

ELECTRONIC COMMENTS REPORT - DATE/TIME STAMP: 07/29/19 8:19 AM
REPORT CRITERIA { Fiscal Impacts: True; Other: True; Email: ALL }

Comment Package Detail

Package Title:	AIR QUALITY CONTROL: NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE REGULATIONS OF THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION: FNSB Serious SIP
Description:	The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation proposes to adopt regulation changes relating to fine particulate matter (PM-2.5) including new and revised air quality controls and a new State Implementation Plan that is comprised of 15 sections covering monitoring, modeling, control measures, emission inventory, attainment demonstration and episode plan, which are intended to meet federal requirements for the serious nonattainment area within the Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB).
Start Date:	05/14/2019 06:45 AM
End Date:	07/26/2019 05:00 PM

Comment Section Detail

Section Title:	18 AAC 50.030
Description:	18 AAC 50.030 is proposed to be amended to adopt revisions to the State Air Quality Control Plan. Those revisions include a. a new section in Volume II, Section III.D.7: Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) Fine Particulate Matter (PM-2.5) Serious State Implementation Plan (SIP); b. amending Volume III Appendix to Volume II Section II to incorporate the proposed regulations after public review and comment. This appendix within the State Air Quality Control Plan contains the state's air quality regulations.
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.

1) Comment:	Please, please, PLEASE stop trying to regulate me into moving. Maybe you politicians should try to figure out how to stay within your means instead. If you can't figure out how to stay in a budget how the hell can I expect you to figure out anything else?		
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Prantis paul.prantis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	I would rather have the US EPA enforce regulations banning wood stoves and controlling coal fired power plants than trust the state or borough to actually control air pollution, since the political process has failed to control air pollution in Fairbanks.		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
2) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant tim.viavant@gmail.com
3) Comment:	Proposing regulations that affect so many adversely, is irresponsible. Implementing them is the very definition of government over-reach, and displays a callous disregard of the citizens, & the environment they live in. Most have no practical alternative, and will be either forced to flaunt these regulations, or suffer enormous financial hardship, never mind the legal implications of obstructing their rights. I propose a MORATORIUM on implementing said regulations, until such time as there are practical alternatives IN PLACE to mitigate the alleged "problem"; i.e., natural gas, in sufficient quantity, & the infrastructure to make it available. If this not the choice made, there will be little support for government entities administering any regulations.		
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
3) Submission Detail:	06/17/2019 12:04 AM	No Attachment.	Jesse Payne onepaladin@hotmail.com
4) Comment:	Proposing regulations that affect so many adversely, is irresponsible. Implementing them is the very definition of government over-reach, and displays a callous disregard of the citizens, & the environment they live in. Most have no practical alternative, and will be either forced to flaunt these regulations, or suffer enormous financial hardship, never mind the legal implications of obstructing their rights. I propose a MORATORIUM on implementing said regulations, until such time as there are practical alternatives IN PLACE to mitigate the alleged "problem"; i.e., natural gas, in sufficient quantity, & the infrastructure to make it available. If this not the choice made, there will be little support for government entities administering any regulations.		
4) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
4) Submission Detail:	06/17/2019 12:04 AM	No Attachment.	Jesse Payne onepaladin@hotmail.com
5) Comment:	I support this proposal especially in light of stakeholder engagement and incorporation of a number of recommendations.		

5) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
5) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox jameslarkinfox@gmail.com
6) Comment:	<p>I would like to know why we are supporting proposed changes on Air Quality based on known falsified research. EPA Grant #R833293, Research Project C. Ms. Potts was working on this grant, but under another Researcher. I am attaching 1. Duke University Researcher Falsification 2. Daily Caller EPA grant info 3. And these paragraphs from the Daily Caller is what had me click on the "environmental justice grant", which sent me to the grant information - refer above to Project C. Investigators reviewed 36 research reports and found that, in many cases, she simply made things up.</p> <p>Potts-Kant admitted that she "generated experiment data that was altered" and "knew the altered experiment data was false," according to information offered on her behalf by North Carolina lawyer Amos Tyndall.</p> <p>She worked in the laboratory of academic Michael Foster, who received a grant from the EPA in 2007 to determine whether exposure to airborne particulates can impair lung development in newborn mice. Potts-Kant used a machine helping researchers gauge the lung function of mice to gain insight on human respiratory ailments like asthma.</p> <p>The project was part of a \$7.7 million environmental justice grant from the EPA. The allegations could throw a wrench in data sets that the EPA uses to show the relationship between particulate and respiratory illnesses. Thank you, and I look forward to hearing your response about trying to put regulations upon FNSB based on falsified research.</p>		
6) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
6) Submission Detail:	07/21/2019 08:37 AM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856201/Qjlcw7Mkq_APMUdevw0NOw2	Kerri Mullis kam63@rocketmail.com
7) Comment:	<p>Last year the majority of the FNSB citizens voted to NOT have any controls over how we he our home.</p> <p>Did that fact get overlooked by the state or DEC? We don't want your interference here.</p>		
7) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
7) Submission Detail:	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen flyerfly@alaska.net
8) Comment:	General premise, insufficient review of propane as an option		
8) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
8) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 05:11 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856504/PiABuD-AP7zh5cfzkZNkMg2	William Rhodes rhodesbill@yahoo.com
9) Comment:	I am very concerned about the air quality and particulate matter in Fairbanks, and support all of these changes.		
9) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
9) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan maureenhogan4@gmail.com
10) Comment:	I support this action		
10) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
10) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz joanbf Franz@gmail.com
Total Comments:	10		
Section Title:	18 AAC 50.075		
Description:	18 AAC 50.075 is proposed to be amended to add requirements regarding visible emissions.		
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.		
1) Comment:	My OIL FIRED boiler emits denser emissions than my wood stove.		
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Prinitis paul.prinitis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	Only wood and coal produce visible emissions, and since almost no one heats their homes with wood or coal, those forms of heat should be banned forever, all year round, all over the non-attainment area.		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	False		

2) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant	tim.viavant@gmail.com
3) Comment:	I strongly support this proposal. My "right" to burn ends at my property line.			
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
3) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox	jameslarkinfox@gmail.com
4) Comment:	<p>It is my understanding that this amendment will lower the window for smoke to be visible from smoke stacks once a burn ban has been called. The previous rule was no visible smoke after 12 hours. The new rule is no visible smoke after 3 hours of a burn ban being called. Stoves can burn for up to 12 hours, some longer, properly loaded and operated. Is it the desire of the DEC for stove owners to use fire extinguishing measures to ensure that a stove is no longer emitting smoke in your 3 hour window? If not, how does the DEC propose for a well stocked and well run stove to no longer have visible smoke in the 3 hour window? If the DEC wants stove owners to artificially extinguish a fire, with what....a fire extinguisher, water, sand, choking up the stove via lack of oxygen... would that not put more harmful pm2.5 into the air than allowing time for the fire to run its course naturally?</p> <p>Your 3 hour window seems arbitrary and does not allow for the natural course of the fire to run itself out. It also does not take into account working people and the hours that they keep. Depending on when a ban is called, those who are not at home but have a well stocked fire will not be able to meet your 3 hour window. If a ban is called in the morning, before normal working hours but a stove owner was up early to ensure that a properly laid fire was ready for a day of burning, then what is that stove owner supposed to do? Be late for work? Break the rules and go to work?</p> <p>In the past, 'officials' have very frequently mistaken an oil stack for a wood stack. How can DEC definitively tell what smoke is coming from what stack? It all seems very much subjective and not fair to the homeowner.</p>			
4) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
4) Submission Detail:	07/16/2019 03:54 PM	No Attachment.	Wendy Mannan	wendymannan@yahoo.com
5) Comment:	And how will you determine that steam (a normal by product of oil combustion) is not wood smoke or the like? Are you going to do like the nazi party did and ask neighbors to tattle on each other?			
5) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
5) Submission Detail:	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen	flyerfly@alaska.net
6) Comment:	I support this.			
6) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
6) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan	maureenhogan4@gmail.com
7) Comment:	I support this amendment. Prevailing winds that we have recently seen with the forest fires make this provision more obviously important. Most burning actions do effect a much larger geographic area than an individual property.			
7) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
7) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz	joanbf Franz@gmail.com
8) Comment:	Visible emissions must be enforced to make any difference in reduced smoke pollution. The state lacks a sufficient budget for ADEC to carry out meaningful enforcement. I believe the will to provide an adequate budget notwithstanding 65 Billion dollars in the state savings account does not exist. Visible emissions have been a part of local or state codes for many years. Over the years fewer than five citations have been issued, including none for winter 2018-19. Alaska must be willing to support enforcement by obtaining "Citation Authority" and by providing a budget that allows for enforcement.			
8) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
8) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:48 PM	No Attachment.	Patrice Lee	patricelee3294@gmail.com
Total Comments:	8			

Section Title:	18 AAC 50.076
Description:	18 AAC 50.076 is proposed to be amended to add requirements for wood sellers.
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.

