Hodina, James

From: SCOTT WARD [mmssward@q.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2009 10:02 PM
To: Hodina, James
Subject: wood boiler solutions

Jim,
My name is Scott Ward, my father and I have been to all of the meeting but unable to speak out yet. Between the rude interruptions during your presentations and the lack of time, it just hasn't happened. I have a few thoughts that I would like to send your way, do with them as you wish.

There's been some discussion on how much PM the boilers put out. It varies very much as to how much wood it takes to heat with. On a below zero day, with cloud cover and wind, it will burn alot (which doesn't happen that often and it still cycles off and on during the coldest times). But or days like this, 55 with sun and little wind, it takes only a couple of pieces a day. Then there's the whole condition of the house thing too. The EPA findings on my Central Boiler states that it puts out similar emissions as a typical wood stove. But unlike a wood stove which only heats a small area or room and doesn't regulate the heat output, my boiler is heating 5000 square feet of area and maintaining the temperature without burning the oxygen from the living space to do it. The house and shop stay at a constant 70 degrees all day, all night. To heat that much space with a wood stove would take three or four units which obviously would pollute three or four times as much as the one boiler. It would increase the risk of fire or suffocation by at least that much too not to mention the probable insurance companies denying coverage. A fireplace isn't even worth mentioning since it robs heat from the house and sends it out the chimney. In my opinion, if one of these unregulated indoor wood stoves/fireplaces burns down a house, that would be more devastating to the PM readings in one shot than all 200 boilers put together. These wood boilers are the best way for a home owner to burn wood as a heat source than any other system. Not only do they maintain a constant steady temperature in the building, the fire (including the original heating system) is all outside, as is the mess with smoke, ash, dirt, sawdust and bugs. It's ridiculous to ban the best system invented to safely burn wood. Not only does burning wood save the users money on their heating bills, it saves everyone else some too. By reducing the demand for natural gas, coal/electricity, etc., it keeps the costs down.

So, to be fair to the people that are already heavily invested, there should be an as-is grandfathering with the exception of the few complaints that need resolved. Those could be resolved on a case by case scenario which shouldn't take long since only two showed up on Monday. Harold is just an extreme complainer and doesn't have a boiler anywhere near him to affect his life at all. He had to drive miles to get that picture that he presented. Also, the setbacks need to be based on stack to occupied residence, not stack to property lines. By design, most properties including farms, have their homes and outbuildings built close to the road and to the edge of property lines. That way, they don't have valuable farmland being taken up with buildings and roadways and have easy access to the property during all types of weather conditions (snow/rain, etc.). To get a boiler hundreds of feet from a property line would be impossible for a great majority of current owners and future owners as well. My case would be an example. My property is a thousand feet from the street but my house sits very close to the property line and obviously, so does my boiler. But, the next closest residence is my father's house, which is a quarter mile away as the crow flies. He can't even smell my smoke much less be polluted by it. The next property is nearly a half mile on down the hill from him. I affect no one but with the proposed setbacks, I would still not be legal. Make the setback from stack to residence somewhere around a hundred feet with the proper stack height unless there's mutual consent between the two property owners. A waiver should be the first line of defense so inspections and mediation could be avoided. It's obvious that when our current boilers are no longer useable, we'll be buying new
ones. By that time, all that will be available will be the high efficiency ones which I would have bought now if I could have afforded it and seen this ordinance coming. Another option would be to limit the season of wood burning to people who have immediate neighbors so they can enjoy their outdoors too. (I personally don’t want to burn year-round, I need a break)

Thanks for listening and if you have any questions to ask a boiler owner or for more ideas pertaining to my suggestions, feel free to reply back,

Scott Ward
Hodina, James

From: Harold Hensel [mhhensel@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 4:13 PM
To: Daugherty, Anthony
Cc: mhhensel@earthlink.net
Subject: FW: RE: Dioxins

Hodina
mhhensel@earthlink.net

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Langston, Linda
To: mhhensel@earthlink.net
Sent: 3/20/2009 2:26:31 PM
Subject: RE: Dioxins

Harold:
Thanks for your information and comments. As we work to build an ordinance that grandfathers EPA certified boilers, I'm also asking that for any property under 5 acres that people get agreements of permission from adjacent land owners and that we proceed with the ordinance as it was written beyond that.

