

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 8:47 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30
Attachments: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0544.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: 11/18/15

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

COMMENT#: 595

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 1404

Mail Envelope Properties (a00edb5ae1c14270b317c83fec63eb97)

Subject: Comment on PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30
Sent Date: 11/25/2015 8:46:58 AM
Received Date: 11/25/2015 8:46:59 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 8:46:59 AM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0544.pdf		68855

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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/23/15 2:15 PM
Received: November 18, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8mc4-jk8m
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-0544

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

Submitter Information

Name: Douglas A Yates

Address:

Box 221

Ester, AK, 99725

Email: dayates@mosquitonet.com

General Comment

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Proposed Rule: Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation

I oppose the proposed rule. Its sponsors have not justified the need to change existing standards for measuring radiation in regard to protecting humanity and all that it surveys. Hormesis is an assumption, suggesting otherwise ignores the foundational work of Sternglass and Gofman proving risk of harm at the smallest doses. The EPA's objection to this proposed rule is similarly secure and well reasoned. I urge the rejection of the application.

Douglas A Yates

Ester, Alaska