



**Marilyn C. Kray**  
**Vice President, Exelon Generation**  
**President, NuStart Energy Development**  
**NRC 2005 Regulatory Information Conference**  
**Session A2 – New Reactor Licensing Issues**  
**March 8, 2005**

## Who is NuStart?

- NuStart Energy Development, LLC

Constellation

Exelon

Duke

Florida Power & Light

EDF, INA

Progress

Entergy

Southern

- Tennessee Valley Authority

- Westinghouse

- General Electric

## NuStart Vision

- Nuclear energy is viewed by power companies, investors and other stakeholders as a safe and economically-viable alternative to meeting our country's future electricity needs, and that the nuclear industry is poised to meet new demands for generation.

## Basis for NuStart Vision

- Excellent performance of current nuclear fleet
- Sensitivity to grid stability
- Recognized need for fuel diversity
- Heightened concern with environment
- Increasing demand for electricity
- Rising price and demand for natural gas

## Assessment

- All supply components to electricity portfolio are critical
- Nuclear component unique given specific challenges to new investment
- Action needed now in order to preserve the nuclear option for the future

## Challenges Facing New Nuclear Plants

1. Demonstrated need for base load power
2. Resolution of spent fuel disposal issue
3. Regulatory unpredictability
4. Lack of completed advanced designs
5. Public confidence
6. Reestablishment of nuclear infrastructure
7. Acceptable financial returns

## NuStart Project Objectives


- Complete the design engineering for selected technologies:  
Westinghouse Advanced Passive (AP) 1000 and General Electric  
Economic Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (ESBWR)
  - Design Certification
  - COL input
  - Design Finalization
- Demonstrate “new” NRC licensing process by submitting a COL  
applications
- Validate assumptions for construction cost and schedule and  
ongoing operating costs
- Position industry for investment decisions

## Need for Acceptable Financial Returns



- Must be favorable to shareholders on an individual project basis
- Must be superior to other fuel alternative investments
  - Clean coal
  - Combined cycle natural gas




# Fuel Alternative Comparisons



# Total Cost Curves



### Nuclear



- O&M Costs
- Fuel
- Real Estate Taxes
- Depreciation
- Decommissioning
- Interest
- Income Taxes
- Return on Equity (Assume 7% of Net Plant)

- Fixed O&M
- Variable O&M
- Fuel
- Nox Allowances
- Real Estate Taxes
- Depreciation
- Interest
- Income Taxes
- Return of Equity

# University of Chicago Study

## NEW NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS—CLEARLY COMPETITIVE

	Nuclear	Coal	Gas
No policy assistance	\$47-\$71 per MWh	\$33-\$41 per MWh	\$35-\$45 per MWh
After engineering costs are paid; no policy assistance	\$31-\$46 per MWh	\$33-\$41 per MWh	\$35-\$45 per MWh
Limited production and investment tax credit for nuclear	<b>\$25-\$45 per MWh</b>	\$33-\$41 per MWh	\$35-\$45 per MWh

*Note: Under a greenhouse gas reduction policy, the capital cost of new fossil-fuel plants would increase significantly, according to the University of Chicago study. Coal-fired plants would cost \$83 to \$91 per MWh and gas-fired plants would cost \$58 to \$68 per MWh.*

SOURCE: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO STUDY; MWH=MEGAWATT-HOUR

## Summary

- Investment decisions based on economics
- Regulatory process directly impacts the financial and risk analysis of a nuclear investment
  - Time and cost of licensing
  - Finality of decisions
- Coordinated government and industry action needed now to reduce the time to market for new nuclear investments
- Financial incentives needed for “first movers”