1) Comment:	Doesn't matter if I sell you dry wood if you leave it the hell out in the gahdam weather now does it? Don't cure the symptom, you incredible idiots.		
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	Paul Pranitis paul.pranitis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	Banning wood stoves in the non-attainment area would be more effective, more cost effective, and more enforceable than trying to enforce a moisture content for wood. Pellet wood stoves burn much more efficiently and cleanly, and pellet wood is guaranteed dry.		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
2) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant tim.viavant@gmail.com
3) Comment:	it is vital to our community to only provide dry wood from businesses. Selling wet wood only encourages people to not take the time to dry it properly.		
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
3) Submission Detail:	05/16/2019 12:07 PM	No Attachment.	Shea Bredlie svines2@gmail.com
4) Comment:	Please consider a period that green firewood may be sold by commercial sellers. This allowance would greatly help our senior citizens, handicapped, economically disadvantaged, and people who cannot safely harvest firewood to be able to reduce their energy costs by buying green wood and drying it themselves. The roughly 40% cost difference between self-dried wood and mechanically dried wood is significant to many in our community. A green sale window (suggested Jun 1st – Jun 31st), early in our drying season, but after weight restrictions go off, would offer a savings opportunity to those who really need it.		
4) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
4) Submission Detail:	06/11/2019 09:16 AM	No Attachment.	Jason Knoles SALES@NORTHLANDWOOD.COM
5) Comment:	Please consider removing the "split and stored covered for at least 9 months" drying requirement. This requirement could needlessly increase drying cost by not taking into account the many variables of the source log i.e. species, season of cutting, decked time prior to processing, original moisture content, small rounds, etc. Due to existing regulations already requiring monitoring and disclosure prior to sale, the process to achieve the required moisture content should be less restrictive.		
5) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
5) Submission Detail:	06/11/2019 09:18 AM	No Attachment.	Jason Knoles SALES@NORTHLANDWOOD.COM
6) Comment:	Consider allowing for the sale of green logs on the condition that 10 FTEs for compliance along with citation authority to enforce regulations are implemented.		
6) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
6) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox jameslarkinfox@gmail.com
7) Comment:	<p>I Jeff Ward owner of ward wood works</p> <p>We log and sell firewood, house logs and lumber.</p> <p>I would like to see the ability for Ward Wood Works to continue to sell green birch,spruce and aspen logs.</p> <p>I sell most of my green logs in winter for the customers who are planing ahead. This is so they have the wood in there yard for spring when they cut and split it. Most of my customers are planing for 2 to3 years ahead.</p> <p>Ward Wood Works has 3 delivery trucks, we cannot deliver enough wood during the summer months to cover the year so we need to deliver year around.</p> <p>Ward wood Works doesn't have enough yard or warehouse space to store 3000 cords of cut split fire wood,to dry for 9 months.</p> <p>Every time you handle wood it costs you money. We processe our wood on the logging site with a firewood prossing machine, the finished product goes directly into a delivery truck then to the customers.</p> <p>Birch firewood is the most preferable wood because it has the highest BTU value spruce is about 10% less and aspen is another 15% below that.</p> <p>Birch wood will not dry intel split where as spruce and aspen will dry without being split</p> <p>Therefore if people are forced to use a lower quality wood they will produce more wood smoke to get the same BTUs to heat there homes.</p> <p>As with anything public education is the answer,</p> <p>Kiln dried wood in Fairbanks is for the most part is uneconomical to produce</p> <p>It should be the responsibility of the home owner to use dry wood.</p> <p>In conclusion I Jeff Ward of Ward Wood Works would like to see the ability to sell green log lengths year around.</p>		
7) Fiscal Impacts:	False		

7) Submission Detail:	07/14/2019 03:31 PM	No Attachment.	Jeff Ward	Jeffward1962@outlook.com
8) Comment:	Blaze King Industries, Inc. comments on SIP requirement for TEOM testing on non catalytic wood heaters.			
8) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
8) Submission Detail:	07/16/2019 09:27 AM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16855968/ldHDzTgMtVQW3IH3qBQjFw2	Chris Neufeld	cneufeld@blazeking.com
9) Comment:	I buy my wood in the spring from private sellers. There are dozens of private and non-licensed sellers on Craigslist who will never be regulated. Increasing regulations on licensed sellers that will increase prices will have no impact on air quality as the free market is just a text message away for firewood delivery.			
9) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
9) Submission Detail:	07/19/2019 09:31 AM	No Attachment.	Justin Powell	jpowell@acsalaska.net
10) Comment:	Wood has to dry some time, it is pointless to put this rule in place, the sellers are not the ones burning the wood. It only harms more of the economy and makes more red tape. The cost of compliance is \$\$\$ on both sides of the fence...those who enforce cost and those who have to keep those records also shoulder costs.			
10) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
10) Submission Detail:	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen	flyerfly@alaska.net
11) Comment:	18 AAC 50.076 requires the registration of persons and businesses that sell wood for space heating in the FNSB PM2.5 Nonattainment Area. In order to ensure this regulation does not transfer to wood sales for manufacturing or milling purposes, I encourage the revision of the use of the term "commercial wood seller" to something specifically referring to firewood or space heating.			
11) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
11) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 04:29 PM	No Attachment.	Chad Schumacher	superiorpelletfuels@yahoo.com
12) Comment:	I support this.			
12) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
12) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan	maureenhogan4@gmail.com
13) Comment:	See comments on 078			
13) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
13) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:27 AM	No Attachment.	Lance Roberts	Roberts.Lance@gmail.com
14) Comment:	Citation authority must be given and used by DEC with adequate funding.			
14) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
14) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz	joanbf Franz@gmail.com
15) Comment:	<p>Dry wood is essential to solving the problem.</p> <p>Aurora 's proposal to build a steam drying kiln should be embraced 100 percent. Previous EPA personnel thought it was a terrific idea for an offset. I, personally, feel that this is the best idea to get the biggest change in reducing air pollution. Way too many people are burning wet wood even with the best catalytic wood stoves . If Aurora puts up the money this will be the absolute most cost effective program for cleaning up the air. Do not squander this opportunity</p>			
15) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
15) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:15 PM	No Attachment.	Dan Givens	dangivens50@gmail.com
16) Comment:	<p>Dry wood is essential to solving the problem.</p> <p>Aurora 's proposal to build a steam drying kiln should be embraced 100 percent. Previous EPA personnel thought it was a terrific idea for an offset. I, personally, feel that this is the best idea to get the biggest change in reducing air pollution. Way too many people are burning wet wood even with the best catalytic wood stoves . If Aurora puts up the money this will be the absolute most cost effective program for cleaning up the air. Do not squander this opportunity</p>			
16) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
16) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:16 PM	No Attachment.	Dan Givens	dangivens50@gmail.com

17) Comment:	The requirement for wood sellers seems a bit restrictive if the buyers do not store the wood properly after purchase. This regulation may put many wood suppliers out of business unless some form of wood dryer is available on a local level. Storing inventory may be cost prohibitive.		
17) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
17) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:45 PM	No Attachment.	Lee Hazen bmwalaska@gmail.com
18) Comment:	Local certified woodcutters should not dry their wood by burning green wood. They should not consider themselves above the law. A review of complaint records should be made to see if serious violations occurred and were not addressed. Adding to smoke pollution in neighborhoods increases all the health risks and the cost to individuals to address their medical needs as a result of poor air quality are expensive and born by people who do not wish to be smoked out.		
18) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
18) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:48 PM	No Attachment.	Patrice Lee patricelee3294@gmail.com
Total Comments:	18		
Section Title:	18 AAC 50.077		
Description:	18 AAC 50.077 is proposed to be amended to add requirements for wood-fired heating devices within the serious nonattainment area.		
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.		
1) Comment:	Figure out why after 10 plus years of political bullshit, there is NO VIABLE ALTERNATIVE AVAILABLE to residents of this area. Want to fix the issue? QUIT ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO MOVE HERE. There are already more damn people here than the infrastructure can support.		
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Prantis paul.pranitis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	It is ridiculous that I have to put up with lousy air so 3% of the people in this town can burn their wet wood in their outdated stoves. All home heating by non-pellet wood and coal should be banned. This would be the most cost effective way to give us all less polluted air.		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
2) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant tim.viavant@gmail.com
3) Comment:	Very necessary for our community. I understand there are some people who only use wood to heat their home or business but they need to be doing so responsibly with the right equipment.		
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
3) Submission Detail:	05/16/2019 12:07 PM	No Attachment.	Shea Bredlie svines2@gmail.com
4) Comment:	<p>I have a masonry heater in my home. Masonry heaters are some of the cleanest and most efficient wood burning devices available if used correctly, but they are not currently certified by the EPA. The SIP only mentions masonry heaters once in relation to the "burn right" program. No information about the "burn right" program seems to exist yet on the DEC website.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to include more language about masonry heaters in the SIP and to encourage their usage by more people.</p> <p>I heat with wood in my masonry heater as often as there are not burn bans, because the fuel is free (from clearing my property), keeps forest fire danger down, and saves me hundreds of dollars versus my propane heater. Additional information about masonry heaters and potential for stage 1 waivers would further benefit my heating budget.</p>		
4) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
4) Submission Detail:	06/25/2019 08:42 AM	No Attachment.	Travis Naibert tnaibert@gmail.com

