



The Oregon Conservancy Foundation

19140 SE Bakers Ferry Rd., Boring Oregon 97009-9158

P. O. Box 982, Clackamas, Oregon 97015

Email: cnsrvncy@cascadeaccess.com

Phone: (503) 637- 6130

Before the Senate Committee on Energy and Environment

Testimony of Lloyd K. Marbet,
Oregon Conservancy Foundation and Oregon Progressive Party
March 5, 2025



Chair Sollman, Vice Chair Smith, members of the Committee, and members of the public, my name is Lloyd K, Marbet and I am the Executive Director of the Oregon Conservancy Foundation (OCF). I appear before you today in opposition to SB 635.

SB 635 directs Oregon State University (OSU) to conduct a feasibility study on nuclear energy generation in Oregon. This legislation does not identify who actually pays for this study and it requires OSU to submit its study to the Legislature. The major problem with this is who is being asked to do it. OSU has a nuclear reactor program that developed a Small Modular Nuclear Reactor (SMNR) design incorporated into an Oregon based company called NuScale.

OSU has an inherent conflict of interest in doing this study since it has frequently appeared before the Oregon Legislature, over the last five full legislative sessions, promoting its SMNR design in support of the repeal of, or an exemption from, Oregon's 1980 Ballot Measure Law. In addition, when Nuscale obtained OSU's reactor design it gave OSU an equity share in NuScale. This establishes a further bias in the outcome of OSU's proposed study.

There are also two other bills in this legislative session, HB 2038 directing the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) to perform a study on the "advantages" **but not the disadvantages** of nuclear power in Oregon, and HB 2410 asking ODOE to help in siting an SMNR Demonstration Project in Umatilla County, Oregon. One wonders how many times the legislature needs SMNR promotional studies?

There have been many studies that have been performed over time, both in favor and opposed to nuclear energy and the use of SMNRs. It might be of benefit, and much less costly, if the legislature held an informational hearing **reviewing both sides of this issue**, before paying for yet another study to be performed. You could even ask the ODOE to review these existing studies and provide their input at that legislative hearing.

Finally there is the question of what the real need is for this legislation? ORS 469.595, which should not be repealed, requires that before EFSC can issue a site certificate for a proposed nuclear fueled power plant there must be “an adequate repository” for the “the terminal disposition,” “with or without provision for retrieval for reprocessing,” for its high-level radioactive waste. **We all know this repository doesn’t exist, nor do we know if it ever will exist, and even if someday it does exist, whether it will work for the thousands of years of its existence! Once again, the desperate need for government accountability remains!**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. We ask that you table SB 635 and not move it out of committee. I am available for questioning.