

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 6/23/15 2:19 PM
Received: June 16, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8jgi-iedh
Comments Due: June 22, 2015
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2009-0279
Potential Changes to Radiation Protection Regulations

Comment On: NRC-2009-0279-0098
Radiation Protection; Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Document: NRC-2009-0279-DRAFT-0129
Comment on FR Doc # 2015-06244

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

General Comment

[1] Please don't ignore the great research of Dr. Ernest Sternglass, who found that low-dose radiation is MORE dangerous than realized:

Quoting Dr. Sternglass:

"And the nature of this curve is such that if you decrease it by 10, the risk per millirad goes up tenfold. If you go down another 10, the risk keeps going up, and therefore we have a strange situation that the weaker the radiation intensity is, the more deadly it is, and nobody anticipated this and present radiation standards do not believe in this and have not accepted this because it goes against the existing regulations, which govern all uses of radiation everywhere, and nobody wants to touch this, although the BEIR Committee of the National Academy called attention to it years ago in the earlier report, BEIR III, and, so, we now find that we have a situation where we have far greater health effects than we ever thought."

<http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/radiation/dir/mstreet/commeet/meet12/trnsc12a.txt>

[2] In the same document, Dr. Sternglass explains how Strontium90 causes miscarriages:

"Strontium 90 damage to the mother's immune system causes her to reject the fetus as a foreign object."

[3] Now to quote Dr. Ian Fairlie on nuclear power plants and increases in childhood leukemia:

The core issue is that, world-wide, over 60 epidemiological studies have examined cancer incidences in children near nuclear power plants (NPPs): most (>70%) indicate leukemia increases. I can think of no other area of toxicology (eg asbestos, lead, smoking) with so many studies, and with such clear associations as those between Nuclear Power Plants and child leukemias. Yet many nuclear governments and the nuclear industry refute these findings and continue to resist their implications. Its similar to the situations with cigarette smoking in the 1960s and with man-made global warming nowadays.

<http://safeenergy.org/2015/04/29/the-evidence/>

[4] If there is even the slightest chance that nuclear energy can do harm to another human being, especially the young, do you want it on your conscience that you had the power to stop it, but didn't stop it, due to industry influence/pressure, or refusing to admit the truth due to economics/money?

What do you think is more important; your fellow human being or money?

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.