

Submitter: Justin Ludwig

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4046

House committee members:

HB 2038 proposes a \$450k study to build small modular nuclear reactors (SMRs) in Oregon.

Any nuclear study privately funded raises serious concerns, especially one that is funded by a corporation interested in producing its own energy supply to power its data centers. The financial motive cannot be ignored.

While a free study may appear to some tax-payers, as with anything free, there is usually a cost.

HB 2038 frames waste and meltdown risks as legal and economic hurdles, not long-term environmental problems, which biases the study toward approval. Even after decades of scientific progress, there is still no way to safely dispose of nuclear waste.

The catastrophic damage caused by nuclear waste cannot be understated. The impact it would have on our people, wildlife, communities and ecosystem, would never be offset by the short-term gains of Amazon data centers, and the corporation's shareholders.

Oregon state law prohibits nuclear waste depositories, but we know that might be challenged more and more as large corporations see AI as their future profit-centers. Some even claim that AI will somehow "invent" clean nuclear fusion, as justification for more expansion of data centers and nuclear reactors.

This is not realistic enough to risk the planet's future. I see the need for clean energy, but nuclear energy is not that. The waste isn't pumped into the atmosphere, but it is deferred to future generations, and would always be at risk of leakage and catastrophe.

The risks are too great, and small modular reactors are untested, which complicates matters further. This new technology is often marketed as safer, but we cannot risk our future on untested technology when the stakes are so high. Especially during this moment in time, when so much uncertainty exists in our country.

This study will lead to conclusions that cannot be trusted when its funding source is biased.

Please vote no.