

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 2015 9:33 AM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Subject:** Comment on PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30  
**Attachments:** NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0609.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:** 11/19/15

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

**COMMENT#:** 620

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1429

**Mail Envelope Properties** (83af2c92ce4d49a595f6ddcf60f1c20f)

**Subject:** Comment on PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30  
**Sent Date:** 11/25/2015 9:33:22 AM  
**Received Date:** 11/25/2015 9:33:23 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 9:33:23 AM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0609.pdf		67982

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

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 11/23/15 3:51 PM <b>Received:</b> November 19, 2015 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8mcr-bhio <b>Comments Due:</b> November 19, 2015 <b>Submission Type:</b> 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-0609

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Jim Hickey

**Address:** United States,

**Email:** spindoctordjimbo@gmail.com

## General Comment

Hi there!

I am not a scientist; just a citizen who is able to read and think clearly. Of course, in a democracy, supposedly the citizens rule.

So saying, I register here my absolute opposition to any decision that gives credence to, let alone adopts, the so-called hormesis theory of biological response to low doses of radiation. Not only does the weight of scientific opinion--as opposed to public relations hacks of one sort or another, whether degreed or not is immaterial--militate against such a position, but the choice to do so would also be anomalous indeed given the recent governmental decision to cancel investigation into the prevalence of leukemia when nuclear reactors are upwind or upstream.

Sometimes, officials and experts decry simple citizens as haters of science. If this decision goes through, the corruption of science that it represents will show the truth behind this assertion of hatred: people truly do despise false authority, that only sells itself to the highest bidder.

Whatever the case may be, time will tell. The Nuclear Fool Cycle will show the hubris of embracing this insidious technology for any other purpose than a relatively efficient way to commit mass collective suicide.

The least that administrators could do who do not want to help such a process of mass destruction along is that they do not encourage further nuclear adventures in profiteering at the expense of the public health.