Dear Energy and Environment Committee:

RE: SB 635

Please vote NO on SB 635. There is an apparent conflict of interest having Oregon State University (OSU) conduct a feasibility study on nuclear energy generation in Oregon. Were they not involved in the past financially with NuScale? You are going to waste valuable tax dollars as there are other feasibility studies already available. I urge all to do their due diligent research and NOT EMBRACE a so called nuclear power renaissance. 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 Small Modular Nuclear Reactors (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. (Reference 1 and Reference 2 end of testimony).

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 SB 635

MORE REFERNCES:

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