

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 8:40 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on NRC-2015-0057 - PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29 & PRM-20-30
Attachments: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0281.pdf

DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SECY-067

PR#: PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PR-20-30

FRN#: 80FR35870

NRC DOCKET#: NRC-2015-0057

SECY DOCKET DATE: 9/8/15

TITLE: Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation

COMMENT#: 288

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 1075

Mail Envelope Properties (64967831defa42a3ad6acf9e493776cb)

Subject: Comment on NRC-2015-0057 - PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29 & PRM-20-30
Sent Date: 9/28/2015 8:40:25 AM
Received Date: 9/28/2015 8:40:25 AM
From: RulemakingComments Resource

Created By: RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS03.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	300	9/28/2015 8:40:25 AM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0281.pdf		66747

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 9/24/15 3:45 PM
Received: September 08, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8l0d-wgnt
Comments Due: November 19, 2015
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2015-0057

Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation

Comment On: NRC-2015-0057-0086

Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation; Extension of Comment Period

Document: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0281

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

Submitter Information

Name: Paul Foos

Address:

527 W. Elm St.

Brockton, MA, 02301

Email: webguy@paulfoos.com

General Comment

I strongly object to the introduction of a "radiation hormesis" model of regulation, and urge the NRC to retain the current linear no-threshold standard. I am not a scientist, but a historian, who has read studies of long-term effects of low-level radiation, and based on that reading would prefer that the NRC take a cautious approach to regulation rather than departing in a new and unproven direction.