

Submitter: Jeramy Clark

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2410

I am a former nuclear operator, and the following is my personal perspective and opinion based on specific knowledge and training, and in no way reflects the opinions of my employers, past or present.

When considering power generation, the top forms that come to mind are nuclear, solar, wind, hydro and fossil fuels. Each has positives and drawbacks.

I will assume and accept the positives of alternative methods are well studied and known by the lay person. I will focus on nuclear.

In 1979 a Hollywood blockbuster called "China Syndrome" starring Michael Douglas and Jane Fonda hit theaters. As Murphy's law would have it, within 2 weeks of its release, Three Mile Island had a partial meltdown, eerily similar to the events in the movie.

Big coal companies seized the opportunity to not only bash the competitor (nuclear) but also attack the president himself (as Jimmy Carter was a Nuclear Engineer trained by the U.S. Navy). Jane Fonda went on to gain fandom with her anti-nuclear campaign, as if playing her role made her an expert in quantum mechanics. Three Mile Island was preventable had the operators followed established protocols. It is worth noting that there have been significant advances in nuclear technology since 1979, and despite zero injuries or fatalities from the accident, it remains a talking point for opponents.

When many hear nuclear, most know nothing about it, or even confuse nuclear energy with nuclear weapons.

Nuclear is by far the greenest form of energy, the cheapest form of energy, and by every metric is the safest form of energy per MW produced, that is, total injuries and fatalities is lower than any other form per MW produced.

I believe the only reasonable opposition to nuclear energy is either ignorance, or virtue signaling. Either way, I have never met an anti-nuclear activist who understands how the engine actually works.