

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2015 6:18 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Subject:** Comment on PRM-20-28, 20-29 & 20-30  
**Attachments:** NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0517.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:** 11/16/15

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

**COMMENT#:** 515

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1312

**Mail Envelope Properties** (47604ec40a7a4fd4929e29eeec50d1e5)

**Subject:** Comment on PRM-20-28, 20-29 & 20-30  
**Sent Date:** 11/16/2015 6:18:21 PM  
**Received Date:** 11/16/2015 6:18:22 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 6:18:22 PM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0517.pdf		68999

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

<b>As of:</b> 11/16/15 4:26 PM
<b>Received:</b> November 15, 2015
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8m9y-7f9d
<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-0517

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Peter Crownfield

**Address:**

407 Delaware Avenue Apt A

Fountain Hill, PA, 18015-1143

**Email:** peter@sustainlv.org

---

## General Comment

I don't know to say it more clearly than this: There is absolutely no safe level for radiation exposure. The idea that very low doses are harmless or even beneficial makes no sense -- and any rules based on such a theory pose severe risk to everyone, especially for women of child-bearing age and their future children.

The precautionary principle requires us to take action to prevent these risks, even in the absence of absolute proof:

"When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically.... In this context the proponent of an activity, rather than the public, should bear the burden of proof.

"The process of applying the Precautionary Principle must be open, informed and democratic and must include potentially affected parties. It must also involve an examination of the full range of alternatives, including no action."

Or, as our grandparents & great-grandparents said, "Better safe than sorry!"