

From: [Gabrielle Kiele](#)
To: [Dec Air Comment](#)
Subject: Regarding the Current Proposals Concerning Wood Stoves
Date: Friday, July 26, 2019 4:05:15 PM

Hello,

I was given this e-mail address by my state senator, listing the deadline for public comments as today, so if this is not the correct address, please forward my comments to the appropriate party without delay. Thank you.

First off, I applaud your efforts to better our air quality in Alaska, especially in Fairbanks. It *does*, indeed, need to be addressed, so that is not my objection. I have some concerns, however, about some of the proposed restrictions.

From my senator's newsletter, it looks like the proposal seeks to ban woodstoves from being installed in new buildings, and tries to severely restrict the use of woodstoves. Is this correct?

(Frankly, I'm trying to read the things on your webpage "Fairbanks PM2.5 Serious SIP", but the language is very long and confusing...is there any way this all could be summarized in simpler language, so residents can clearly understand what is being proposed, and how it will affect us?)

Well, if the above is the case, I have some concerns about that. I fully understand and agree with the idea that people should take care to burn dry enough wood, not burn hazardous materials, etc. However, trying to restrict or actually ban the burning of wood seems like a very impractical and even dangerous idea.

For many people, burning wood is an important part of surviving our harsh Alaskan winters. I have no idea of the numbers, but I know of many people who, at least in the coldest parts of the winter, have to use oil heaters, wood stoves, and electric space heaters all three, just to keep the temperatures in their homes at a livable level.

I noticed that one of the alternatives to wood stoves is pellet stoves. While this may seem like a good idea, it is my understanding that pellet stoves require electricity in order to function, as do oil heaters.

I think it is very dangerous to require people to use a heat source that needs electricity. In a state that is prone to earthquakes, and which sometimes has wind- or ice-storms which knock out electricity for hours or days, we need to have reliable heat sources which do not require electricity. I hate to imagine what would happen to thousands of people whose electricity

were to go out at 40, 50, or 60 degrees below zero, and they had no other heat source. Back-up generators can only go so far.

There is also the price. I don't personally know the price comparison for pellets, but I do know that a cord of wood does not cost nearly as much as a tank of oil does. There are many people who can barely afford wood, much less oil.

It strikes me, also, that wood is a much more logical long-term solution than oil is. Eventually our sources of oil will dry up, but, if re-seeding and logging were to be done responsibly, I think we could keep using wood for much longer.

It just seems strange to me that, of all the ways pollution could be addressed, the government is choosing to pick the one thing that, actually, invades our homes. I understand that we can't ticket lightning, or wild fires, or the extreme cold (which all affect my asthma way more than wood stove smoke does), but aren't there any other ways we can fight pollution? How about all the cars which are left running in parking lots during the winter? (And, if we're so concerned about pollution, why did we do away with the emissions tests on our cars?) What about cracking down on fireworks and campfires during burn bans and high fire risk times? Why try to penalize people for merely trying to survive, to keep their families and pets alive in the deadliest of winter temperatures?

In conclusion, I thank you for taking my comments into consideration. Admittedly, I have not researched some of this extensively, but I wanted to inform the decision-makers of how some of these proposals could adversely affect residents on a daily basis.

Thank you,

R. Gabrielle Kiele