

Testimony in Opposition to HB 308 - Include energy generated by nuclear reaction as green energy

Good morning Chair Reineke, Vice-Chair McColley, Ranking Member Smith and members of the Ohio Senate Energy and Public Utilities Committee. My name is Lee Blackburn and I thank you for allowing me to testify in opposition to HB 308 - Include energy generated by nuclear reaction as green energy.

I am shocked to see that members of our legislature would actually consider nuclear in any of its forms to be green energy. This is greenwashing in its most elemental form. And since this committee is actually considering to: "Include energy generated by nuclear reaction as green energy", allow me to define greenwashing. In its purest and simplest form, Ecolife defines it as: "The process of **making false or misleading environmental claims** to mislead customers" (Emphasis added), in this case your constituents.

Certilogo, in turn, defines greenwashing as: "a marketing tactic used by companies to make their products or services appear more green and environmentally friendly than they actually are **to gain a competitive advantage over competitors.**" (Emphasis added). This is exactly what this bill is designed to do, define something that is actually dirty and harmful as something clean and green to gain an advantage over other, more benign, forms of energy such as wind, solar and hydro.

Certilogo goes on to say: "(greenwashing)...may seem effective, but it undermines legitimate green initiatives and it is bad for the environment and it distracts from actual sustainability efforts." By calling nuclear green, you are deceiving your constituents and perpetrating a fraud.

Let me backup and address the issue of nuclear being green energy. Many groups and organizations use green, clean and renewable interchangeably. Yet we know that nuclear isn't clean with its thousands of tons of deadly radioactive waste that threatens the very existence of our planet every day, and it's certainly isn't renewable. The Department of Energy, home of all things nuclear, defines renewable energy as: "...energy produced from sources like the sun and wind that are naturally replenished and do not run out." That definitely doesn't define nuclear.

So, if it isn't clean and it isn't renewable, why would we call it green unless the intent is to deceive your constituents and why would you ever want to do that?

If we call nuclear green, what's next? What's left? Section 4928.01 already calls gas green and refers to "clean coal" as an "Advanced Energy resource". Calling nuclear green is just a really **BAD** idea. I would ask that you vote against this false and deceptive change.

Thank you.