

**DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE** **63**
(70 FR 53313)DOCKETED
USNRC

November 22, 2005 (10:01am)

From: Jim and Virginia Wagner <JimWagner@safe-mail.net>
To: <secy@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Nov 1, 2005 4:12 PM
Subject: RIN 3150-AH68

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dear Ms. Vietti-Cook,

We are writing to OPPOSE your recent proposal to implement EPA's revised radiation protection standard for Yucca Mountain.

(5)

We write because EPA's proposed standard is still a draft, and is presently being commented on by the public.

By proposing to implement this draft standard, NRC appears to believe that the standard will become the final rule -- meaning that public comment will have no effect.

This assumption conflicts with the very intention of the public comment process.

NRC should wait until EPA has taken public comment into account and issued a final standard, before going forward.

We also are compelled to bring to your attention, that the radiation standard being proposed by EPA is inadequate for protecting public health, and furthermore it does not comply with federal law.

Although the standard now extends through a more appropriate timeframe, the two part standard burdens future generation with 23 times the radiation we ourselves are willing to bear.

There is no scientific justification for this.

A standard such as this proposed standard would be the least protective radiation standard in the world.

Furthermore, EPA's proposed standard is not even consistent with its own previous recommendations, which specifically state that exposures above 25 mrem per year are unacceptable.

It is transparently clear that EPA's proposed standard ignores the scientific consensus on the health impacts of radiation, and ignores the many unresolved problems surrounding radioactive waste.

Such a standard would set a terrible precedent, a lowering of the bar for radiation protection around the country.

NRC should immediately withdraw its premature proposal to implement EPA's draft standard, and instead allow EPA's standard to run its course through public comment.

Only when this comment process is done, and EPA has responded and proposed a final standard, should NRC consider and evaluate this standard for implementation into its own regulations.

Jim and Virginia Wagner
4897 E Walnut St

Westerville, OH 43081

Template = SECY-067

SECY-02

Mail Envelope Properties (4367DA43.011 : 22 : 28689)

Subject: RIN 3150-AH68
Creation Date: Tue, Nov 1, 2005 3:53 PM
From: Jim and Virginia Wagner <JimWagner@safe-mail.net>

Created By: JimWagner@safe-mail.net

Recipients

nrc.gov
owf5_po.OWFN_DO
SECY (SECY)

Post Office

owf5_po.OWFN_DO

Route

nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE
Mime.822

Size

2084
3198

Date & Time

Tuesday, November 1, 2005 3:53 PM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard