

# Contents

---

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xi
PREFACE	xiii
1	
The Riddle of Nuclear Waste	1
The Status Quo: Promoting Permanent Disposal	2
The Mistakes of the Past	3
Summary and Overview	6
2	
Understanding the Origins of the Problem	11
Radioactive Waste: Technical Background	13
Radioactive Waste: Historical Background	15
The Current Status of High-Level Radioactive Waste	19
Radioactive Waste: Legal and Regulatory Background	21
Conclusion	26
3	
Reliance on Value Judgments in Repository Risk Assessment	27
Science and Methodological Value Judgments	28
Quantitative Risk Assessment and Value Judgments	31

Value Judgments in Estimating Risks	34
Value Judgments in Evaluating Risks	36
Conclusion	37

## 4

Subjective Estimates of Repository Risks	39
--	----

Repository Risk Estimates Rely on Questionable Value Judgments	40
Value Judgments about Long-term Risks	42
Value Judgments about Model Reliability	50
Value Judgments about Simplification of the Phenomena	53
Value Judgments about Reliability of Sampling	56
Value Judgments about Laboratory Predictions	60
Value Judgments about Fractured, Unsaturated Media	61
Value Judgments that Interpolations Are Acceptable	66
Value Judgments that Human Error Is Not Significant	67
Problems with Yucca Mountain versus Problems with Permanent Disposal	72

## 5

Subjective Evaluations of Repository Risks	75
--	----

Value Judgments that a Given Magnitude of Risk Is Acceptable	76
Value Judgments that Risk Reductions Are Sufficient	80
Value Judgments that Worst-case Hazards Are Not Credible	82
Value Judgments that Average Risks Are Acceptable	86
Value Judgments that More Recent Assessments Are More Reliable	88
Value Judgments that Utilitarian Risk Theories Are Just	90
Value Judgments about Single-site Studies	94
Value Judgments that Full Liability Does Not Promote Safety	96
Value Judgments that High-Level Waste Is as Safe as Ore	99
Conclusion	101

6		
Problematic Inferences in Assessing Repository Risks		103
The Appeal to Ignorance		105
Two-Valued Epistemic Logic and the Appeal to Ignorance		114
Begging the Question		121
The Expertise Inference		127
The Linearity Inference		134
The De Minimis Inference		136
The Consent Inference		139
Specious Accuracy		141
The Inference of the Multiple Maximand		142
Affirming the Consequent		145
The Appeal to Authority		149
Conclusion		157
7		
Uncertainty: An Obstacle to Geological Disposal		160
We Cannot Adequately Guarantee Yucca Mountain Safety		161
Extensive, Nonquantifiable Uncertainty at Yucca Mountain Argues against Disposal		169
Uncertainty and Permanent Disposal		171
Uncertainty and Permanent Disposal: Other Countries		172
Uncertainty and Permanent Disposal: Faulty Inferences		175
Uncertainty and Permanent Disposal: An Objection		177
Uncertainty and Permanent Disposal: Type-II Error		178
Conclusion		181
8		
Equity: An Obstacle to Geological Disposal		182
Equity and Permanent Geological Disposal		183
Equity and Permanent Geological Disposal: Objections Based on Utility		185
Equity and Permanent Geological Disposal: Are There Duties to Future Generations?		189
Consent and Permanent Disposal		195
Practical and Legal Considerations against Disposal		207
Conclusion		211

An Alternative to Permanent Geological Disposal	213
Basic Principles	216
The NMRS Option	217
Historical Context	218
Independent Technical and Review Committees	219
A Lottery to Determine NMRS Rotations	222
Regional and Temporary NMRS	223
Public Defender for the Future	227
Full Liability	227
Compensation from the Beginning	229
Negotiated Compensation	229
A Public-legacy Trust	231
Benefits of NMRS Facilities	231
Objections to NMRS Facilities	236
Is a Hundred-year NMRS More Expensive?	239
Discounting Underestimates Repository Risks	241
Does NMRS Unrealistically Seek Zero Risk?	243
Would NMRS Burden the Future?	244
Would NMRS Facilities Become De Facto Permanent?	245
NMRS Uncertainties	246
Do Several Sites for NMRS Create Too Much Anxiety?	247
Does the Quantity of Waste Require Permanent Disposal?	247
Conclusion	249
NOTES	253
INDEX OF NAMES	329
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	337