

**DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE****PR 20**  
**(68FR09595)****240**

**From:** "Robert Marsh" <robertmarsh@prodigy.net>  
**To:** "Secretary Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <secy@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Jun 18, 2003 10:58 AM  
**Subject:** re Controlling Disposition Solid Materials (10 CFR Part 20)

Robert Marsh  
1083 LaMonte Lane  
Houston, TX 77018

DOCKETED  
USNRC

June 18, 2003 (11:34AM)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

June 18, 2003

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Dear Secretary:

I am flabbergasted that an agency charged with the responsibility of protecting public health and safety would be considering rolling back regulatory protections to the point of allowing radioactive material into the general population.

This is what is known as a No-Brainer.

Would you want your children riding around on bikes with frames and seats made out of radioactive and contaminated "solid materials?" That's simply insane.

Instead of being a lapdog the nuclear industry, the NRC should be protecting the general public -- for a change.

The NRC accepts the validity of the linear, no-threshold (LNT) model of human exposure to radioactivity, which holds that "any increase in dose, no matter how small, results in an increase in risk" to human health. But despite this, the Commission is obstinately pursuing a contradictory proposal that would, in fact, result in exposing the public to greater doses of radioactivity! This sentiment is revealed in the statement of NRC Chairman Richard Meserve, contained in the NRC Commission Voting Record of October 25, 2002, in which he advised that "it would not be appropriate to mask the Commission's continuing support for the release of solid material." It is a travesty of proper government regulation that the NRC is pursuing, in effect, a subsidy worth billions of dollars that rewards waste generators for irresponsibly scattering their waste into the unregulated environment and ducking responsibility for any of the consequences.

Under absolutely no conditions should nuclear waste be deregulated, dumped in unlicensed facilities that are not prepared to monitor for or contain radioactive waste, or allowed into general commerce.

However, the Commission openly acknowledges a prejudice favoring release. The results of this rulemaking will endanger not only human health and ecological integrity, but the integrity of the NRC as a credible regulatory agency, as well.

The NRC's primary mission to "to protect public health and safety, and the environment from the effects of radiation from nuclear reactors,

Template = SECY-067

SECY-02

materials, and waste facilities" can only be upheld by, at a minimum, establishing permanent policy wherein all radioactive material waste is restricted from general commerce and required to be disposed of in an NRC- or Agreement State-licensed low-level waste disposal site, best articulated as "Alternative 5" in the notice published in the Federal Register on February 28, 2003.

For once, please do what's best for the public's health and not what's best for the nuclear industry's pocketbook.

Sincerely,

Robert Marsh