

RulemakingForm3CEm Resource

From: Jean Harper <jbh22@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2015 12:23 PM
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Docket Nos. PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30, NRC-2015-0057

Dear Secretary,

WE ARE PAYING TAXES TO BE PROTECTED - NOT POISONED BY OUR OWN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY WHICH ACTUALLY CONSIDERS GIVING DECISION-MAKING TO NON-SCIENTISTS.

The NRC should REJECT THE 3 PETITIONS FOR RULE-MAKING.

They are an IMMEDIATE THREAT to our grip on a healthy and disease free present and future.

There is no solid evidence of any kind that low doses of radiation exposure may actually be beneficial.

The NRC should not be considering radical proposals that contradict its own update.

Further, it is the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that is charged with setting radiation protection of the public overall and its most recent update of the Blue Book (EPA 402-R-11-001, 2011), like the NRC's current standards (which are themselves too weak), continue to be based on the LNT model. Adoption by the NRC of the "hormesis" model would put the agency in direct and unnecessary conflict with the EPA on this critical underpinning of public health and safety regulation.

As the chief of EPA's radiation section said in 2009, "Although recent radiobiological findings indicate novel damage and repair processes at low doses, LNT is supported by data from both epidemiology and radiobiology. Given the current state of the science, the consensus positions of key scientific and governmental bodies, as well as the conservatism and calculational convenience of the LNT assumption, it is unlikely that EPA will modify this approach in the near future".

If anything, the NRC should move in the opposite direction, as significant research indicates that long-term exposure to low levels of radiation may carry a greater risk of harm than the LNT model presents. It is also well established that radiation causes other kinds of health damage in addition to cancer, but the regulations and risk studies ignore these, and thus are inadequate in that sense.

The petitioners have done the nation a disservice by attempting to weaken these standards using a scientifically suspect model, and thus directing attention away from the real need to strengthen those standards, in particular to account for the reality that radiation is more harmful to children, especially girls, and to women than it is to men, and that the "standard man" approach used by the NRC allows for even greater exposure levels to those who are more vulnerable.

Any changes to radiation regulations contemplated by the NRC should be in the direction of strengthening, not weakening them.

Jean Harper
12 Don Court
12 Don Court
Redwood City, CA 94062

Federal Register Notice: 80FR35870,NRC-2015-0057
Comment Number: 2049

Mail Envelope Properties (191177604.34619.1440260602418.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Docket Nos. PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30,
NRC-2015-0057
Sent Date: 8/22/2015 12:23:22 PM
Received Date: 8/22/2015 12:23:23 PM
From: Jean Harper

Created By: jbh22@comcast.net

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

Post Office: vweb102

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2574	8/22/2015 12:23:23 PM

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