

February 10, 2026

Dear Chair Lively, Vice Chairs Gamba and Levy, and members of the committee:

I write to urge you to oppose HB 4046. I am an attorney who has been engaged in Public Utility Commission proceedings over the last few years. I am convinced that “studying” nuclear energy development in Oregon is a distraction from focusing on beneficial generation pursuits and wholly unnecessary because sufficient reliable and unbiased scientific analysis already exists. I believe this conversation is fueled by the confluence of ideological political theater and corporate dominance. It is just a step by obscenely wealthy tech corporations and those under the influence of the ideology of Project 2025 which rejects “green” energy (accusing supporters of creating an artificial energy scarcity in the name of combating climate change) to advance their interests at the expense of the health and safety of Oregonians, and the world for that matter.

As you know, Project 2025 supporters have moved their policy forward by exempting new reactors from many of the decades old safety protective measures for operating nuclear generation. This is wildly in the opposite direction of the intent of the citizens of Oregon in passing the 1980 ballot measure, declaring that Oregonians will not engage in nuclear generation until the method of disposal of the waste has been developed. Not only has that not happened, but now we cannot have any confidence that such energy will be generated safely.

If we cannot be transparent about what this is about, there is no way we can feel confident that the study will not be biased. Tech companies want control of powerful generation for their competitive rush to super-intelligent AI. Anti-green actors, well, they are simply misinformed but no study will change their views.

Yet, this conversation ignores all that; instead, it allows for unusual rhetoric. Without acknowledging that the super-intelligent AI competition is the cause, proponents get to say Oregon has a crucial shortage of energy. And then, because nuclear generation does not emit the greenhouse gases of coal and methane, the proponents get to argue it is clean, which it is not. With these bases, in fact, we can feel confident the study is an attempt to obtain a particular result. We do not need this conversation. We do not need this study.

Oregon has a strong track record of acting responsibly. We do not worry about competing with other states when the result still threatens health and safety. Instead of this waste of time, the conversation and analysis we should have is whether and how to lead the way toward the responsible development of AI, or said differently, how to lead away from the irresponsible, threatening production of grown super-intelligent AI.

Yours truly,

*/s/ Tonia Moro*