

Submitter: Diane Meisenhelter
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2038

I urge you to vote 'no' on HB 2038. First it is outrageous to ask for a one-sided study by ODOE where they would only weigh the 'advantages' of nuclear power and not full evidence including the multiple disadvantages. Secondly, this is an effort to undermine the state's ballot measure supported moratorium on nuclear energy until radioactive waste issues have been adequately resolved--which has not happened. Third, there is a plentitude of studies not only on the problematics and false solution of nuclear power and SMNRs in particular that are already available. The facts are that nuclear waste is deadly and lasts for over a quarter million years. There are not safe ways of storing it and industry has a poor record of managing the storage. Transporting waste to far away sites has the risks of accidents and negatively impacts other communities and ecosystems. Right now the Federal government is laying off critical nuclear workers in our state and Washington who are already challenged to keep us safe. Nuclear is the most expensive way to generate electricity(5x more expensive and notorious for cost overruns) which will impact low-income rate payers and nuclear takes away funding from less expensive and cleaner generation options. It saddles future generations with nuclear waste and the siting often affects poor and Indigenous populations disproportionately. It is misleading to say that it is non-emitting for during the full fuel process it is highly dependent on fossil fuels. When there are accidents the impacts are devastating. The sites also can be source of terrorism or vulnerable to nuclear weapons proliferation. There are low benefits and huge harms which is why Oregon wisely moved away in the past and should not be reopening that can of worms since the industry has still not resolved the problems left over from the past generation of reactors. There are only three operating SMNRs in the world and all are underperforming. It will a far longer time to get these on line than we have to impact the climate crisis and given all parts of the life cycle (uranium mining, still requiring life cycle fossil fuel usage and so much more) it is still a false solution. Claiming it being needed as a baseload technology is an outdated concept given rapid and ongoing improvements in both storage and grid potentials. Just say NO to false solutions that divert energy and funding from energy efficiency, cleaner renewable energies, and storage technologies.