

PRM-20-28, 20-29, and 20-30  
80FR35870

46

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

|   |
|---|
| <b>As of:</b> 7/24/15 12:01 PM          |
| <b>Received:</b> July 23, 2015          |
| <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post             |
| <b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8k5d-1pu5       |
| <b>Comments Due:</b> September 08, 2015 |
| <b>Submission Type:</b> Web             |

**Docket:** NRC-2015-0057

Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation

**Comment On:** NRC-2015-0057-0010

Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation; Notice of Docketing and Request for Comment

**Document:** NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0059

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-15441

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Anonymous Anonymous

---

## General Comment

The radiation hormesis model has not been adequately proven to have any benefits or mainstream medicine would already be prescribing our protective dose. The petitioners are claiming health benefits from low doses of radiation without providing enough medical research on the dose deemed protective and the dose deemed dangerous. Atomic bomb testing and nuclear power plant deployment have increased the levels of background radiation and now everyone is getting more radiation than previous generations; yet, cancer rates have not fallen, instead, they continue to rise as do immune disorders. If the NRC changes the rule from LNT to Hormesis, will people be allowed to bring malpractice cases against the medical profession for not adequately protecting them from immune disorders and cancers with a protective dose of radiation?

Radiophobia must be rampant in the nuclear industry since so much effort goes into building strong containment of nuclear fission piles and moving nuclear waste to remote locations. The medical industry spreads radiophobia with the radiation labels required on radio-medical diagnostics/therapies indicating danger. Will such labeling no longer be required or desired under a new rule?

Will the NRC be trying to raise or lower the background levels of radiation to a protective dose? What level of background radiation will be deemed protective? If an accident were to occur near a metropolitan area too large to evacuate, will this rule change provide cover to the nuclear industry for dangerous radioactive contamination levels above background that will affect peoples health?

This rule change does not bring clarity and only adds more confusion to peoples perception of nuclear energys safety and the risks of low level radiation.