

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2015 6:00 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Subject:** Comment on PRM-20-28, 20-29 & 20-30  
**Attachments:** NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0505.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#:** 503

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1300

**Mail Envelope Properties** (5d09d87b9d8b47ad85703dcd6a5c3920)

**Subject:** Comment on PRM-20-28, 20-29 & 20-30  
**Sent Date:** 11/16/2015 5:59:49 PM  
**Received Date:** 11/16/2015 5:59:50 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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	298	11/16/2015 5:59:50 PM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0505.pdf		67523

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

<b>As of:</b> 11/16/15 4:14 PM
<b>Received:</b> November 13, 2015
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8m8n-e6cs
<b>Comments Due:</b> November 19, 2015
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

**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-0505

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Nancy Kasper

---

## General Comment

We will not accept loosening 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 last virtually forever. We must not in anyway encourage a casual attitude towards this material.

And long latency periods for cancer are no reason to evade the issue. Suffering the negative health impacts of radiation exposure later in life does not make them any less severe or significant. 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 increasing allowable limits of exposure (100 mSv) would cause an additional 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 especially 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! We will not accept it. It smacks of sexual discrimination.

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!