

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2015 11:49 AM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Subject:** Comment on NRC-2015-0057 - PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29 & PRM-20-30  
**Attachments:** NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0317.pdf

### **DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**SECY-067**

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

**FRN#:** 80FR35870

**NRC DOCKET#:** NRC-2015-0057

**SECY DOCKET DATE:** 9/9/15

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

**COMMENT#:** 324

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1113

**Mail Envelope Properties** (f51f38ab767c498e848b9b9b61840f73)

**Subject:** Comment on NRC-2015-0057 - PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29 & PRM-20-30  
**Sent Date:** 9/29/2015 11:49:14 AM  
**Received Date:** 9/29/2015 11:49:15 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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	296	9/29/2015 11:49:15 AM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0317.pdf		65338

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

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 9/25/15 10:05 AM
<b>Received:</b> September 09, 2015
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8118-szfu
<b>Comments Due:</b> November 19, 2015
<b>Submission Type:</b> 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-0317

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Karl Poehleman

---

## General Comment

There are no conclusive studies showing a benefit to humans from ionizing radiation ( above background ), and therefore no data to support what level above background would be beneficial. Even if there were some practical way to control individual dosing, which there is not, some ( children in particular ) are more susceptible to damage from low levels of radiation. There is therefore, no compelling reason to move away from the current LNT standard.