5) Comment:	I do not support the installation of new EPA-qualified pellet hydronic heaters. We should strive to rid the nonattainment area of hydronic heaters. Unqualified OHHs emit, on an average per hour basis, about four times as much fine particulate matter pollution as conventional wood stoves, about 12 times as much fine particle pollution as EPA-certified wood stoves, 1000 times more than oil furnaces, and 1800 times more than gas furnaces. (State of New York, 2005)		
	It's ironic that ADEC proposes forcing over 30,000 homeowners and businesses to change from heating oil #2 to #1 by 2020 for an estimated reduction of <0.01 of PM2.5 tons/episodic day and an additional average cost of \$68/year per household. Yet 1% of structure owners and businesses don't have to remove their non-pellet-fired hydronic heaters until 2024 despite research from 2009 that suggested these devices contribute over 50% of the PM2.5 pollution. The most recent estimate for outdoor hydronic heaters in 2019 in the nonattainment area are 389 unqualified and 97 Phase 2 qualified outdoor wood boilers. Using a rough figure of 36,000 heated structures in the nonattainment area, divided by those hydronic heaters suggests that 1.3% of the structure owners are responsible for half of the pollution yet we continue to all suffer physically and financially. Even with the threat of federal sanctions will we still suffer at the expense of this 1%?		
	Also, need to clarify that only one dry cabin per 2+ acre lot may have a primary SFBA. Otherwise there is an apparent loophole to place multiple dry cabins on a 2+ acre lot, which could add up to thousands of square feet of poorly-insulated housing burning solid fuel all winter long. It is quite common for multiple cabins to be packed onto a lot 2-acres or larger.		
5) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
5) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox jameslarkinfox@gmail.com
6) Comment:	Data from Brookhaven NL and EPA indicate EPA certified wood stoves produce over 40x as much PM 2.5 as home heating devices using no 2 FO. Yet, ADEC proposes forcing over 30,000 homeowners and businesses to change from heating oil #2 to #1 by 2020 for an estimated reduction of <0.01 of PM2.5 tons/episodic day and an additional average cost of \$68/year per household. This is a foolish way to allocate resources.		
6) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
6) Submission Detail:	07/13/2019 09:57 PM	No Attachment.	ron johnson rajohnson@alaska.edu
7) Comment:	Who is going to issue the search warrants and pay for the police escorts to enter private residences to inspect wood stoves? There is no way to prevent someone from installing any device of their choosing within their private residence.		
7) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
7) Submission Detail:	07/19/2019 09:31 AM	No Attachment.	Justin Powell jpowell@acsalaska.net
8) Comment:	Did you get this idea from California where it is nice and warm?		
8) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
8) Submission Detail:	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen flyerfly@alaska.net
9) Comment:	Please find attached the comments of the Hearth, Patio & Barbecue Association (HPBA).		
9) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
9) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 08:08 AM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856399/v3OFzb9eyBmgTClqSiaKSQ2	Rachel Feinstein feinstein@hpba.org
10) Comment:	18 AAC 50.077 establishes standards for wood-fired heating devices. I appreciate the efforts to differentiate pellet fueled hydronic heaters from wood-fired hydronic heaters. I would encourage the same distinction be applied towards wood pellet stoves during curtailment periods by excluding pellet fueled devices from stage 1 burn bans without the requirements to pursue the stage 1 waiver and registration process.		
10) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
10) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 04:29 PM	No Attachment.	Chad Schumacher superiorpelletfuels@yahoo.com
11) Comment:	Libby Montana experience proves replacement of wood stoves with EPA Certified wood stoves does not work		
11) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
11) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 05:11 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856505/2bNwVoZOfTkNjHqJZVRTqw2	William Rhodes rhodesbill@yahoo.com

12) Comment:	The majority of the PM 2.5 air pollution that rose to dangerous levels starting in 2008 is from solid fuel burning devices. I agree that all sources must be addressed, but think that giving people using badly polluting devices 4 more years after 10 years of talking about the problem, providing change out funds, etc, is too generous. I think it should be a shorter time frame, perhaps with incentives for doing the change out sooner rather than later. Or- get the hydronic heating devices out within 2 years. I also feel very strongly that polluting heating devices that are taken out should not be allowed to be used outside the non-attainment area. I think that practice might create new non-attainment areas within the borough or expand the current non-attainment area. For instance, people could buy them for cabins at Harding Lake, which is a pretty congested community, or in the Two Rivers area, or in subdivisions off Chena Hot Springs Road where I live. I understand that some people have their outdoor wood burners in a building attached to their house, or in their garage. If that is possible and true, they should be removed also, even if they are not outside.		
12) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
12) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 12:50 AM	No Attachment.	Jennifer Gleason Schmidt jjschmidt@mosquitonet.com
13) Comment:	I support this.		
13) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
13) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan maureenhogan4@gmail.com
14) Comment:	Again, it shouldn't be the fuel source (input) that is a criteria for allowing or not allowing a device, it should be based on pollution output.		
14) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
14) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:27 AM	No Attachment.	Lance Roberts Roberts.Lance@gmail.com
15) Comment:	I strongly believe that all wood and coal fired hydronic heaters must be removed with a prohibition on installation of ANY hydronic heater in the Non attainment area. The emissions of hydronic heaters are so much greater than other heating sources that a ban must be made regarding the sale and/or the installation of hydronic heaters throughout the state starting in January 2020. The removal of all types of hydronic heaters in the non attainment area by December 2020 with financial aid to replace the heater. No NOASH permits should ever be allowed for hydronic heaters in the non attainment area. This source of PM2.5 emissions is so much greater than other heating sources that we must eliminate them.		
15) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
15) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz joanbfrenz@gmail.com
16) Comment:	DEC needs to keep open a change out program for all types of fuel if they can be shown to be clean burning. I favor not only gas but wood to wood change outside. Especially, since federal money has and will be used. Not everyone likes gas or will be able to afford it. Gas can be dangerous and with shifting soil, earthquakes, etc. there the risk of deadly fires. Example check the Japanese earthquake in 1995 that ruptured gas lines destroyed more of the city 3 the quake itself. Two more recent examples were in California and Massachusetts that serve as a reminder of the dangers of gas which have some people here that will not sign up for it. The utility company is charging \$100 per foot after the first 100 feet. This has caused several potential customers to back away from gas. For this reason clean burning alternative devices better be available or they will use some polluting monster.		
16) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
16) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:15 PM	No Attachment.	Dan Givens dangivens50@gmail.com
17) Comment:	DEC needs to keep open a change out program for all types of fuel if they can be shown to be clean burning. I favor not only gas but wood to wood change outside. Especially, since federal money has and will be used. Not everyone likes gas or will be able to afford it. Gas can be dangerous and with shifting soil, earthquakes, etc. there the risk of deadly fires. Example check the Japanese earthquake in 1995 that ruptured gas lines destroyed more of the city 3 the quake itself. Two more recent examples were in California and Massachusetts that serve as a reminder of the dangers of gas which have some people here that will not sign up for it. The utility company is charging \$100 per foot after the first 100 feet. This has caused several potential customers to back away from gas. For this reason clean burning alternative devices better be available or they will use some polluting monster.		
17) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
17) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:16 PM	No Attachment.	Dan Givens dangivens50@gmail.com

