SB 360

Concerning NuScale's proposal to build modular nuclear reactors, both myself and my husband are strongly opposed. First, why nuclear energy here and why now? We currently have very competitive hydro power and we have very good options for solar and wind in terms of locations and in terms of a new administration that is very supportive of clean and sustainable green energy.

Nuclear energy is not clean. There are accidents, equipment failure, maintenance operation failures, ruptures, leaks, fires, operator errors, and substandard materials, to mention a few. And then there is always the problem of waste and waste disposal. This has been the burden of the industry since its inception. My husband was involved in the design and construction of the Simi Valley plant in 1959; that experienced a partial core meltdown. I was part of the support staff of the Enrico Fermi plant in Monroe Michigan which experienced a sodium system malfunction and fuel element melting. The personnel working on these projects were all dedicated to creating the right design. Disposal was a critical problem then as it continues to be. It is the nature of the industry, because of its highly dangerous and toxic materials, and the nature of the human to err and the unknowns of substandard materials and workmanship that combine to make nuclear energy too costly to treat lightly and endorse.

There are 440 power plants operating in the world. Not all countries report problems. There are 96 commercial power plants in the U.S. 53 of the them have reported the problems listed above up to the current time. The introduction of smaller modular nuclear plants does not in itself guarantee that they will be any safer. The company has an unproven background and we do not believe that Oregon ought to provide the laboratory in which to prove their product.

We have a worldwide climate crisis. Nuclear energy is not a climate solution. For the most part, Oregon can boast clean water and air. Power plant errors and failures threaten this most valued asset. We cannot allow the threat to our underground water or open streams, nor should Oregon offer its soil as suppositories for waste disposal/storage for the same reason. We know that the core value of the corporate world is profit and often to ensure profit, shortcuts are made and oversight is sidestepped. This is a fact and there is ample evidence to support this. To avoid the threat of seismic and tsunami activity of our coastal areas would of necessity place these power plants in areas where solar energy as well as wind energy makes the most sense. So why nuclear energy? I began with that question and I end it with the same question. It doesn't make sense for our state to endorse this experimental and known hazardous when other systems are available, are less costly and do not pose danger to humans and the environment.

NuScale Power already has a test facilityin Idaho. Oregon can wait 9 years until its anticipated startup date of 2030 and 5 years of operation to see whether their reduced scale generators are safe and cost effective, compared with what Oregon can safely offer to its citizens at this time.

When the experimental work using compressed magnets to produce hydrogen with a nontoxic waste product, currently being tested in France, can offer a safe model, perhaps it will be the time for Oregon to open up the field to this form of power plant.

We strongly oppose to HB 26923

Nan Harvey,
Don Harvey
Florence OR