

**From:** Timothy Mock [tmock@lvv1.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 04, 2010 7:34 AM  
**To:** EP, RegComments  
**Subject:** Comments on OWB regulations for environmental quality board  
**Attachments:** Environmental Quality Board.doc

RECEIVED

2010 JAN -04 PM 8:36

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

Attached is a word document with the same information as below

**Environmental Quality Board,**

**I have chosen to heat my house with an outdoor wood-only fueled furnace. I am opposed to the proposed legislation for several reasons.**

**1. It is too costly.**

- a. This regulation will be a significant economic burden to all owners of furnaces that don't meet regulations. Our slow economy does not need another drain. This time in the name of environmental protection based on shotty arguments.
- b. Price of complying with stack requirements based on over \$119 for 4 feet plus guide wires and installation can be upwards of \$1000.00 for someone that needs to increase height of just 20 feet. For houses in hilly terrain this count be 50 feet or more, making it almost impossible.
- c. They were perfectly legal when purchased and installed, homeowners should be able to use them over their intended life. A homeowner should be able to make a legal investment in their property and reasonably expect to reap the investment for the life of that product.

**2. It unfairly singles out OWB users as opposed to indoor furnaces.**

- a. Old in-home installed wood burners do not have to comply with the same legislation as these units that perform the same duties in a safer cleaner manner.
- b. My furnace will need to have a chimney that is higher than my neighbor's house up the hill but down the hill from me, the house that burns coal or oil, (items with more dangerous particulates and pollution) does not need to have their chimney higher than my house simply because it's inside their home.
  - i. Please do not make some residents of the commonwealth comply with a law that others are exempt from simply because their furnace is inside their home.
- c. Outdoor furnaces are much safer than indoor heating units
  - i. Thousands of homes are damaged or destroyed every year by faulty or malfunctioning indoor heating units. Carbon monoxide poisoning is also a major risk with indoor units.
    1. Please do not make me risk my family's well being by restricting my outdoor furnace's usefulness to nothing.

**3. Scientific Merit is small.**

- a. The burning of wood releases no more CO2 into the atmosphere than if that wood were to rot in the forest. Using any fossil fuel to heat is a significant source of CO2 and other pollution.
- b. Particulate matter may be a problem in densely populated areas but in rural PA it is not and many homes are heated with coal which creates more dangerous particulates. Wood is a good alternative and outdoor furnaces are the safest way to accomplish this.
  - i. The matter of particulates is best left up to local municipalities to enforce whether the specific operation of a furnace will create a health hazard for inhabitants.

**Note:** The date regulations banning the use of the furnaces between May 1 and September 30 are not reasonable for areas such as Somerset County. The average High and low temperatures in May are 70 and 44 degrees Fahrenheit and in September 74 and 48 degrees Fahrenheit respectively. Heat is required in these months when the temperature regularly drops below 50 degrees and often falls below freezing. **Please do not limit the use based on one date for the entire state and in doing so mandate that homeowners in some areas have a secondary heat source significantly increasing heating expense.**

**Timothy Mock, 6609 Somerset Pike, Boswell, PA, 15531, concerned citizen, responsible wood burner**

Timothy Mock  
Controller  
Laurel View Village  
2000 Cambridge Dr  
Davidsville, PA 15928  
814-288-2724 x274