Linda Langston
Linn County Supervisor
930 First St. SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 52403
(319) 892-5000

From: Harold Hensel [mailto:mhhensel@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 1:52 PM
To: Board Internet Address
Cc: mhhensel@earthlink.net
Subject: Dioxins

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Burning wood produces dioxins

Please read and understand what dioxins are.
Here are a couple quotes.

"no "safe" level of exposure to dioxin"

"Dioxin is formed by burning chlorine-based chemical compounds with hydrocarbons. The major source of dioxin in the environment comes from waste-burning incinerators of various sorts and also from backyard burn-barrels." And I might add, woodburning boilers.

"Group 1 carcinogen, meaning a "known human carcinogen."
"In addition to cancer exposure to dioxin can also cause severe reproductive and developmental problems (at levels 100 times lower than those associated with its cancer causing effects). Dioxin is well-known for its ability to damage the immune system and interfere with hormonal systems.

Dioxin exposure has been linked to birth defects, inability to maintain pregnancy, decreased fertility, reduced sperm counts, endometriosis, diabetes, learning disabilities, immune system suppression, lung problems, skin disorders, lowered testosterone levels and much more. For an detailed list of health problems related to dioxin, read the [People's Report on Dioxin](http://www.ejnet.org/dioxin/).

I don't know how anyone could knowingly allow pollution from burning that produces dioxins. There are real people who are being affected by it, especially children and older people. It is your responsibility to protect them. That is why we have a public health dept. You should take their advice.

I have skin cancer and lung problems from burning and can speak first hand about it. (Not that many people care or believe it)

Sincerely submitted,

Harold Hensel

1231 N Apple Creek Rd

Mt Vernon, Iowa 52314

Harold Hensel
mhhensel@earthlink.net
Hodina, James

From: Clark, Jeff
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2009 10:49 AM
To: Drahos, Amy; Hodina, James
Cc: Daugherty, Anthony; Hinrichs, Dustin
Subject: RE: County Environmental Ordinances and farms

The Worth County case was an attempt to regulate confinement operations disguised as a health regulation when the iowa legislature had specifically pre-empted local control. My argument (and not a formal opinion at this point) would be that we are expressly permitted by the legislature to have local air quality programs and that OWB are not directly related to any livestock operation.

Jeffrey L. Clark
Assistant Linn County Attorney
(319) 892-6340
Fax: (319) 892-6389
e-mail: jeff.clark@linncounty.org

From: Drahos, Amy
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 9:56 AM
To: Hodina, James; Clark, Jeff
Cc: Daugherty, Anthony; Hinrichs, Dustin
Subject: FW: County Environmental Ordinances and farms

Jim and Jeff,

I received a call from a concerned Linn County farmer regarding the OWB ordinance. He feels that Linn County does not have the legal authority to pass a more restrictive ordinance than what is required by state law. I explained that the 0.6 lbs/MMBtu has been in Linn County’s ordinance for many years but I did not explain that it was a requirement of the SIP. The email below provides a link to a ruling by the Iowa Supreme Court regarding counties passing more restrictive ordinances for farms than what is required by the legislature. Mr. Gibson would be interested in the county attorney’s opinion of this rule. This will likely be brought up for discussion at Tuesday's meeting and I would like to include a short summary on the OWB fact sheet.

Amy

From: adgibson@rockwellcollins.com [mailto:adgibson@rockwellcollins.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 9:20 AM
To: Drahos, Amy
Subject: County Environmental Ordinances and farms

Hi Amy,

Thanks again for talking with me this morning. I appreciated your time.
Here is the link to the Summary Judgement of the Iowa Supreme Court (scroll down to No. 03-0552 WORTH COUNTY FRIENDS OF AGRICULTURE v. WORTH COUNTY).

http://www.iowabar.org/iowasupremecourt.nsf/9a275c73f72409f4862564bb00563305/026b7ea3
OpenDocument

Respectfully,
Andrew
Hodina, James

From: Hinrichs, Dustin
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2009 4:35 PM
To: Hodina, James
Subject: FW: Outdoor wood fired boilers
Importance: High

Dustin A. Hinrichs
Air Pollution Control Specialist & Public Information Officer
Linn County Public Health
(319) 892-6014
www.linnclleanair.org
www.linncounty.org/health

