

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

As of: 7/24/15 11:21 AM Received: July 22, 2015 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1jz-8k4q-7yuf Comments Due: September 08, 2015 Submission Type: Web
--

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: NRC-2015-0057

Linear No-Threshold Model and Standards for Protection Against Radiation

Comment On: NRC-2015-0057-0010

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

Document: NRC-2015-0057-DRAFT-0045

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-15441

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

General Comment

I am generally supportive of nuclear energy, but this rule is complete nonsense. There is of course no way to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Linear No Threshold model is completely correct, but it is more likely than not. Look at Kendall et. al. (2013). Look at the ICRP ("The report concludes that while existence of a low-dose threshold does not seem to be unlikely for radiation-related cancers of certain tissues, the evidence does not favour the existence of a universal threshold.") The whole LNT issue is a joke because the NRC will not consider costs for rules on new reactors; it is simply a way for the NRC to pretend that there are no benefits. In that sense, "pretending" that LNT is incorrect would actually be a net benefit to society, even if it were not true; a sad state of affairs.