

Submitter: Bill Bold

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2410

For starters, the costs and risks of nuclear power are known. The state already has spent considerable money supporting renewable energy as an alternative. Why are we allowing a demonstration project for a technology we already rejected investing in? It seems to me that there are other states in the union that already have nuclear plants and have the infrastructure in place to support a demonstration plant. Why does this have to happen here, why not do the demonstration in one of those locations?

There is one area where I agree with the writer of this bill. I am a consulting engineer and have had a client who wanted to run a pilot plant project in the biofuels area. The state land use laws seem to have no provisions for temporary land uses for scientific research - only for a permanent plant. If the bill were focused on covering more than someones pet project I might show more interest in supporting something, but not a carve out for nuclear power.