

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 8/20/15 2:33 PM <b>Received:</b> August 09, 2015 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8kgl-yuur <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-0112

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-15441

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** James Martin

---

## General Comment

The problem I see is raising exposure to the worker level is great except for one small detail. The 'workers' all get monitored don't they? Workers know how much radiation they are exposed to throughout the year.

SO a couple questions come to mind...

Are "They" (the facility dealing with the nuclear product) going to supply everyone (the public) with equipment to monitor their radiation exposure throughout the year like workers?

If a public citizen becomes overexposed are they going to be able to file a workers comp claim against the company like a worker?

If standards are changed I believe it should be mandatory that all citizens within the downwind zone of the facility that may expose the public be supplied with equipment to monitor their exposure level at the expense of the facility owner. The testing should be done by an independent company not affiliated with the facility that may produce the radiation. All related expenses should be paid by the facility including treatments for overexposure. Each citizen in the area will have the option to opt out of such monitoring and testing (sign and notarized opt out).

If, as claimed by the petitioner, "[t]he costs of complying with these LNT based regulations are enormous.", then let them decide which method they prefer to use. Have both. In rural areas with low populations testing the public would be the least expensive. In large public dense areas the LNT model would be cheaper.

Also if the LNT model is not used all real-estate sales should include a mandatory disclosure that

the purchaser will be monitored for radiation exposure at no charge because XXX facility does not follow the LNT model.