

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2015 5:10 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: FW: Comment on Raising acceptable radiation level for industry.

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: 11/19/15

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

COMMENT#: 541

From: Sarah Peterson [mailto:hummingbirdpottery@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2015 1:43 PM
To: RulemakingComments Resource <RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov>
Subject: [External_Sender] Comment on Raising acceptable radiation level for industry.

November 19, 2015

NRC Rulemaking Judges,

The proposed new regulation lifting the restrictions on allowable radiation exposures is not at all consistent with known science. We discovered decades ago, with the exposures of significant numbers of people and animals to varying degrees of radiation during the atomic age of the 20th Century, that all radiation exposure is cumulative throughout life, and harmful at any level.

In addition, we also now know that the health effects of radiation itself is independent of the additional health effects of the metals that the radiation is associated with. Heavy metals themselves have significant health compromising and toxic effects, even in low levels as well, that is independent of the radiation they give off, making for a "double whammy" to the living body of plants, animals and humans. These heavy metal exposures associated with radioactive substances are not being properly tested for, as in speciation of inorganic compounds and organified metals so as to properly assess their true toxicity. Science has known for decades that different metallic compounds have different tissue and organ affinity and different levels of toxicity in the living body. This also needs to be incorporated into policy, not ignored as it is today.

Sites of exposures that are proposed to be impacted are old mining sites, nuclear test sites, fracking sites, nuclear reactor sites, etc., are also sites that contain significant hazardous waste and heavy metal exposures that need to be addressed as superfund

sites, not those of proposed new "limited use", as would be if this proposal were adopted.

I understand the NRC wants to reduce its regulatory oversight obligations and costs and become more "industry friendly", however, it is the mandate of the NRC to first protect the people of the United States, and regulate industries to that regard, not the other way around.

Very Sincerely,
Sarah Peterson
510 Jennings
Hot Springs, SD 57747

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 1339

Mail Envelope Properties (0ec6c7cdc70f43e9a1d16ec4256d761c)

Subject: FW: Comment on Raising acceptable radiation level for industry.
Sent Date: 11/19/2015 5:10:23 PM
Received Date: 11/19/2015 5:10:24 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 | 2614 | 11/19/2015 5:10:24 PM |

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