

Chair Reineke, Vice Chair McColley, Ranking Member Smith, and members of the Senate Energy and Public Utilities Committee;

I am writing in opposition to HB 308 which would include energy generated by nuclear reactions as “green energy”. I am sure many of the members on the committee are old enough to remember Three-Mile Island, Chernobyl and more recently, the 2011 accident of Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant. The accidents, two of which were caused by human error, shocked the world, killed many people and left many permanently harmed. Chernobyl’s site is still radioactive today.

Why would anyone attempt to call nuclear energy “green energy”? What is the gimmick behind HB 308? You cannot change the dangers of this energy source by legislation to classify it as green energy. All the legislation in the world cannot make nuclear energy safe or green.

I have two green energy sources in my house; an 8.4 kW solar system and a geothermal heat pump system. I don’t live in fear of those systems exploding, or melting down, or releasing radioactive isotopes.

Both of my systems were quite affordable. My panels were installed in a day and my heat pump ground loops were drilled and installed in four days. I didn’t have to wait at least ten years for a nuclear reactor to be built. I don’t need to worry about toxic radioactive wastes being created. I don’t need to worry about the earth or the sun increasing their “rates” for the energy. I don’t have to worry about destroying a 45-mile radius around my home should a solar module break down or the heat pump has a mechanical issue.

Ohio needs to support renewable energy like solar and wind. My county, Harrison County, approved a commercial scale solar project “Nottingham Solar” located on a brownfield site where coal mining was conducted. It will provide a significant tax incentive (900k annually) to our schools and library. Currently, Ohio only derives 4% of its energy from renewable resources, yet companies want to embrace solar. Campbell’s Soup installed close to 10 megawatts of solar on its plant in Napoleon, Ohio in 2014. “Over the course of the 20-year PPA, Campbell will save up to \$4 million dollars based on U.S. Department of Energy projections for the cost of electricity in Northwest Ohio. The project will also eliminate approximately 250,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gas emissions in the region.” Financial, environmental and safety concerns show that solar just makes sense.

Many years ago, during my graduate work, I had the opportunity to visit Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. It was dubbed the birthplace of the atomic bomb during the Manhattan Project. As we drove along the streets, we saw barbed wire fences everywhere along with security cameras and many businesses named after atomic structures. It was a sad reminder of our love affair with a deadly energy source that still threatens to rear its ugly head in the form of smaller reactors (SMR). Make no mistake, these reactors will be just as deadly and require years to construct.

That region is still dealing with the legacy wastes from plutonium dumped around the laboratory site. In 1945, while watching the explosion of the Trinity Bomb, J. Robert Oppenheimer quoted Hindu scripture, saying, “Now I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds.” Does this sound like something a sane person would say about “green energy”?

Unlike real green energy, nuclear energy requires the mining of uranium ore which means frontline communities and workers are exposed to the radiation from these processes. No community wants to house radioactive wastes that have half-lives in the hundreds of thousands of years.

I thought I had heard it all when Ohio legislators dubbed methane gas as green energy via HB507, but I was wrong. Calling nuclear energy “green” is absolutely ridiculous. Anyone who believes nuclear energy is green needs a science class ASAP.

Randi Pokladnik AAS Environmental Engineering, BA Chemistry, MA and PhD Environmental Studies  
Uhrichsville, Ohio 44683