to our energy needs.

Of course, which is why no one source of energy should be relied upon disproportionately. But the fact still remains, that nuclear is the best..... well..... "bang for the buck" (for lack of a better term).

We should wain ourselves off of coal however. That has clearly been demonstrated to be the dirtiest form of energy on this planet. Sadly, as with so many special interest groups and lobbyists with deep pockets, the coal industry is one of those. Thus, many politicians will more than happily block any attempt to replace coal with any other form of energy, no matter what the benefits are.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



frieddough (0 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 3m ago

Maybe you can help me on this one. USA Today ran a story some months ago about a man who was very high up in an environmental organization--Greenpeace?--but quit over their policy on nuclear energy. He said that they were blindly, automatically, ignorantly against it. When he examined the facts, he saw that nukes are less polluting and less dangerous than coal or gas. When he tried to explain this to the other leaders, they shouted him down. He couldn't convince them, they wouldn't listen, so he ended up resigning. Hey, I consider myself to be pretty much of an environmentalist, but I don't want to see my sons going to some war in the mideast being fought because of our dependence on foreign oil.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



Dog (35 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 6m ago

c laird478 (6 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 3m ago

robinjoe wrote:

The Feds need to have a standard nuclear plant design, perhaps two (maybe even a third based on Thorium) and all plants have to be built to that specification. They also need to take responsibility for the nuclear waste. That would take away the uncertainties in the design, make the planning simpler and streamline all future inspections.

The Feds ARE supposed to take ultimate responsibility for the nuclear waste. That's what Yucca Mountain was all about. The trouble is, nobody wants the nuclear waste stored anywhere near them and, you have to remember that the expenses that the Feds incur are born by whom? The US taxpayer, that's whom! That's a dirty little secret the nuclear power industry doesn't like to let out, that the cost of nuclear energy that is usually disseminated to the public doesn't take into the account the cost of the storage of all that nuclear waste for decades. It's sort of swept under the rug. But the taxpayers still have to ultimately pay for it.

=====

Listen, we all know the Yucca Mtn project is being shelved by one man....Harry Reid who refuses to bring it up to a vote in our Democracy....he of course knows best for all of America.

The A Bombs were tested in Nevada....that place is already radioactive and will be for years....why not use the Yucca Mtn as a storage area until BREAHER reactors can be built here to use that spent fuel as intake?

Recommend | Report Abuse



Gammachaser (0 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 6m ago

mr dave (1 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 11m ago

Going back to nuclear power is a mistake. We have no way to keep them safe and nowhere to store the radioactive waste. Three Mile Island was just a tiny demonstration about how things can go so wrong so fast.

So, how does it feel to have a nice, squeaky clean brain after all that washing? Do yourself a favor and get an education on a subject before you show your ignorance. TMI was a demonstration on how safe nuclear power is: even when the operators do everyt hing wrong, the design still protects the public. Nobody got hurt or even overexposed (not even the people in the plant) and the only damage was to the plant itself. The panic caused by the Chicken Littles was the most dangerous part. All it did was sell a whole lot of newspapers.

Recommend | Report Abuse



Jay-1 (0 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 9m ago

Jay-1 wrote:

How much nuclear waste does nuclear energy create?

If all the electricity use of the USA was distributed evenly among its population, and all of it came from nuclear power, then the amount of nuclear waste each person would generate per year would be 39.5 grams.

Now multiply that by the population of the US, over 300 million as of last summer.

I have and it is a very small number compared to the waste created from coal/oil plants. That's 100,000kg of CO2 per person! ADD THAT UP. The average nuclear plant creates 2500 barrels of waste per year which actually still contains a lot of energy and has a promise of being used in the future. That is very little waste considering how much power is generated per plant. It's the best option we have.

Recommend **1** | Report Abuse



c laird478 (6 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 9m ago

The nuclear fuel rods can be reprocessed and used many times again. The resulting "waste" if done correctly, would be a tiny fraction of the current level of "waste" each spent nuclear fuel rod produces.

One of the problems is that the spent nuclear fuel isn't the only nuclear waste that has to be disposed

of. Components of the nuclear containment vessel become radioactive from exposure and also have to be replaced periodically, and they constitute nuclear waste also. And they cannot be reprocessed.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



Dog (35 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 9m ago

Thank you editors of the Harrisburg newspaper that set our country back 30 years. You used fear tactics and mass hysteria to sell your newspapers and refused to print the truth of what was happening at 3 mile Island. You should still be in jail.

Obambi has said he is going to take the politics out and go by the science.....that is a laugh. He is in the back pocket of the Environazis who helped get him elected and Al Gore.....they will stall and eventually block any Nuclear projects as that industry doesn't fund his campaign efforts.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



c laird478 (6 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 12m ago

robinjoe wrote:

The Feds need to have a standard nuclear plant design, perhaps two (maybe even a third based on Thorium) and all plants have to be built to that specification. They also need to take responsibility for the nuclear waste. That would take away the uncertainties in the design, make the planning simpler and streamline all future inspections.

The Feds ARE supposed to take ultimate responsibility for the nuclear waste. That's what Yucca Mountain was all about. The trouble is, nobody wants the nuclear waste stored anywhere near them and, you have to remember that the expenses that the Feds incur are born by whom? The US taxpayer, that's whom! That's a dirty little secrete the nuclear power industry doesn't like to let out, that the cost of nuclear energy that is usually disseminated to the public doesn't take into the account the cost of the storage of all that nuclear waste for decades. It's sort of swept under the rug. But the taxpayers still have to ultimately pay for it.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



Sgt Bob (7 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 13m ago

The real downside that nobody wants to talk about with nuclear isn't the waste, it is the fact that it is another finite energy resource. It may help bridge the gap, but isn't really a long term solution to our energy needs.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



frieddough (0 friends, [send message](#)) wrote: 15m ago

I would much rather face the risks associated with nuclear energy than the risks associated with coal (pollution, greenhouse gases) and oil (again, pollution, greenhouse gases PLUS the dependence for this stuff upon anti-American foreign countries.) How many problems have we gotten into because we have to be involved in the middle east due to our dependence on foreign oil?

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)

More comments on this story: [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [Next](#) ▶

Sponsored Links

Oprah's Flat Stomach Rule: Obey

Oprah Cut Down 2 lbs of Stomach Fat Per Week by Obeying this 1 Rule
MichellesWeightLoss.com

Great Desktop Deal from Dell - Only \$409

2GB memory*, 160GB* hard drive, DVD player and 19" flat panel monitor
www.dell.com/smb

How I Lost 43 Pounds in 12 Weeks!

Find out how to lose that fat belly in no time with this Crazy Diet!
LaurasBody.com

[Get listed here](#)




Save BIG on Digital
Huge selection, great prices, top p

Newspaper Home Delivery - Subscribe Today

[Home](#) • [News](#) • [Travel](#) • [Money](#) • [Sports](#) • [Life](#) • [Tech](#) • [Weather](#)

About USATODAY.com: [Site Map](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Jobs with Us](#) | [Terms of Service](#)
[Privacy Policy/Your California Privacy Right](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Press Room](#) | [Media Lounge](#) | [Reprints & Permissions](#)

News Your Way: [Mobile News](#) | [Email News](#) | [IM Alerts](#) | [Add USATODAY.com RSS feeds](#) |

Partners: [USA WEEKEND](#) | [Sports Weekly](#) | [Education](#) | [Space.com](#)

Copyright 2009 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.