

2802

RECEIVED

Tate, Michele

From: Harvie Beavers [harvie.beavers@verizon.net] 2009 OCT 26 PM 4:27
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2009 7:01 AM
To: EP, RegComments
Subject: PROPOSED RULEMAKING; [?25 PA.?CODE CHS. 121 AND 123?] Outdoor Wood-Fired Boilers

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

1. I question both the science and the reality that this 'rule' is based on. No direct connection to any health impact is made, only implied, so such interference into individual home and small industry heating units to 'achieve' a federal particulate mandate is not justified unless a much stronger direct connection is made. Estimates through inaccurate statistics are not enough to justify government interference into citizens lives at this level, until the impact of the recent CAFÉ effort is known.
2. As the price of natural gas, a primary residential and small business energy source, is pushed up due to the onslaught of 'Climate Change' efforts, many folks see 'wood' as a cost effective renewable alternative. Unfortunately they also have a two or three story structure on their property. A 'forty or fifty' foot exhaust stack is not a viable option to 'mix' the exhaust of a wood unit from either a scientific or cost view. Did we learn nothing from 'transport studies'?
3. If the intent is to 'fix' certain areas of the cited problem (non-attainment in densely populated residential areas and basins), why is the 'rule' applied state wide? Most 'rural localities' don't seem to have the defined problem but do suffer from reduced income and restricted availability to comply with this action. Appears this is a 'do something' effort even if it actually has no impact on the cited problem in many geographic locals that it is being applied to.
4. Is the next step to 'permit' home heating units according to the proposed 'fee schedule' recently issue? I'm aware that Mr. Hanger desires to pay more taxes, but don't believe that is the desire of the rest of the population.

Harvie Beavers
337 Pine St.
Kane PA 16735