18) Comment:	The amount of smoke that comes from any given wood stove has more to do with the person operating the stove than perhaps the stove itself. Enforcement is the key to reducing smoke pollution for all solid fuel burning devices which exceed limits within the state and local code. The state must make a good faith budget that allows for all aspects of enforcement. In order to comply with the Clean Air Act, provisions must be permanent and mandatory. That requires money for enforcement.		
18) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
18) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:48 PM	No Attachment.	Patrice Lee patricelee3294@gmail.com
Total Comments:	18		
Section Title:	The proposed addition of 18 AAC 50.078		
Description:	The proposed addition of 18 AAC 50.078 includes new control measures related to diesel fuel use and smaller commercial sources of PM-2.5 within the serious nonattainment area.		
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.		
1) Comment:	Instead of limiting how I heat my residence, how about limiting the amount of time a yahoo in a diesel truck can idle. Or the number and type of said vehicles, to include those not actively engaged in commercial transport of essential goods and services. Operative words here being ACTIVELY and ESSENTIAL.		
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Prantis paul.pranitis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	I have no problem spending a little more money for #1 heating oil, but do not think I should have to pay a lot more money for low sulfur heating oil so a very small percent of people in town can keep burning wood stoves or worse yet, coal stoves.		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
2) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant tim.viavant@gmail.com
3) Comment:	the cost impact is not deterring		
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
3) Submission Detail:	05/16/2019 12:07 PM	No Attachment.	Shea Bredlie svines2@gmail.com
4) Comment:	I support this proposal on the condition that ADEC compliance staff for the nonattainment area rises to 10 FTEs and delegated citation authority. Otherwise, this proposal may, likely, have the unintended consequence of creating an incentive to burn more solid fuel.		
4) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
4) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox jameslarkinfox@gmail.com
5) Comment:	Another drain on the pocket book.		
5) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
5) Submission Detail:	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen flyerfly@alaska.net
6) Comment:	18 AAC 50.078(e) Non-commercial wood sellers may only sell dry wood needs to be revised to "Non-commercial firewood sellers." This is vital in protecting the impact on the wood manufacturing and milling industries in the future.		
6) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
6) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 04:29 PM	No Attachment.	Chad Schumacher superiorpelletfuels@yahoo.com
7) Comment:	DEC is way behind the information curve on the use of high efficiency propane engines and there flexibility to incorporate wind generated electricity.		
7) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
7) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 05:11 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856506/X1NIDc7LoF_iTYiLbePYQQ2	William Rhodes rhodesbill@yahoo.com
8) Comment:	I support this.		
8) Fiscal Impacts:	False		

8) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan	maureenhogan4@gmail.com
9) Comment:	It doesn't make sense to require commercial wood sellers to sell only dry wood, when the customer can just dry the wood themselves. You're just creating inefficiencies in the market that don't benefit anyone but large wood sellers. Translated: You'll be raising the costs of wood and hurting the people who most need financial help the most.			
9) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
9) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:27 AM	No Attachment.	Lance Roberts	Roberts.Lance@gmail.com
10) Comment:	If accepted this proposal must include there is an increase of the ADEC compliance staff who have citation authority.			
10) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
10) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz	joanbfranz@gmail.com
11) Comment:	I support switching to #1 fuel oil to lower the sulfur content. Not changing to ultra low sulfur oil at this time will allow a period of time for study. Maybe it will not be necessary for a switch to ULSD			
11) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
11) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:45 PM	No Attachment.	Lee Hazen	bmwalaska@gmail.com
Total Comments:	11			
Section Title:	18 AAC 50.079			
Description:	18 AAC 50.079 is proposed to be amended to add requirements for coal-fired heating devices.			
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.			
1) Comment:	Better to just ban them. Why am I having to breath polluted air so a few stubborn greedy people can get away with burning coal?			
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
1) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant	tim.viavant@gmail.com
2) Comment:	Regulating the coal fired heating devises is critical to helping our air pollution			
2) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
2) Submission Detail:	05/16/2019 12:07 PM	No Attachment.	Shea Bredlie	svines2@gmail.com
3) Comment:	I support this proposal but the deadline should be within one year.			
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
3) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox	jameslarkinfox@gmail.com
4) Comment:	Another drain on the pocket book. I know several elderly people who have lived here their whole lives that use coal...they can't afford a new heater and will have to move away.			
4) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
4) Submission Detail:	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen	flyerfly@alaska.net
5) Comment:	18 AAC 50.079 If the goal is to meet at or below an average emission level of 0.10 pounds per million Btu of heat output, shouldn't any device which can prove to meet these standards and achieve EPA certification be allowed? The focus should be on emission rates per unit of energy rather than banning the use of specific devices based solely upon fuel type.			
5) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
5) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 04:29 PM	No Attachment.	Chad Schumacher	superiorpelletfuels@yahoo.com
6) Comment:	I support this requirement.			
6) Fiscal Impacts:	False			

6) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 12:50 AM	No Attachment.	Jennifer Gleason Schmidt	jjschmidt@mosquionet.com
7) Comment:	I support this.			
7) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
7) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan	maureenhogan4@gmail.com
8) Comment:	This section goes to far and defies common sense. If a coal unit can meet the PM 2.5 output requirements of a wood stove then it should be allowed to exist. Please use math and not just a prejudice against coal that many environmentalists bring to the table. Coal can be burned clean, technology should be appreciated not ignored. Don't use fuel source (input) to determine whether a stove meets your standards, use output.			
8) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
8) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:27 AM	No Attachment.	Lance Roberts	Roberts.Lance@gmail.com
9) Comment:	I do not support the use of coal fired heating devices in the non attainment area and support a ban on their use by December 2020.			
9) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
9) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz	joanbf Franz@gmail.com
10) Comment:	DEC needs to allow emerging technologies. The ESP's have promise, but chemical looping using coal has been financed and developed by OSU and DOE and are ready to go commerical. This zero emission technology using a readily available inexpensive fuel creates an alternative to the if and at what price natural gas. A truly affordable system that creates competitive market forces that benefit the environment and consumer. UAF should have used this technology, but, at least, Ft Wainwright can avail themselves to this in a few years. Dr Fan who patented this system to disprove the old adage that there is no such thing as clean coal while working in West Virginia.			
10) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
10) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:15 PM	No Attachment.	Dan Givens	dangivens50@gmail.com
11) Comment:	DEC needs to allow emerging technologies. The ESP's have promise, but chemical looping using coal has been financed and developed by OSU and DOE and are ready to go commerical. This zero emission technology using a readily available inexpensive fuel creates an alternative to the if and at what price natural gas. A truly affordable system that creates competitive market forces that benefit the environment and consumer. UAF should have used this technology, but, at least, Ft Wainwright can avail themselves to this in a few years. Dr Fan who patented this system to disprove the old adage that there is no such thing as clean coal while working in West Virginia.			
11) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
11) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:16 PM	No Attachment.	Dan Givens	dangivens50@gmail.com
12) Comment:	I support removing coal stoves from the non attainment area			
12) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
12) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:45 PM	No Attachment.	Lee Hazen	bmwalaska@gmail.com
13) Comment:	Coal fired home heating is a detriment to health. Without the scrubbers attached to point sources, they pose serious risk to people in the nearby air shed and add to overall volatile substances in the air. This toxic contamination leads to a myriad of health problems which add dramatically to the cost of health care for affected individuals. A coal burner may save a few hundred dollars a winter, but the affected individuals may have thousands or tens of thousands of dollars worth of costs related to treating the problems caused by the toxic coal smoke.			
13) Fiscal Impacts:	True			
13) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:48 PM	No Attachment.	Patrice Lee	patricelee3294@gmail.com
Total Comments:	13			
Section Title:	18 AAC 50.990			
Description:	18 AAC 50.990 is proposed to be amended to add definitions.			
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.			
1) Comment:	What exactly does the word "is" mean?			

