

Better insurance against climate change

I loved your editorial (“Go nuclear on climate change,” April 14) about nuclear power and climate change — except your conclusion.

I loved that you appreciated efforts by state Sens. John Eklund and Frank LaRose to relieve financial pressure from FirstEnergy by designing a system of zero-emissions credits that recognize our need to cut carbon emissions and nuclear’s important role. You note that opponents object to the government playing favorites by designing a system that favors nuclear over fossil fuels. You politely don’t mention that the government already allows fossil fuel emissions into our air for free.

Instead, you elegantly apply the language of insurance: We may not know with certainty how rapidly the planet’s warming will proceed, and or how long it’ll be until we have affordable utility-sized batteries for solar and wind, but we do know that maintaining existing nuclear plants provides emissions-free energy right now.

Here’s what I didn’t like: Opponents of Eklund-LaRose’s plan object to customers having a 5 percent increase in electric bills. Please, acknowledge they are right.

There are many ways to accomplish the same type of “insurance” without dumping the cost on customers. The libertarian Niskanen Center suggests that until Congress enacts a revenue-neutral carbon tax (which would not dump costs on customers), states like Ohio should join the Northeast Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI).

RGGI already values the carbon-free electricity of nuclear plants. RGGI has helped our nine states cut electricity emissions while lowering our customers’ average electricity bills. For more information, contact Citizens’ Climate Lobby at <http://citizensclimatelobby.org>.

Judy Weiss

Volunteer member of Citizens’ Climate Lobby
Brookline, Mass.

[LINK](#)