

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 9:45 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30
Attachments: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0615.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#: 626

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 1435

Mail Envelope Properties (6ce70b75ce484167bad2f53c81b53295)

Subject: Comment on PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30
Sent Date: 11/25/2015 9:44:43 AM
Received Date: 11/25/2015 9:44:44 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 9:44:44 AM
NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0615.pdf		72294

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

As of: 11/23/15 3:44 PM
Received: November 19, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8mcs-4o2x
Comments Due: November 19, 2015
Submission Type: 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-0615

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-20722

Submitter Information

Name: Steven Olsen

Address:

94-1093 Hanauna st

Waipahu, 96797

Email: freshenergy888@yahoo.com

General Comment

I have a Master Degree from U of Michigan in Material Science and am very well versed in nuclear and radiation.

It is beyond reckoning that the "medical industry" supposedly based at the most basic "Hippocratic Oath" level of "Do No Harm".

Radiologist "Doctors" are some of the highest paid in the industry. They probably think it is cool to treat cancer with radiation. For the most part that is just short of insane.

Carol Marcus should be ashamed, especially as a woman" to insist that women, girls, and even fetuses be allowed to be blasted with up to 100mSV per year. "remove any differential treatment" is the nice way of saying "blast them just the same as a nuclear plant worker during an accident.

Although LNT itself is rather "silly" to use as a standard, if you are looking for something that is correct per science. I mean, LNT is based upon nuclear bomb exposure in Japan, extrapolated down to zero. Although it sets a somewhat conservative safety level, It just doesn't make sense out of the gate compared to the numerous different isotopes and radiation related heavy metals humans and animals are now exposed to.

That said, tossing out LNT because it is not perfect, and replacing it with "hormesis, radiation is good for you,

is absurd, i am kind of shocked that the NRC would even consider this.

Now we know the nuclear industry is shutting plants left and right, and Vogtle, if it ever goes critical will double or triple the electric cost. And we know the NRC, if not captured, surely promotes and tries to protect the nuclear industry. After all...no nuclear industry, no need for the highly paid salaries at the NRC.

Miller, Doss, and Marcus are in cahoots in writing their letters all about the same time...strategically staggered. To create the appearance that "a lot of people are supporting hormesis". In fact, Miller and Marcus used almost exactly the same letter....with the exception that the woman Dr Marcus added "Why deprive them of the benefits of radiation" without presenting a bit of evidence of the "benefits"

These letters are quite sloppy in fact, like the sloppy thinking that radiation is good for you. Per Miller and Marcus "Worker doses should remain at present levels, with allowance up to 100mSV effective dose per year if the doses are chronic". 2 points here:

1) The ploy of "remain at present levels" while at the same time suggesting an increase of 100 fold is almost sociopathic in the nature of saying things that are completely contradictory as a way to through people off their game.

2) and then saying "allow up to 100mSV if doses are chronic". Were they in their right mind while writing this? Chronic means recurring, so they are saying 100mSV is OK is it keep occuring year after year.

Even the staunchest of hormesis supporting papers (submitted with effecitvely no proof of test results), nevertheless states that any hormesis benefit goes away about 200 mSV cumulative.

I am insulted the NRC published these papers, and am ashamed of being part of the USA scientific community when I see this obvious support for radiation in medicine and less controls on radiation releases at nuclear plant.

Once again, I am appalled that the apparently low empathy Dr Carol Marcus insists that women, children, and fetuses be cut no slack in terms of immensely high doses of 100 mSV per year. I am disgusted, and concerned that a medical doctor could feel this way or make this statement. It appears to be sadistic.