1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Pranitis paul.pranitis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	I support this.		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
2) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan maureenhogan4@gmail.com
Total Comments:	2		
Section Title:	General Comments on the Overall Proposal		
Description:	Please provide any general comments you have on this proposal. General comments may be submitted even if you have submitted comments elsewhere on this electronic comment form.		
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.		
1) Comment:	<p>Firstly, Thank you! Please stay firm on deadlines and enforcement. Would love to see even shorter deadlines. People have known of this problem for years now. There has been plenty of time to act.</p> <p>Secondly, emphasis on home heating devices and industrial point sources is key but I would also like to see added controls on vehicle idling in temps above 0°F and for less than 2 hrs. Also, please reinstate emissions inspections on older vehicles. Current technologies and warming winter temps greatly decrease the need for idling.</p>		
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 08:29 AM	No Attachment.	Sharon Baring sharon_baring@hotmail.com
2) Comment:	<p>You people are on crack and I'd really like some of it. Rather than spending time in your air conditioned townhouse inside the Beltway, come here and spend a winter UNDER YOUR RESTRICTIONS ON MY PAYCHECK. Let me know how that electric heat works out for you after 4 or 5 days of the power being out. Till you either subsidize my oil bill to conform to your requirements or get off your collective asses and get a viable alternative to cheap, effective wood heat, you can kiss my hairy ass.</p>		
2) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
2) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Pranitis paul.pranitis@gmail.com
3) Comment:	<p>Wood and coal fired home heating devices (except for emission-compliant wood pellet stoves) should be totally banned within the non-attainment area. All coal fired power plants should be required to have emission control equipment to reduce emissions (even if this makes electricity cost more). It is completely unfair that 95 percent of the people who live here have to put up with lousy air so 5% of the people can burn wood or coal. This is completely a case of a few people getting a small benefit resulting in a lot of people suffering.</p>		
3) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
3) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 06:39 PM	No Attachment.	Tim Viavant tim.viavant@gmail.com
4) Comment:	<p>Requiring a person to use a certified wood stove installer to install a new wood stove is ridiculous. It is only a political favor to the owner of wood stove retail stores. Fairbanks is filled with professional carpenters who have been building homes for decades and independent home owners who build their own house. No one is installing these stoves incorrectly as it would be a potential fire hazard. This is an unnecessary cost in home building.</p>		
4) Fiscal Impacts:	True		
4) Submission Detail:	05/23/2019 11:05 AM	No Attachment.	Makeag Malone MakeagM@bucherglass.com

<p>5) <i>Comment:</i></p>	<p>The entire paradigm is flawed. This is a legitimate problem, that rules, regulations, and politicians can NOT solve. Inversion conditions are caused by latitude and weather. PERIOD. I have been a resident of Fairbanks since 1963. Inversions happen. I also have some education and understand the health consequences. I have also seen the locations of the “sniffers”. On top of buildings, 40 feet off the street. 10 feet above the road surface on a Ford Escape driving thru the neighborhoods. As far as I know, no one in town lives on their roof. Place the “sniffers” between 5 and 6 feet off the ground, where the people are at. Additionally, as more and more people decide to stay in Fairbanks, when they retire. We will see more health issues related to aging and geriatrics. This is also going to skew the data. I think we need more citizen-statesmen in office and on these committees. People who have nothing to gain in using more fuel oil, electricity, or pushing natural gas. I have been using firewood off and on for 40 years now. I even did the woodstove exchange program. That is a joke. We froze our butts. The stove is pretty, but puts out less than half the heat of the old blaze king stove.</p>			
<p>5) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i></p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>5) <i>Submission Detail:</i></p>	<p>06/17/2019 03:19 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Charles Mailander</p>	<p>cam_javaman@yahoo.com</p>
<p>6) <i>Comment:</i></p>	<p>The serious SIP plan for the Fairbanks PM 2.5 issue doesn't have any exemptions for elevation. Anyone living above 600' elevation is above the inversion and anyone living above 800' should be exempt from any of the requirements currently required in the serious SIP.</p>			
<p>6) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i></p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>6) <i>Submission Detail:</i></p>	<p>06/18/2019 08:49 AM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Jim Sackett</p>	<p>Jim_Sackett@hotmail.com</p>
<p>7) <i>Comment:</i></p>	<p>Please consider adding a provision requiring that the numerical PM2.5 results recorded on a daily basis be easily accessible to the public along with comparisons to prior year results. There is presently no way that the public can observe the progress of their efforts to reduce air pollution and compare it to the previous years. This information would be most useful as a graphic presentation published with at least monthly averages. For instance: a bar graph comparing 4 years of data for each of the six winter months of concern. This would provide real information instead of the hysterical sky-is-falling speeches reported in news media.</p>			
<p>7) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i></p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>7) <i>Submission Detail:</i></p>	<p>06/23/2019 01:37 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Victor Bell</p>	<p>victorb@ptialaska.net</p>
<p>8) <i>Comment:</i></p>	<p>There needs to be serious consequences for those individuals who ignore or otherwise violate the conditions of a wood/coal burn ban during periods of severe PM2.5 pollution. Otherwise, individuals will not comply with regulations. This is for the greater good of our most at risk individuals and young children, along with all FNSB residents. It is obvious that many residents disregard the health risks associated with PM2.5 particulates, otherwise they would not have rejected recent FNSB proposed regulations. The State can not allow misinformed individuals to place at risk individuals in harms way and must step in and enforce new regulations that require a burn ban during selected winter time intervals when inversion conditions are present.</p>			
<p>8) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i></p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>8) <i>Submission Detail:</i></p>	<p>06/27/2019 01:01 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Patrick Reinhard</p>	<p>Pwreinhard@gmail.com</p>

<p>9) Comment:</p>	<p>Work with the legislature to increase compliance staffing and obtain citation authority!</p> <p>The proposed NOASH waiver and eligibility and exceptions to Stage 1 Alert eligibility and requirements must incorporate guidance for pellet-fired, EPA-certified hydronic heaters. And the emission rating for those devices must be converted to g/hr to show apples to apples comparison to non-hydronic SFBAs.</p> <p>It is shortsighted and unfortunate that ADEC continues to overlook incentives for using weatherization technologies to reduce residential heating demand and thus emissions from solid and liquid fuel burning appliances.</p> <p>I request Stage 1 and NOASH eligibility be tied to a structure's AkWarm Energy rating. The better the rating the more freedoms! This would be yet another criteria in the draft table in Section 7.12. This is a strategy that saves a structure owner money! There are 3 certified raters in Fairbanks. I encourage ADEC work with CCHRC to develop the criteria for each exception.</p> <p>Overall the draft serious SIP continues a long-term trend of ADEC placing a higher value on the short-term economics of heating over the short and long-term economics of human health, well-being and death. There is ample State data available online that shows the tremendous financial impact of poor air quality yet ADEC refuses to bring that data to light. For example, FMH visits for cerebrovascular disease and respiratory tract infections rose 6-7% per10µg/m3 of PM2.5 (ADHHS 2009). According to ADHHS (2016) respiratory illness was the #4 Cause of hospitalization in AK and the median charge was \$28,592 (mean \$51,774). Circulatory system disease and disorder #5 and the hospitalization median charge was \$57,824 (mean \$98,646). A person could buy a lot of heating oil for the price of one trip to the hospital for respiratory infection!</p>			
<p>9) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>9) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/07/2019 12:58 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Jimmy Fox</p>	<p>jameslarkinfox@gmail.com</p>
<p>10) Comment:</p>	<p>A followup to Comment 274, I have additional financial impact information.</p> <p>Asthma is 3rd leading cause of hospitalization for children in the US (CDC 2014). According to the American Lung Association, in the Fairbanks North Star Borough the average Medicaid payment for an ER visit for asthma was \$1,059 avg., inpatient and outpatient services (2016). According to ADHSS (2006) for asthma the avg. cost was \$9200 for hospitalization ('01-'04). A study in central CA found a cost of >\$4,000/family/yr for childhood asthma (Brandt et al 2012).</p> <p>As I wrote previously, I share this information as counterpoint to allegations that one night or 20 nights of curtailment would bankrupt people.</p> <p>I also wish to thank staff for the huge amount of work put into the draft. You are unsung heroes and your service to the public is much appreciated by me.</p>			
<p>10) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>10) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/07/2019 07:02 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Jimmy Fox</p>	<p>jameslarkinfox@gmail.com</p>
<p>11) Comment:</p>	<p>Over a dozen years of voluntary efforts to lessen the impact of PM emissions from wood stoves hasn't worked. The only way we have a chance of solving our problem is to give ADEC citation authority.</p>			
<p>11) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>11) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/13/2019 09:57 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>ron johnson</p>	<p>rajohnson@alaska.edu</p>
<p>12) Comment:</p>	<p>After months of actual health hazards from wildfire smoke I find the states attempt to regulate wood heating a laughable joke. I will never follow any state regulation and will continue to heat my home in any matter that I choose.</p>			
<p>12) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>12) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/19/2019 09:31 AM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Justin Powell</p>	<p>jpowell@acsalaska.net</p>

