To: Members of the Ohio Senate Energy and Public Utilities Committee
CC: members of congress, national media, general public
Regarding HB 308 – Consideration of codifying nuclear energy as green

If HB 308 is defining “green” in economic terms, and financial benefit to the nuclear industry and select stakeholders, the language of the bill should clarify this. (sarcasm intended) Surely the HB 6 scandal should be cause for pause before allowing the nuclear industry to influence Ohio legislation this way.

If “green” is referring to ecological principles designed to minimize pollution, minimize harm to people and the environment, and minimize depletion of natural resources, then HB 308 must be considered classic “greenwashing”. (deceptively promoting false solutions to ecological problems)

Consider the tragic record of off-site radiological contamination from nuclear sites such as PORTS in Piketon, Ohio, where lethal transuranics have been found in air, soil, creeks, vegetation - homes and schools.

- Children who attended Zahn’s middle school have died with rare aggressive leukemia.
- Cancer rates are extreme.
- Radiological contamination into fractured bedrock beneath PORTS threaten the Taeys Aquifer.
- Np137 uptake from water and soil into plants (and food crops!) is a violation beyond comprehension.
- These are but a few examples.

The EPA clearly defines nuclear as Conventional - not Renewable (or its subset Green). https://www.epa.gov/green-power-markets/what-green-power It is an extractive industry (fueled by mined uranium) and by definition must not be considered Green.

Please do your research.
Nuclear is not Green – It’s Mean!
Thank you for denying HB 308

Sincerely

Kalene Walker

San Diego California