

Submitter: Ken Bonetti
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment
Measure, Appointment or HB4046
Topic:

Members of the House Committee on Climate, Energy and Environment

My name is Ken Bonetti from North Bend Oregon. I am strongly urging you to oppose HB4046. I believe this bill not only opens the door to future nuclear power development in Oregon, but actually encourages its adoption, which would be detrimental to our environment and quality of life. Nuclear energy is a false solution to fossil fuel dependence. From mining Uranium, processing, utilization for power generation and ultimate waste disposal, nuclear is fraught with insurmountable problems. Rather than prodigious amounts of carbon emissions of which mining and transport of ore produces plenty, there is the virtually insurmountable problem of the disposition of long-lived radioactive byproducts and highly radioactive waste for which, despite decades of effort, there still is no accepted permanent safe storage technology or location to protect current and future generations from deadly contamination. Deploying smaller so-called "advanced" generating units will simply compound the problem with many more points of potential contamination, security breaches, safety hazards and inevitably radioactive waste disposal.

Furthermore, nuclear power is far more expensive than improving energy efficiency and deploying solar, wind, wave, geothermal and battery power generation. Nuclear will require far more costly public regulation and subsidization. There is a reason why the Price-Anderson Act was passed and is still in effect on behalf of nuclear energy; because no private insurer was willing to cover the risks associated with nuclear generation, particularly for accidents of which there plenty of disastrous historical examples. Further, there is a long history of well-documented cost overruns with nuclear. In my former home state of Colorado the St. Vrain nuclear plant at Platteville incurred billions in cost overruns to the point that the plant had to be permanently closed after many costly delays, mishaps and shutdowns. Nuclear power is also extremely capital intensive, incurs high operating costs and is an ongoing security threat from mishaps, accidents, sabotage, theft of radioactive materials and other breeches that necessitate concentrated ownership and operational control, costly security measures and secrecy that afford little to no public accountability or meaningful input into operations, operating costs, public safety and consumer welfare, including electrical rates, plant location and public exposure to hazards.

Compare these well documented problems to those that would be incurred from implementing energy efficiency and far more benign renewable energy generation, particularly democratic and accountable generating capacity distributed to households, businesses and communities. The contrast is stark. And please don't

claim that energy efficiency combined renewable energy cannot fill the bill. There is plenty of research that supports the opposite conclusion. I suggest you inquire with the Political Economy Research Institute (PERI) at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. I am certain they can put you in touch with a wealth of research and 'studies' that can prove the point.

Support for nuclear power, which this bill effectively amounts to, is support for a dirty, dangerous, anti-democratic and costly energy future unworthy of a great state like Oregon that prides itself on environmental stewardship, a strong democratic tradition, public accountability and attention to public welfare. Instead of spending millions on more "studies," review what is already well known about this long ago discredited energy generation platform. Put our money to work for a clean, efficient, economical and democratic energy future, a future that Oregonians want and deserve.

Sincerely,

Ken Bonetti, North Bend