

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 8:17 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on PRM-20-18, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30
Attachments: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0529.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: 11/17/15

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

COMMENT#: 581

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 1390

Mail Envelope Properties (0c64ebe47c2c4abc859a4240d05f275d)

Subject: Comment on PRM-20-18, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30
Sent Date: 11/25/2015 8:16:31 AM
Received Date: 11/25/2015 8:16:32 AM
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	11/25/2015 8:16:32 AM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0529.pdf		66663

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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/23/15 2:04 PM
Received: November 17, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8mb5-8z1s
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-0529

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

Submitter Information

Name: Craig Chartier

General Comment

Advocating to permit more exposure to radiation is akin to arguing that humans need more lead in their blood stream. I am flabbergasted that this issue is seriously being discussed or considered.

These safety standards have been in place since the 1950's (when the consequences of radiation exposure were plain to see).

Perhaps, consider an alternative view point: <http://www.counterpunch.org/2015/09/08/radiation-is-good-for-you-and-other-tall-tales-of-the-nuclear-industry/>

I live in close proximity to Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, the age of which is worrisome enough. I have no desire to worry that the aging plant will be permitted to release more radiation into the surrounding environment, which is precisely what will happen if the new standards are adopted.

There is no safe level of radiation. I hear this every time I go to the doctor for a evaluation of the sun damage to my skin. It's the reason I do not have dental x-rays on every visit for a cleaning.

Yes, it is safe to assume, that if I had a vote, it would be a resounding "no".