


Climate & Energy Communications Cheat Sheet

3/26/19



Jared DeWese

Senior Communications Advisor

 [@jareddewese](https://twitter.com/jareddewese)

We're back early this week, and we're focused on a bill that could have the biggest near-term impact on emissions that we see all year. But this debate isn't happening in Washington, DC. It's happening in Harrisburg, PA. And the outcome could affect not just the Keystone State but also thirteen other states and Washington, D.C.

Related Tweet to Share



Third Way Climate & Energy @ThirdWayEnergy · Mar 26, 2019



Closing nuclear plants in PA is not just bad for climate, it's bad business. @jsfreed explains the economic & climate risks if these plants close in yesterday's @PhillyInquirer.



Closing nuclear plants is a bad deal for Pennsylvanians | Opinion
The most important upcoming vote on climate policy will not be in Washington, D.C. It will be right here in Pennsylvania.
[inquirer.com](https://www.inquirer.com)

Bad for Climate, Bad for Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania is one of the largest electric producers in the nation--so big that its actions can have impacts far outside its borders. That's why passage of the Keep Powering Pennsylvania Act (HB-11) is incredibly important. The [new legislation](#) would require Pennsylvania to get at least 50% of its power from carbon-free resources. It's particularly critical for the survival of the state's nuclear power plants that produce 42% of Pennsylvania's total power generation and put massive amounts of carbon-free electricity onto the PJM regional grid.

For perspective, closing Pennsylvania's nuclear plants would have the same emissions impact as eliminating one-third of the entire country's wind power.

As we have seen all over the world when nuclear plants close they are often replaced by dirty fossil fuels and emissions rise. To make up for the lost power from the potential shuttering of Pennsylvania nuclear plants, [an analysis shows](#), that dirty fossil power production would have to increase in neighboring states. We can't afford to take any steps backward when scientists have made it very clear that we must reach net zero emissions by 2050.

Read More

Josh Freed, Senior Vice President of the Clean Energy Program at Third Way explains in *The*

JOSH FREED, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CLEAN ENERGY PROGRAM AT THIRD WAY EXPLAINS IN THE Philadelphia Inquirer why preserving and expanding clean energy in Pennsylvania is not just good for climate but good for Pennsylvanians.

Talking Points

- Major natural gas producers are trying to crush this legislation, knowing that if it fails, two of Pennsylvania's nuclear power plants will shut down, and the remaining three could follow. They would be more than happy to replace nuclear power on the grid, even if it means more emissions and higher costs to Pennsylvanians.
- Passage of HB-11 could lay the groundwork for Pennsylvania to generate all of its power from clean, carbon-free energy sources by 2050 — the benchmark scientists say we must hit to stave off climate change's most devastating impacts.
- The economic impact would also be severe. If Pennsylvania were to abandon its nuclear power it would be sacrificing nearly 16,000 jobs. The Three Mile Island facility alone employs more than 675 full-time employees and another 1,500 local union workers who are contracted to help refuel the plant. Two billion dollars in state GDP and \$69 million in state tax revenues also would be swept away.