



February 4, 2026

To: Senator Sollman, Senate Committee on Energy and Environment
Senator Brock Smith, Vice Chair, Senate Committee on Energy and Environment Members
of the Senate Committee on Energy and Environment

Re: Opposition to SB 1597 without Amendment

Chair Sollman, Vice Chair Brock Smith, and Members of the Committee,

We are all dedicated to decarbonizing the electricity grid by accelerating the transition to clean energy resources. Our members include renewable energy and storage developers and businesses, environmental organizations, elected local leaders and consumer advocates. We are in favor of narrowing the bill with a straightforward amendment that would provide needed clarity and better align the bill with its original intent.

In conversations with the bill sponsor, we understand that SB 1597 was intended to apply to nuclear facilities and the unique challenges associated with developing nuclear energy and storing nuclear waste. However, as drafted, the bill is written broadly and applies to all energy facilities. That disconnect between intent and language creates confusion and could lead to unintended consequences for other types of energy facilities.

Renewable energy facilities generally do not produce waste that is stored long-term. Instead, waste is typically disposed of through existing, well-established processes. For example, solar, wind, and battery components are managed through disposal or recycling - not storage in the way nuclear waste is stored.

Because of that, the bill's requirement to disclose "the costs of storing waste produced by an energy

facility in generating electricity” does not meaningfully apply to renewable energy projects. Yet as written, these facilities could still face new and confusing reporting requirements that do not provide additional public benefit.

It’s also important to note that waste from renewable energy projects is already comprehensively addressed under existing EFSC standards and is part of the permitting process at both the state and county level. Those standards require waste management plans covering construction, operations, and retirement, as well as decommissioning plans that address waste at end-of-life. While counties generally determine their own permitting processes and standards, Oregon law requires counties to adopt EFSC’s comprehensive decommissioning standards which restore energy sites to a useful and nonhazardous condition. In other words, these issues are already being responsibly managed at the state and county level.

For those reasons, we are opposed to the bill and recommend an amendment that adds the word “nuclear” before all references to “energy facilities” in the bill. This change would clearly limit SB 1597 to nuclear facilities, align the statutory language with legislative intent, and avoid unnecessary confusion or unintended impacts on renewable energy development in Oregon.

Thank you for considering the proposed changes to SB 1597.

Angela Crowley Koch
Executive Director
OSSIA

Tess Milio
Lobbyist
CREA

Katie Chamberlain
Regulatory Manager
Renewable Northwest

Sidney Villanueva
Senior Policy Advisor
NIPPC