

RulemakingComments Resource

From: Judi Edwards <edwards.jc@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2015 4:56 PM
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Docket Nos. PRM-20-28, PRM-20-29, and PRM-20-30, NRC-2015-0057

Dear Secretary,

I'm concerned about the above petitions for rule-making. I keep looking for increased protection, stricter rules, and rigorous enforcement. So please reject the petitions.

There are always arguments for reducing safety and pollution requirements, basically: "It takes too long, it costs too much, and besides we want to make more money". There are always studies that indicate that an increase in something harmful (pollution, poison, radiation) isn't "all" that bad. But just like climate change... limiting, wishing, and twisting information doesn't make it so.

Work by the NAS and EPA would both support rejecting these petitions. Do you really want higher risks for cancer and other illnesses, when tighter controls mean increased safety?

Again -- please reject the petitions.

Judi Edwards
5650 24th Ave. NW, Unit 402
Seattle, WA 98107
US