

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 5:52 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on PRM-20-28, 20-29 & 20-30
Attachments: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0503.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: 11/13/15

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

COMMENT#: 496

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 1298

Mail Envelope Properties (6479787a786b40218ddb8733d4bb548f)

Subject: Comment on PRM-20-28, 20-29 & 20-30
Sent Date: 11/16/2015 5:52:29 PM
Received Date: 11/16/2015 5:52:30 PM
From: RulemakingComments Resource

Created By: RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

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

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	298	11/16/2015 5:52:30 PM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0503.pdf		66694

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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/13/15 4:58 PM
Received: November 13, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8m8k-bw4e
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-0503

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

Submitter Information

Name: susan gateley

General Comment

We must not loosen the standards for exposure to radiation by the public. If any change is to be made, the standards should be made more restrictive, imposing even lower limits on radiation exposure.

This is clearly a situation that calls for the precautionary principal. Some forms of radioactive waste are virtually forever. We must not in anyway encourage a casual attitude towards this material. And long latency periods for cancer are no reason to duck the issue. Someday you will be seventy. Wouldn't you like a decent quality of life at that point? What about your kids?

A recently released study of nuclear industry workers suggests that at these new limits of exposure (100 mSv) there will be an extra 10 cancers per 100 people. This is an unacceptable level of risk for neighbors of nuclear plants. (like me. I live on a drinking water supply with sixteen nukes on it.) Even the nuke workers presently have lower limits of allowable exposure! The general public that includes young and old people and women who are known to be more susceptible to radiation induced cancer than working age males should not have to accept this latest move to de regulate and make the 'problem' go away!

This appears to be yet another cynical example of changing regulations to suit the industry rather than the public for short term gain. This is no way to rein in ever rising medical costs!