

1. Among the Tentative Findings of the Royal Commission are *elements* that suggest undue bias in favour of Costly, Wasteful and, thankfully, Outgoing SOLID FUEL (eg, Fuel Rod or Pebble based) Nuclear Reactors.

We strongly feel that to encourage thinking towards building such “Fukushima-era” Reactors, in 2030, would unnecessarily burden South Australians with excessive costs – both to build (& to buy the electricity produced by) a SOLID FUEL Reactor, & the cost of storing or processing much more waste produced by it.

We consider it a Duty of the Commission to “correct” itself, & now consider & include LIQUID FUEL MSRs in its (later) Findings. A summary of our grounds for this comment are below:

As Safer, More Cost-Effective & Far Less Wasteful LIQUID FUEL based Molten Salt Reactors (MSRs) are set to become available as early as 2020 (or as late as ~2025) – ie, some 5 - 10 years before 2030, by which year the Commission (tentatively) expects SA to be Ready-to-Build reactor(s) it was inappropriate - in our judgment, NOT to list the trade-offs in & cost some of the three (3) MSRs, companies are now building, which appear very likely to succeed, before 2030. &, in any case, consider these Molten Salt Reactors – along side the SOLID FUEL based SMR(sic) – ie, the only Small Reactors considered, in its Tentative Findings.

2. Features of LIQUID FUEL based Molten Salt Reactors (MSRs) are (or should be) familiar to the Royal Commission, since it has already received several Submissions (which we now cite), eg, from companies like:

Canada’s TERRESTRIAL ENERGY INC., describing its Integrated Molten Salt Reactor (IMSR)
 MIT-based TRANSATOMIC POWER, describing its Waste Annihilating MSR (WAMSR) and
 USA-based: THORCON POWER, describing an export-focused Molten Salt Reactor factory

I believe that many other Submissions also gave the Commission links to & summaries of good reasons to seriously consider LIQUID FUEL MSRs for Nuclear Energy & Energy Recovery (eg, from SOLID FUEL Reactor Waste, from overseas operators).

The Commission erred by NOT including LIQUID FUEL MSRs’ Lower Costs, beside those for SOLID FUEL SMRs(sic). However, the Commission now has a chance to present a more complete & unbiased glimpse of the Nuclear Energy industry, through 2030, when it expects SA to be ready to build a Nuclear Reactor.

3. Finally, we seek to understand possible / likely reason(s) for the lapse of judgment - by the Commission – which lead to the omission (inadvertent or otherwise) of what now appears to be the safest & most cost-effective class of Nuclear Reactors, which SCIENCE (eg, at Oak Ridge National Lab) has yet delivered to humanity: the LIQUID FUEL Molten Salt Reactor (MSR); cf Kirk Sorensen on TED.com & app “Thorium”

We forgive Commissioner Hon. Kevin Scarce, as we hope our many readers will forgive our own lapse, ie, in only belatedly (specifically, this week) beginning to explore Mr Scarce’s qualifications for his job.

While far from complete, our Tentative Findings are: that a lack of deep Science and/or Engineering expertise may have contributed to a lapse, on his part, to include MSRs in the Commission’s Tentative Findings. We need & deserve more Science/Engineering expertise in the Royal Commission, IMO.

Cf: “What Do You Care What Other People Think” by Nobel Lauriat+Physicist Dr Richard Feynman (r.i.p.)