

March 10, 2025

## TESTIMONY REGARDING NUCLEAR POWER BILL SB 216

Dear Senate Committee on Energy and Environment:

Thank you for allowing me to submit testimony today. I ask you Vote NO on SB 216. Why on Earth repeal a requirement for a licensed repository for the disposal of high-level radioactive or nuclear waste before a site certificate for nuclear-fueled thermal power plant may be issued? There is no repository facility operating at this time. And no prospects of a repository facility for decades if ever. This despite decades of effort and billions spent on trying to have this type of facility in our country for the permanent disposal of nuclear waste. This moratorium in Oregon since 1980 is vitally important so that citizens will not be dangerously burdened with new nuclear power plants that will cause a serious nuclear waste issue. I only wish other states had this remarkable legislation in place besides Oregon.

I urge all to do their due diligent research and NOT EMBRACE a so called nuclear power renaissance. SB 216 attempts to weaken the protections for people in Oregon. SB 216, if passed, would allow pronuclear proponents to plunge recklessly ahead with nuclear power development, pushing the Small Modular Nuclear Reactors (SMNR's). It would be a reckless use of millions of dollars that can be utilized for a true renewable energy grid instead of wasting millions on development of nuclear power plants.

We all must face the urgency of acting with readily available resources and methodologies that are available now and are actually feasible to build in the time and budget constraints we have now. No where yet as any nuclear power project come in on time and on budget in the United States. There are no SMNR's built or operating anywhere in the United States. There are much less expensive, proven, easy to implement alternatives. These include energy efficiency and conservation as well as clean renewable sources like wind and solar, along with other renewable energy sources presently under development that would benefit so greatly from these loans and are far more worthy of the funding described in the bills (Reference 1 at end of comment and Reference 2).

SMNRs or other nuclear power plants will not save us as we continue to face climate crises; they will not be built for a decade or more to come if ever. Proponents continue to use the climate crisis as a call to arms to support nuclear power and continue to ignore the harm, extreme time required to build, and refuse to acknowledge that nuclear power is neither green nor clean.

Proponents of nuclear power still ignore conveniently that there is absolutely no safe way to store and dispose of toxic nuclear waste. They wish to push it on to our children and their descendants to deal with. The toxicity of nuclear waste last thousands of years.

We have the technology now to move to a renewable energy grid if the will was placed in motion instead of wasting millions and millions of dollars on a dangerous technology such as nuclear power. Please read: **"NO MIRACLES NEEDED - How Today's Technology Can Save Our Climate and Clean Our Air"** by Dr. Mark Jacobson <https://web.stanford.edu/group/efmh/jacobson/WWSNoMN/NoMiracles.html> . And read **"Seven Reasons Why New Nuclear Energy is an Opportunity Cost That Damages Efforts to Address Climate Change and Air Pollution"** by Mark Z. Jacobson (7 page article - Reference 2 at end). It is so important not to go down the road to financial disaster by promoting nuclear power in this country, but to instead to take the road to a true renewable and sustainable energy future with the technology **that exists now and that can be quickly improved upon with the millions of dollars that would be available by not detouring toward nuclear power.**

For more on the fallacies of nuclear power, please read **"NUCLEAR IS NOT THE SOLUTION: The Folly of Atomic Power in the Age of Climate Change"** by Dr. MV Ramana. For a detailed and easy overview, go to <https://sppga.ubc.ca/news/why-nuclear-energy-is-not-the-solution-to-the-climate-crisis/>. The text below taken from the book description adequately explains the dangers of nuclear power. "NUCLEAR POWER WILL SLOW OUR RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND INCREASE THE RISK OF WEAPONS PROLIFERATION AND CATASTROPHE. THE CLIMATE CRISIS has propelled nuclear energy back into fashion. Its proponents argue we already have the technology of the future and that it only needs perfection and deployment. "Nuclear Is Not the Solution" demonstrates why this sort of thinking is not only naïve but dangerous. Even beyond the horrific implications of meltdown and the intractable problem of waste disposal, nuclear is not practicable on such a large scale. Any appraisal of future energy technology depends on two important parameters: cost and time. Nuclear fails on both counts. It is more costly than its renewable competitors wind and solar. And, importantly given the need for rapid transformation, it is slow. A plant takes a decade to come online. If you include permits and fundraising, this adds another decade. And we should not forget the deep roots it has in the defense industry."

Nuclear power is a perilous diversion from the urgent mission of decarbonizing our energy systems and building a truly renewable resilient power grid. Vote NO on SB216.

#### **MORE REFERENCES:**

1. **No Miracles Needed** by Mark Z. Jacobson PhD. makes it clear:

"The world needs to switch away from using fossil fuels to using renewable sources of energy as soon as possible. Failure to do so will lead to accelerated and catastrophic climate damage, loss of biodiversity, and economic, social, and political instability. This book describes how to solve the climate crisis, and at the same time eliminate air pollution and safely secure energy supplies for all - without using miracle technologies. It explains how to use existing and known technologies to harness, store, and transmit

energy from wind, water, and solar sources to ensure reliable electricity and heat supplies worldwide. It also discusses which technologies are not needed.

2. **“Seven Reasons Why New Nuclear Energy is an Opportunity Cost That Damages Efforts to Address Climate Change and Air Pollution by Mark Z. Jacobson**  
<https://web.stanford.edu/group/efmh/jacobson/Articles/I/24-01-MZJ-HRTestimony.pdf>

“Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University January 17, 2024  
*Submitted to the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions, House Financial Services Committee*

A small group of scientists has proposed replacing 100% of the world’s fossil fuel power plants with nuclear reactors as a way to solve climate change (1). Many others propose that nuclear should satisfy up to 20 percent of all our energy (not just electricity) needs. They advocate that nuclear is a “clean” carbon- free electricity source, but they don’t look at the full scope of impacts of nuclear. Let’s look at the facts. “

Go to PDF link for full 7 page reference.

Sincerely,  
Nancy Morris