

**DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE PR 20****68FR09595**

**From:** "Leigh Davis" <fyrekat@msn.com>  
**To:** "Secretary Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <secy@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 24, 2003 2:39 PM  
**Subject:** Comments on Controlling the Disposition of Solid Materials (10 CFR Part 20)

1562

Leigh Davis  
34 North Ave. West  
Cranford, NJ 07016

DOCKETED  
USNRC

June 24, 2003

June 24, 2003 (3:18PM)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dear Secretary:

We need to significantly limit the scope of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposed "rulemaking on controlling the disposition of solid materials" to only those regulatory options that would strictly prohibit the deregulation of any solid materials containing or contaminated with manmade radiation, and require that such materials be disposed of only in secure, licensed facilities that are designed to isolate such radioactive waste from people and the environment.

Despite the fact that the NRC accepts the validity of the linear, no-threshold (LNT) model of human exposure to radioactivity, which holds that "any increase in dose, no matter how small, results in an increase in risk" to human health, the Commission is obstinately pursuing a contradictory proposal that would, in fact, result in exposing we the people to greater doses of radioactivity! This sentiment is revealed in the statement of NRC Chairman Richard Meserve, in the NRC Commission Voting Record of October 25, 2002. Meserve advised that "it would not be appropriate to mask the Commission's continuing support for the release of solid material." This is a travesty of proper government regulation that the NRC is pursuing, in effect, a subsidy worth billions of dollars that rewards waste generators for irresponsibly scattering their waste into the unregulated environment and shirking their responsibility for any of the consequences.

Under absolutely no conditions should nuclear waste be deregulated, be dumped in unlicensed facilities that are not prepared to monitor for or contain radioactive waste, or be allowed into general commerce.

As an agency that considers its "primary mission" to be protecting public health and safety from the dangers of radiation, you should not consider any rollback in regulatory protections. Inasmuch as the current scoping process involves the NRC's alleged serious consideration of various alternatives—ranging from no release of materials to unrestricted release—while the Commission openly acknowledges a prejudice favoring release, the results of this rulemaking will likely endanger not only our health and ecological integrity, but the integrity of the NRC as a credible regulatory agency, as well.

The NRC's primary mission to "to protect public health and safety, and the environment from the effects of radiation from nuclear reactors, materials, and waste facilities" can only be upheld by, at a minimum,

establishing permanent policy wherein all radioactive material waste is restricted from general commerce and required to be disposed of in an NRC- or Agreement State-licensed low-level waste disposal site, best articulated as "Alternative 5" in the notice published in the Federal Register on February 28, 2003.

Further regulations and protections should be implemented as needed to fulfill said mission in a serious and responsible manner.

Sincerely,

Leigh A. Davis