<p>13) Comment:</p>	<p>As a person who has worked over 35 years in the controls and instrumentation field, owner of a biotechnology business, and resident of the non-attainment area in North Pole, I have several concerns with this proposal.</p> <p>My first concern is that indoor air quality (IAQ) is many magnitudes of order more important during the winter months in Interior Alaska than outdoor air quality (OAQ). When inversions occur, it's dark and bitter cold. No one, especially children and elderly, ventures outside for more than brief moments. Most people's concern is staying indoors and heating their home as cheaply as possible. But often IAQ is much worse than OAQ.</p> <p>If the State is concerned about health, they should look at ways to monitor and improve IAQ. Examples: Better HRV filters, air purifiers, and inexpensive home monitors.</p> <p>Secondly, I know that in super-cold temperatures, particles and measuring devices behave erratically. Assuming the AQ meter is reading correctly, one can find immensely different reading mere yards apart depending on air flow and inversion effects. It is also doubtful that the AQ meters are able to be calibrated under conditions in which they are used during inversions. Therefore, the measurements should only be used to warn people of potentially dangerous air quality and to watch for improvements...and not used to trigger burn bans or other substantial deviations in the use of EPA approved home heating devices.</p>			
<p>13) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>13) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/20/2019 09:14 AM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Tim Steele</p>	<p>akman2014@live.com</p>
<p>14) Comment:</p>	<p>I have lived in the now so called non-attainment area for 32 years burning firewood to augment our heat. I am always at least 2 years ahead with split,stacked,stored firewood. I have never had a complaint from my neighbors and in fact they call me to cut up trees for them when they fall because they know it won't be burned until properly seasoned. Because most people spend the majority of their time inside during cold weather, it seems that inside air quality, with mold, pet dander, dust etc. is a bigger problem than outside air. I live right on the borderline of the non-attainment area on the bad side but work on the good side. I have been riding my bicycle to work year round in all weather for over 15 years. It is ludicrous to think that a magical random line will control smoke. One side is punished with burn bans while others burn at will. We have shown improvement with the methods we have adopted, and cookie cutter rules not taking into account our climactic conditions should not be implemented.</p>			
<p>14) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>14) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/24/2019 10:12 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Jim Hadlock</p>	<p>jhadlock@ptialaska.net</p>
<p>15) Comment:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments mean almost nothing. We have commented in several elections and you continue to try and make rules that are adverse to our wishes. So what is the point of commenting? Does it make you feel like you are listening? 2. You insist that you are just following federal law...but the state routinely breaks federal drug laws. Why the duplicity? 3. You say it is about health and yet the state does not seem to mind people smoking pot and other plants. I saw a chain smoker complain at a meeting about wood smoke...and then light up a cigarette...oh the irony and hypocrisy. The state gets money from drugs and so it becomes ok to break federal law...so how much protection money do we have to pay the state so we can heat our homes without insane regulations? What happened to equal treatment under the law? 4. Why comment? Why, will it matter to anyone? Will it actually prevent you from turning our state into California north? 			
<p>15) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>15) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/24/2019 11:24 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Jon Christensen</p>	<p>flyerfly@alaska.net</p>

16) Comment:	<p>Superior Pellet Fuels, LLC recognizes the value of solid fuels such as pellets, compressed logs, traditional firewood, and coal to our community. We want to ensure the highest quality solid fuels are made available in the FNSB and paired with clean burning technology. This combination paired with reasonable curtailment participation is critical for the Department of Environmental Conservation to achieve PM2.5 compliance in the future.</p> <p>There are a few things the community and government will need to offer to encourage this to happen.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current availability of dry firewood is a major issue impacting air quality. A dry wood supply can be increased by encouraging access to standing dry timber from state and borough lands with high tree fatality due to forest fire, spruce bark beetle infestation, or river flooding. However, the only way to provide a consistent low moisture content product to the community is to encourage the development of a firewood kiln. 2. Electrostatic precipitators (ESPs) and other retrofit devices have been shown to reduce or eliminate effluent discharge. The option to demonstrate conformance to an emission standard while using retrofit devices should be recognized as an option for all solid fuel burning devices. Unfortunately these systems currently lack a regulatory path for certification. Superior Pellet Fuels strongly encourages the State of Alaska and FNSB invest in appropriate testing to streamline a certification process. 3. Assuming ESP testing provides similar results to previously performed local tests, the installation of these devices needs to be encouraged as quickly as possible. Funding is going to be a challenge for these devices but could be addressed with future targeted watershed grant funds designated towards retrofit devices or with personal/private investment. The personal/private investments could be greatly encouraged by developing a curtailment waiver achievable by meeting a specific emissions threshold established by pairing an EPA certified solid fuel burning device with an emissions reducing ESP. 		
16) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
16) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 04:29 PM	No Attachment.	Chad Schumacher superiorpelletfuels@yahoo.com
17) Comment:	Seeking a complete overall of the existing SIP, its horribly outdated technically.		
17) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
17) Submission Detail:	07/25/2019 05:11 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856507/QBT4VQ0MbMtzIRz1cfYHgA2	William Rhodes rhodesbill@yahoo.com
18) Comment:	<p>I have been a registered nurse in Alaska since 1972, and am troubled by how long it has taken for our community to respond to this serious health issue.</p> <p>The children born in North Pole, Alaska in 2009 have spent their whole life breathing poor air, and will be out of high school when the SIP projects the level will meet EPA requirements. That is a whole generation of kids whose lung function may never be normal and will never be what it could have been. Other diseases that are higher in areas of poor air quality are poor pregnancy outcomes, cardiac arrhythmias, heart attacks, and strokes, inflammatory diseases, cancer rates.....basically, nothing good.</p> <p>I was a participant last year in the Air Quality Stakeholders Group and feel that the SIP reflects the hard work of the group and the most acceptable compromises to try to reach attainment. I am willing to do my part, by using #1 heating oil by 2020, and I live in a small, heat efficient home. I think that many wood sellers are already doing their part, or will be by 2021. But, after 10 years of informing, offering change-outs, and other problem solving, I think 4 years is too long for people to have to replace their stoves. It took about 2 years for the pollution to get really bad in 2008 and 2009; Fairbanks should be able to clean things up a little faster. The most polluting devices should be first to go for the community to get the biggest bang for its money. With budget cuts at the state level this year, I expect to see more people financially strapped turning to burning wood to save money. I think we will have backsliding in the progress that has been made for this reason.</p> <p>I look forward to following the progress on this serious problem.</p>		
18) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
18) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 12:50 AM	No Attachment.	Jennifer Gleason Schmidt jschmidt@mosquionet.com
19) Comment:	Excellent proposal.		
19) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
19) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:23 AM	No Attachment.	Maureen Hogan maureenhogan4@gmail.com
20) Comment:	<p>What is fully evident is that only technology will solve this problem. The two proven technologies that can drastically improve our situation are natural gas and ESPs. We aren't in control of being able to get affordable natural gas to the Interior, but this SIP could be modified to use ESPs. The most important thing that could be done to incentivize ESP participation is to allow burn ban waivers for those with an ESP installed. The math says that the total amounts of pollutants removed by this proven technology is magnitudes of order more than a stove with an ESP might produce during a burn ban. The State needs to create a BACM that allows burn ban waivers for stoves with an ESP. Everything else that is being done has marginal effect relative to converting a lot of wood stoves to using an ESP. At every point in the regulations we should be incentivizing their use, but the burn ban waiver is critical since there is no other financial incentive for someone to install an ESP.</p>		

20) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
20) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 07:27 AM	No Attachment.	Lance Roberts Roberts.Lance@gmail.com
21) Comment:	Please see the attached PDF document for comments on the methodology of the economic analysis and suggestions of how to improve the economic analysis to ensure the analysis recommends solutions that maximize public net benefit and are economically efficient.		
21) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
21) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 12:37 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856548/oFW7T4t937I8nIOkxcz1yA2	Tim Leach timkayaks@hotmail.com
22) Comment:	<p>As a health care provider in Fairbanks for the past 39 years, I have personally observed the devastating health effects of poor air quality within schools, homes and my clinic where I work with children who have fragile respiratory systems from prematurity, asthma and other health impairments. However, as you know "sensitive populations" are not the only ones who suffer significant health impacts. Our community has made small improvements regarding public awareness and knowledge, but I feel the significant health impacts have been downplayed and not given the critical significance that help people change their behavior. In my conversations with individuals who are opposed to regulations regarding wood burning, I often hear that there are no scientific studies that address the health impacts of poor air quality on different ages and specific adult and child diseases. The American Lung Association has a wonderful program with Lathrop biology teachers who had students studying different aspects of air pollution. More programs like the above must be part of the solution.</p> <p>Education within Schools:</p> <p>Health, science, art and social/behavioral curriculum can incorporate knowledge and study of health impacts, what is air pollution composed of and what different heating sources contribute to air quality, differences between SFB devices compared to other heating options, health effects at different air quality indexes, weatherization of homes, what is a hot spot for air pollution, what is an inversion, how can you protect yourself plus many more issues. Helping children from a very young age hear and understand these concepts and thoughts were essential in reducing the number of children who smoke cigarettes and must be part of the DEC approach when looking at long term changes in a serious SIP that will improve our community and attitudes into the future. We can not change our geography, but we can change the scientific knowledge of future generations and children's knowledge will also effect their parents behavior too.</p> <p>Citation authority must be given to DEC or any agency that is given responsibility to monitor and deter "bad burners".</p> <p>Working with small neighborhood groups located in "hot spots" may be one of the most effect ways to begin to change behavior.</p> <p>Provide incentives for better burning practices such as property tax reductions or opportunities to purchase lower cost fuel alternatives to use during an air quality event when individuals or small neighborhoods make significant improvements in reducing emissions by complying with air quality alerts for burn bans. The cost of alternative fuel sources is often a concern for wood burners asked to stop burning wood.</p> <p>All above suggestions are dependent on a state government that will provide funding to support these measures. Who has provided a budget that will support the needed changes? Funding sources committed by the state to different agencies should be part of the Serious SIP.</p>		
22) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
22) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 02:00 PM	No Attachment.	Joan Franz joanbfranz@gmail.com
23) Comment:	Comments attached for proposed changes in 18AAC 50		
23) Fiscal Impacts:	False		
23) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:01 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856626/DEAg2OSHIYu5M-FtYBVe7w2	Carrie Nyssen carrie.nyssen@lung.org

