
From: BRC [CommissionDFO@Nuclear.Energy.Gov]
Sent: Saturday, April 02, 2011 3:44 PM
To: correspondence@blueribboncommission.net
Subject: FW: deep bore holes

From: Timothy Havel[SMTP:TFHAVEL@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Saturday, April 02, 2011 3:47:18 PM
To: BRC
Subject: deep bore holes

Dear BRC,

By teaching a class on nuclear waste management at MIT, I learned what a political debacle Yucca Mountain was. Fortunately, it's over, and now we can begin to consider practical solutions.

From a technical and economical point of view, the best waste disposal option is clearly deep boreholes that go well below the water table and into Precambrian basalt or granitic rock formations far from major faults. These have the advantage of being available in several widely dispersed parts of the US, so the waste does not have to be shipped so far, and ensuring that a simple copper or titanium containment vessel (like those used in Sweden) combined with a good overpack would be quite sufficient.

Whether the public near the entrances of those boreholes could be convinced to let the waste be stored there despite the impossibility of it coming out again is the main open question with this option, but if they can't be convinced to do something that makes sense, then there is no option at all.

Of course, if only we'd spent all the money we've wasted on fusion on developing the Thorium fuel cycle instead, the disposal problem would already be well on its way to being solved today.

--
Dr. Timothy F Havel
Scientist & Entrepreneur