

Submitter: Nathalie Paravicini

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment

Measure: HB2215

Dear elected representatives:

I am strongly opposed to eliminate the requirement to have adequate repositories for terminal disposition of high-level radioactive waste as a precondition for issuing licenses for nuclear power plants for a number of reasons:

SUPER COSTLY on MANY FRONTS

- 1) Even after 40-50 years seeking for solutions we still do not have a repository for radioactive waste in the US. That is because there is no solution for high-level radioactive waste. Even with SMRN, that waste will be lying around for hundreds if not thousands of years. I do not want Oregon to become a new repository of nuclear waste. We keep on kicking the can to future generations and that has to stop.
- 2) Even if we assume SMRN were to reuse nuclear material, the dangers and problems associated with reopening cores are huge - and we will be paying for those costs as well.
- 3) The costs of production, waste management, loans and assumption of the industry's liability are huge. Nuclear power is very expensive; we will be paying for its costs just like we are paying for costs of the oil and gas industries while their profits soar. I am opposed to subsidize yet another industry with long-term costs to provide a short term bandaid to our energy problem.

I just found a report that outlines these problems and others:
<https://www.columbiariverkeeper.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/2021.9.14%20FINAL%20SMR%20Report.pdf>

THE COST OF EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES IS BORNE BY LOW INCOME COMMUNITIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

I could not agree more with the following statements: "Nuclear energy is extractive energy, and not part of a Just Transition. The vast majority of uranium mining in the US and around the world has been done on Indigenous land with Indigenous communities suffering from the health impacts. Nuclear production and waste storage often occurs near low-income communities and communities of color. Nuclear energy is a false solution to the climate crisis."

THE PROBLEM IS OVERCONSUMPTION

The major problem we face is one of overconsumption - lack of proper insulation, energy-efficient technologies, education and implementation of waste reduction solutions. Even Bezos in one of his interviews acknowledged we simply did not have

enough energy on the plant to sustain the data farms or virtual economy. Our lifestyle is simply not sustainable yet there is scarcely any considerable investment in decreasing overconsumption, making mass transit a real part of the solution, educating and supporting the population in transforming our economic system. SMNR and nuclear power in general is going to be just a temporary distraction, not a real solution.

Oregon needs to lead in reimagining how we can organize our entire economic system, instead of subsidizing short term solutions because some folk profit from it by externalizing the costs to the rest of society.

If they want to move forward with SMNR - then demonstrate how you are going to manage the waste other than creating farms with highly radioactive material that will create risks and problems for generations.