<p>24) Comment:</p>	<p>The over all proposal is doomed for failure. Not because people do not want to help in controlling pm2.5 during burn bans. Because people have no choice but to use wood heat. The regulations are set up to be invasive to peoples private informaton and private property. The regulations are set up to be advisarial in nature. Nobody, who is of sound mind, should like the idea that there are people driving around looking for smoke off of roofs.</p> <p>The idea that residents get a warning letter, based soley off of what may or may not be actual wood smoke is rediculous. The way that is set up is complelty backwards. Smoke is seen coming off of a roof. How do you verify first that it is wood smoke instead of fuel oil? Then how can you verify that wood stove burner has violated the ban by adding more wood to thier fire? Withouty verifying as fact that one has broken rules, how can you then warn them that they HAVE broken rules, and could be subject to further punishmemnt if the do it again. The system is predicated on the assumption that you have broken a rule without proving that you actually did.</p> <p>For the most part, people want to do the right things, But they will not let themselves be pushed into a corner. The way these rules are set up, pushes people into a corner, and they are pushing back.</p> <p>It is not within the perview of the Gov. to decide if I can use wood heat for my home just because of how much money I do or do not make. It is not within the gov. perview to require admittance into my home to ensure that my stove is installed and cleaned properly. I most certainly am not under any obligation to let a gov official onto my private property to inspect my wood pile.</p> <p>None of these requirements are necessary for fuel oil. Can you imagine the uproar if you insisted that you inspect furnaces and boilers before allowing peole to put fuel oil in them? Or what about inspecting private homes to ensure they are adaquittly insulated, banning people from using fuel if thier houses are under insulated or very old and inefficient? Or requiring financial information to allow one to burn propane and natural gas instead of fuel oil?</p> <p>We, have made great strides in reducing pm2.5 without the addition of burn bans and smoke patrols. Really advocating for and implementing ESPs as an official control measure would go a long way to helping residents clean up pm2.5 and allowing people to heat cheaply. Continuing with the education of proper burning and storing practices. Continuing to encourage old stoves to be volintarily replaced with newer stoves. Encourage the use of community involvement in a dry wood exchange program.</p>			
<p>24) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>24) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/26/2019 04:02 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Wendy Mannan</p>	<p>wendymannan@yahoo.com</p>
<p>25) Comment:</p>	<p>I am impressed with the work Cindy and Alice have done by moving to the 5 percent plan. There has been talk about having working groups help DEC work within the area to help inform the community about how to actually make a difference. This will require dancing on eggshells, but if people start noticing a difference I believe others can see the merit of burning properly and shutting down when necessary. We need to bring this community together and not divide it. This can be done through education and volunteers without spending huge amounts of money.</p> <p>Lastly, I need to address the forest fires. I have my own monitor and it has exceeded 750 recently. It hovered at 300 for a week. I could feel the health impacts. I have threatened to cough up a log out of each lung. In the past the nay sayers always pointed to the forest fires and EPA shrugged it off as not man induced. I researched BLM firefighting practices. There's a 3 day acessment with a two day logistical plan. As a result a majority of fires are 3-5 days ahead of the overworked firefighters.</p> <p>While forest fires don't count on the daily average they do factor into the yearly average (unless that has been changed recently). They definitely affect the health of the people downwind and I expect for DEC to hear more complaints , especially when the air quality was 10 times EPA allowances.</p> <p>Why can't there be a tactical fire fighting squad that can be sent immediately to areas close to large populations instead of all the political wrangling and computer modeling that's outdated by the hour. Can't afford it, but the money is available when it comes time to pay the 200 plus firefighters and emergency personnel. Don't insult me with that argument! My hope is that EPA and DEC brings pressure on the appropriate government agencies to expedite these efforts in streamlining the fire fighting response time. Otherwise, DEC loses a lot of credibility with some citizens and makes a mute point of Dr Hanley 's excellent presentation. It is hard to pinpoint a health problem with other environmental factors. A case in point last week a gentleman was driving down the road in a truck with the window open and wearing a mask because of the smoke. Stopped at the traffic light we noticed the man smoking a cigarette through the mask. The light changed before we were able to take a picture. The point is that it is hard to state a health issue with some many other environmental factors especially, forest fire smoke 10 times government regulations.</p> <p>Lastly, all the pop ups make it hard to type in this venue, so forgive all the mistakes .</p>			
<p>25) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>			
<p>25) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/26/2019 04:15 PM</p>	<p>No Attachment.</p>	<p>Dan Givens</p>	<p>dangivens50@gmail.com</p>

<p>26) Comment:</p>	<p>I am impressed with the work Cindy and Alice have done by moving to the 5 percent plan. There has been talk about having working groups help DEC work within the area to help inform the community about how to actually make a difference. This will require dancing on eggshells, but if people start noticing a difference I believe others can see the merit of burning properly and shutting down when necessary. We need to bring this community together and not divide it. This can be done through education and volunteers without spending huge amounts of money.</p> <p>Lastly, I need to address the forest fires. I have my own monitor and it has exceeded 750 recently. It hovered at 300 for a week. I could feel the health impacts. I have threatened to cough up a log out of each lung. In the past the nay sayers always pointed to the forest fires and EPA shrugged it off as not man induced. I researched BLM firefighting practices. There's a 3 day assessment with a two day logistical plan. As a result a majority of fires are 3-5 days ahead of the overworked firefighters.</p> <p>While forest fires don't count on the daily average they do factor into the yearly average (unless that has been changed recently). They definitely affect the health of the people downwind and I expect for DEC to hear more complaints, especially when the air quality was 10 times EPA allowances.</p> <p>Why can't there be a tactical fire fighting squad that can be sent immediately to areas close to large populations instead of all the political wrangling and computer modeling that's outdated by the hour. Can't afford it, but the money is available when it comes time to pay the 200 plus firefighters and emergency personnel. Don't insult me with that argument! My hope is that EPA and DEC brings pressure on the appropriate government agencies to expedite these efforts in streamlining the fire fighting response time. Otherwise, DEC loses a lot of credibility with some citizens and makes a mute point of Dr Hanley's excellent presentation. It is hard to pinpoint a health problem with other environmental factors. A case in point last week a gentleman was driving down the road in a truck with the window open and wearing a mask because of the smoke. Stopped at the traffic light we noticed the man smoking a cigarette through the mask. The light changed before we were able to take a picture. The point is that it is hard to state a health issue with some many other environmental factors especially, forest fire smoke 10 times government regulations.</p> <p>Lastly, all the pop ups make it hard to type in this venue, so forgive all the mistakes.</p>
<p>26) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>False</p>
<p>26) Submission Detail:</p>	<p>07/26/2019 04:16 PM No Attachment. Dan Givens dangivens50@gmail.com</p>
<p>27) Comment:</p>	<p>The State Implementation Plan as currently written is extremely inadequate for the following reasons:</p> <p>Citation Authority is needed to adequately enforce the law as violations occur. The state and local borough have a dismal, embarrassing rate of enforcement. It has been wood burners 100, breathers 0. Millions have been spent on wood stove change outs, target programs, etc and nothing has been spent on the suffering of those with chronic illness exacerbated or caused by smoke pollution, medical bills, or even premature death for the tens of thousands of affected individuals. My son has to leave the Interior when our neighbors "light up". We have to go to Anchorage or some other cleaner place, costing us enormous amounts of money we don't have. Our cost to leave has far exceeded any dividends we receive annually. Our neighbor's smoke drifts over our property nearly everyday. No complaints have ever made a difference. No action has ever been taken.</p> <p>Thousands of studies now exist regarding the health effects of smoke pollution. A generation of children have now grown up in the Fairbanks North Star Borough, subjected to inflammation that has no doubt caused these children to fail to reach their full potential. Their lungs, hearts, brains, etc. have been affected. For What? Because the state with the richest resources in the nation in oil and gas couldn't come up with a way to supplant wood burning so people could stay warm in their homes. This is an utter failure of leadership at every level. The history of this debacle may well surpass Flint, Michigan and the lead in drinking water situation. As terrible and horrifying as that was, one can drink bottled water, but one cannot breathe bottled air as a matter of everyday living.</p> <p>Because the cost of health care is left out of every economic analysis related to the "cost" of fuel options for heating, the true cost of using wood to heat homes has not been adequately described or enumerated. It may turn out to be the most expensive form of heating available if the economics of the health affects are ever accurately included.</p> <p>The failure of our elected and appointed officials to take the problem of wood smoke pollution to a solution has been political and not practical. Stop the smoke and the pollution stops. The issue was made political and people have been the collateral damage associated with that extreme poor decision making.</p> <p>The SIP as written now, isn't enforceable by the current attainment date of Dec. 31, 2019 or 5 years from that date. Most Stringent Measures (MSM) are excluded from this SIP and they should not be excluded. Not wanting to pay for MSM doesn't make it impracticable! Again, an accurate economic analysis that includes health care costs associated with wood smoke and the damage it causes to people and especially children who are growing is required for every determination.</p> <p>The people of the FNSB have been under assault by perhaps 1000 people out of 100,000 people who won't or can't heat in a cleaner manner. How on earth can we be in a position where the Clean Air Act has been ignored and thwarted for over a decade with no progress? We got to the moon way faster than we can figure out how to help 1000 people change how they heat their homes. There are many ways to heat a home more cleanly, but there is only one way to breathe. When will breathers get a break? When will the law be enforced? Will we cease to be collateral damage, pawns in a political game we don't want to participate in?</p>
<p>27) Fiscal Impacts:</p>	<p>True</p>

27) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:48 PM	No Attachment.	Patrice Lee	patricelee3294@gmail.com
28) Comment:	<p>My family has Leiden V Factor which means our blood clots at a faster rate than 70% of the population. At 42 my daughter had a stroke, my brother at 65, my son had a pulmonary embolism at 49, the size of a baseball that nearly killed him and my father died of complications from deep leg thrombosis. My father lived in the most polluted area off Badger Road. I believe the PM 2.5 in our atmosphere contributed to all their problems and exacerbated their vulnerability to our inherited genetics. My brother is in a wheel chair, paralyzed on his left side, and my son is facing extensive dangerous surgeries to replace his arteries. Thirty per-cent of the general population has the Leiden factor and do not know it. Many Fairbanks residents have never been tested. Because of PM 2.5 they should be so they can try to mitigate the damage of PM 2.5 to their bodies.</p> <p>My husband has weak lungs and is susceptible to pneumonia, as is my 2 year old grandson. We have spent thousands of dollars on air filtration and medicines for the both of them. Not only do we have it in the summer with the smoke but must endure it all winter.</p> <p>My grandson said he would leave here if it wasn't for his business and I would do the same if I could convince the rest of my family to go. PM 2.5 cannot be left unchecked any longer. I do not support the present SIP plan that puts off any serious mitigation for the future. We are sick and dying now.</p>			
28) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
28) Submission Detail:	07/26/2019 04:57 PM	No Attachment.	Pamela Throop	pam@realtyAlaska.com
Total Comments:	28			
Section Title:	Comments on the Public Review Process for this Proposal			
Description:	Please provide any comments you have on the public review process for this proposal. Comments on the process may be submitted even if you have submitted comments elsewhere on this electronic comment form. If you have questions on the public review process, please contact the individual listed in the public notice (see link at the top of this page).			
Disclaimer:	The summary language above does not reflect the detailed verbiage that is out for public comment. Please review the actual language prior to submitting your comments.			
1) Comment:	Like you're really gonna look at or even think about any of this.....			
1) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
1) Submission Detail:	05/14/2019 03:06 PM	No Attachment.	PAul Pranitis	paul.pranitis@gmail.com
2) Comment:	<p>I support the state's opinions and efforts.</p> <p>I am specifically against the requirement for wood sellers to only sell "dry" wood. The previous educational efforts were very effective, and I now regiously buy my "seasoned" wood two years in advance, and makes a huge difference. I also built a proper wood shed, which was the biggest difference maker.</p> <p>I do not want to be charged \$100 more per cord for "dry" birch, and I am no longer able to cut my own.</p> <p>I believe a lot more dry wood would be burned if effort were made to subsidize Wood sheds, and/or have a rebate/rewards people with 4 cords of dry wood sitting in a wood shed. \$50/cord would be a lot of incentive to get my wood two years in advance!!!</p>			
2) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
2) Submission Detail:	05/15/2019 03:08 PM	No Attachment.	Klaus Wuttig	kgwuttig@gmail.com
3) Comment:	<p>Goldstream Valley residents must be protected from their neighbors solid fuel burning so I applaud the incorporation of this portion of the nonattainment area into these proposed regulations. Do not remove the area. In 2015 area realtors agreed this area, especially the Sheep Ck Road neighborhood, was experiencing more population growth than other areas of the borough except Badger Road neighborhood. With this said, I expect vociferous push back from enforcement of any rules adopted because so little public engagement has actually happened in the Valley.</p>			
3) Fiscal Impacts:	False			
3) Submission Detail:	07/07/2019 12:58 PM	No Attachment.	Jimmy Fox	jameslarkinfox@gmail.com

4) <i>Comment:</i>	Public comment seems to be just so you can say you listened...but the state is going to do what it wants anyway so you are not really listening except to the special interest groups that sue you and have deep pockets...we don't have deep pockets so you don't listen to us...so why comment. Trust me...I would be very surprised if my comments help keep our state free at all...in the long run somebody will MIGHT read them and just throw them away and ignore anything that does not go along with the state/federal agenda to control people.		
	I don't think I will comment anymore...if I don't see DEC back off I will know it is a waste of my time.		
4) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i>	False		
4) <i>Submission Detail:</i>	07/24/2019 11:24 PM	No Attachment.	Jon Christensen flyerfly@alaska.net
5) <i>Comment:</i>	I commend the State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation on the public review process. The DEC leadership and staff have shown a willingness to have open communication and discuss specific areas of concern thoroughly. It will be extremely important for the DEC to continue this open dialog with the community and industry and share the elements of the 5% reduction plan as soon as possible. Future plans for curtailment and enforcement are currently unknown and will greatly impact the response from the community.		
5) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i>	False		
5) <i>Submission Detail:</i>	07/25/2019 04:29 PM	No Attachment.	Chad Schumacher superiorpelletfuels@yahoo.com
6) <i>Comment:</i>	Cost comparison of new state of the art equipment vs remodeled out of date equipment is staggering, new equipment is the clear choice for BACT		
6) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i>	False		
6) <i>Submission Detail:</i>	07/25/2019 05:11 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856508/tQHqYWktdTEFieqH5Mu1sg2	William Rhodes rhodesbill@yahoo.com
7) <i>Comment:</i>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment. I have attached a letter with personal testimony and below are links that can be viewed for additional personal testimony from the community https://youtu.be/hOQvRemN7CU https://youtu.be/1laN_nsbFNU https://youtu.be/dorr-lp-GWw https://youtu.be/6UPB18dQKFc https://youtu.be/ebFUqPFxjQI https://youtu.be/GzvsXDbw9ww		
7) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i>	True		
7) <i>Submission Detail:</i>	07/25/2019 09:07 PM	http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/Home/ViewAttachment/16856512/zd_ozVVbj-pVZ5MsPR2prw2	Jennifer Willeford jwilleford7@gmail.com
8) <i>Comment:</i>	Those residents who continue to burn uncertified devices or burn during alert days should be fined or lose their right to use wood stoves. We have continued to violate the air quality standards because of these practices. Alert notices are not visible enough. Hi way signs, frequent radio and TV. ads need to be used for notification. The wood change out program should also require verification there is a proper wood storage area for fire wood. ESP devices once installed should require a yearly inspection verifying the proper operation. All dry cabin residents should attend a training coarse to learn proper burning requirements before operating wood stoves.		
8) <i>Fiscal Impacts:</i>	False		
8) <i>Submission Detail:</i>	07/26/2019 04:45 PM	No Attachment.	Lee Hazen bmwalaska@gmail.com
Total Comments:	8		