

Another problem with SB 360 is how our US government has a huge investment in maintaining a nuclear work force for their nuclear arsenal. There are many political and financial resources to support this untried SMR that make claims of safety without persuasive proof. Their claims mirror the first round of utopian promises as nuclear power plants were put in place to ensure a nuclear workforce for national defense and shield the true cost of mining and milling uranium for nuclear weapons. Nuclear technology was purposefully rooted in our academic, government and international institutions. We have been propagandized to desire these technologies as "our only choice" despite their proven problems.

SB 360 presents additional problems in terms of decision making and corruption of democracy. We are being distracted once again by industry manipulation to see a glitzy unproven technology as a problem solver when instead of seeing how it is a long-lived pollution and problem producer. We need to come together to adequately address the climate crisis to mitigate the severity ahead, but SMRs are not an answer. They hold only limited, risky experimental promise while they enrich large multinational corporations to the people's detriment.

OSU and the state of Oregon are patent holders in SMR technology. Those with alternative energy methods do not have equal access to these levers of power. The state of Oregon should work to equalize public utility and alternative energy development and access to create more equitable systems of power for democratic decision making, and address the questionable investment in nuclear power by public Universities and the state of Oregon. The ongoing lack of democratic and fair funding of science is problematic. Why are certain sciences allowed to prosper while other, more promising alternative energy sources suffer for funding? Why should nuclear science, with its harmful legacy, continue to have such a privileged position?

We are losing time precious time to prepare for climate crisis with other sources that we can all support and are less expensive, proven and much more practical. We cannot continue to invest our precious brain power and resources in untried, dangerous, polluting and risky technologies connected to nuclear weapons and injustice, like small modular reactors when there are more acceptable, working alternatives, such as wind, solar, wave and the best, proven choice: conservation?

Individual nuclear scientists speak as if they have the best interests of the people in mind to help us to survive the climate crisis. However, the reality of this industry is how it has concentrated vast profits and global power outside of any democratic control at the expense of our genetic and physical futures and health. We must invest in green energies that do not oppress and threaten others genetics and health like SMRs. Thank you.