

I want to submit testimony in opposition to H.B. 308 which is a classic example of 'Green Washing' which is defined as falsely promoting a dirty energy or product as clean. This is commonly done by:

**"Lies**, false claims that make environmental benefits that are non-existent or grossly the opposite of the truth.

**Vagueness**, purposely non-specific about processes or materials

**Hidden Trade-offs**, suggesting that based on a single environmental attribute

**Lesser Evil**, applying a good label to an unfriendly process or product

**No Proof**, making an environmental claim that cannot be substantiated"

Lynda Williams physicist

The current H.B. describes "Advanced Energy as almost anything and lumps "Green Energy" with nuclear and gas and 'clean coal' another monumental example of Green Washing a dirty fossil fuel.

*"Advanced energy project" means any technologies, products, activities, or management practices or strategies that facilitate the generation or use of electricity or energy and that reduce or support the reduction of energy consumption or support the production of clean, renewable energy for industrial, distribution, commercial, institutional, governmental, research, not-for-profit, or residential energy users, including, but not limited to, advanced energy resources and renewable energy resources. B. No. 308 Page 6 As Passed by the House facilitate the generation or use of electricity or energy and that reduce or support the reduction of energy consumption or support the production of clean, renewable energy for industrial, distribution, commercial, institutional, governmental, research, not-for-profit, or residential energy users, including, but not limited to, advanced energy resources and renewable energy resources.*

*"Green energy" means any energy generated by using an energy resource that does one or more of the following: (a) (i) Releases reduced air pollutants, thereby reducing. Is more sustainable and reliable relative to some fossil fuels. (b) "Green energy" includes energy generated by using natural gas the following as a resource: (i) Natural gas as a resource; (ii) Nuclear reaction.*

If we are to believe this torrent of lies we should not be able to separate truly clean and cheap energy from fossil fuels or nuclear fuels. There is a difference.

Fossil fuels must be mined and processed (cleaned, graded, loaded and shipped) all creating much dirty air and degrading our environment. This is not in question. Nuclear fuel is also mined and processed (cleaned, graded, loaded and shipped) with another process called enrichment which takes the uranium ore and bombards it with highly charged particles to create nuclear fuel. This fuel does not blow away in the wind but remains deadly for thousands of years "Half-life is defined as the amount of time it takes a given quantity to decrease to half of its initial value". This means a storage for thousands of years and the necessary energy and air pollution. Nuclear power creates radioactive elements but these elements remain to cause future death in over exposure and this is not only not clean energy but the most dangerous and dirty.

Studies on human health have proven the exposure is hazardous and should not be taken lightly.

"...the human epidemiological evidence establishes—by any reasonable standard of proof—that there is no safe dose or dose-rate...the safe-dose hypothesis is not merely implausible—it is disproven." Dr. J.W. Gofman 4 "One thing we should take from this (1991 study of Oak Ridge weapons workers by Steve

Wing, et al.) is that there isn't any safe level of radiation exposure..." Dr. Carl Shy 5. "The reanalysis (of Hanford worker data) provides no support for the idea that...there is reduced cancer effectiveness of radiation at low dose levels..." Drs. G.W. Kneale and A. Stewart 6

The costs are very different for true clean energy with Utility scale wind and solar declining since 2009 by 69% and 83% respectively while nuclear has increased by 49% according to Lazard levelized cost of energy. This does not include the endless costs for maintenance and decommissioning the plant and constant storage.

Nuclear does not pass the no emission test since it does emit huge clouds of steam (greenhouse gas) and small amounts of radioactive material. *For example, a case-control study of cancer among children < 5 years of age found that residence within 5 km of a nuclear facility was associated with a 61% [one-sided lower bound of the 95% confidence interval (CI), 26%] increased incidence of all cancer (Spix et al. 2008) and a 119% (lower bound of the 95% CI, 51%) excess risk of leukemia (Kaatsch et al. 2008a). A meta-analysis of geographic studies reported 23% (95% CI, 7-40%) higher incidence of leukemia among children 0-9 years of age living within 16 km of nuclear facilities (Baker and Hoel 2007).* According to an article from National Institute of Health, Environmental Health Perspectives.

All of these examples confirm that nuclear power is not user friendly of "Green" in any way. It is in fact the worst choice from a health, emissions and cost comparison to solar and wind and geothermal and hydroelectric which are all low or no significant contributor to the climate crisis or huge energy costs.