From: Roxy Savage [mailto:retired2005@imonmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2009 4:35 PM
To: Barron, Lu; Langston, Linda; Houser, James; Hinrichs, Dustin; Oleson, Brent; Rogers, Ben; Tony Daugherty
Cc: RJ & Joey Meineke; Shoop, Becky; Becky
Subject: Outdoor wood fired boilers
Importance: High

When considering a redraft of the outdoor wood-fired boiler ordinance, I believe it imperative to incorporate language used by Linda Langston, and I quote:

"It is my understanding that as we move forward we will need to clarify the language that is used, but I believe the intent of the direction to the BOH was to grandfather in all the existing units that have been purchased from reputable distributors and have the properties of 5 acres or less get a support letter from adjacent property owners. Then people would get a permit. There would be a date in the future when the original ordinance would go into effect. There will indeed be likely to be some situations that will need individual attention."

The necessity of grandfathering in those units that currently exist makes the most sense. Future installations would be addressed under the ordinance being proposed.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration and attention in this matter.

Roxy Savage
2765 J St SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 52404
Hodina, James

From: freedomofair@yahoo.com
Sent: Saturday, March 21, 2009 10:19 AM
To: Hodina, James
Subject: [LinnCleanAir.org] New Contact Form Received [3/21/2009]

A new contact form has been received.

First Name: Air
Last Name: Freedom
Email: freedomofair@yahoo.com
Phone: 614-243-3225
Address1: 
Address2: 
City: 
State: Illinois
Zip: 
Questions/Comments: 
Mr. Hodina:

I commend you on your efforts to take on the problem of OWBs in your county. Despite not being the most popular decision you know what you are doing is right. My family and I are also victims of OWBs and I say victims because we were forced from our home in Illinois because of one these, only to find our government would not help us. Please feel free to view my websites at: http://freedomofair.webs.com or www.myspace.com/freedomofair

to see our constant struggle with our situation.

Also please visit http://burningissues.org to learn more about the dangers and health risks of wood smoke. Thank you very much for your time and feel free to email me for additional contact regarding this.
From: Langston, Linda  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 5:02 PM  
To: Dickson, Curtis; Hodina, James  
Subject: FW: Must know FACTS of OWB

FYI

Linda Langston  
Linn County Supervisor  
930 First St. SW  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52403  
(319) 892-5000

From: Kate Ehlts [mailto:katron@iowatelecom.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 3:08 PM  
To: Langston, Linda; Barron, Lu; Oleson, Brent; Rogers, Ben; Houser, James  
Subject: Must know FACTS of OWB

Hi. I am an owner and operator of an outdoor wood boiler (OWB) for 17 years. We purchased another unit last year. There are a number of points I would like to make to clear up any misconceptions.

1) In the last couple of years the U.S. EPA developed a VOLUNTARY program to encourage OWB. Manufacturers on a nationwide basis to reduce emissions from newly mfrd OWBs. EPA involved stakeholders during the meetings and conference calls to develop emission "guidelines", a test method, labels and an implementation time line. Stakeholders included mfrs., the Hearth Patio and Barbecue Assoc. (HPBA), state regulators, NESC/AM, and Environment Canada. The EPA has made it clear that it does NOT intend to adopt mandatory emission limits or other mandatory requirements for OWBs in the foreseeable future. The implementation of the VOLUNTARY program involves Phase 1 and Phase 2. THERE CURRENTLY VERY FEW INSTALLED UNITS THAT CAN MEET PHASE 1 AND EVEN FEWER IF ANY THAT MEET PHASE 2. SO PLEASE BE COGNIZANT OF THIS WHEN WRITING THE ORDINANCE TO GRANDFATHER. OWB Manufacturers are diligently working on reducing emissions but it takes time to re-invent and re-design. Then the units need to be operated under normal operating conditions and the "kinks" worked out so customers are Not stuck with headaches... (like occurred with outdoor corn burners in 2005). Sometimes the companies that jump out first with Phase 1 & 2 certified do NOT necessarily have their best units for the customers. The customers become their test ground. Your patience is needed.

2) Please eliminate the STACK requirements on the proposal. According to a gov't website: No testing has been done to determine how raising the stack height will affect stack emissions. Discussions with combustion experts indicate that a height change will likely affect air flow rates, which could increase overall emissions from the OWBs. The only purpose would be to improve 'dispersion' if there were neighbors within 100 feet. PLEASE DO NOT INCORPORATE STACK HEIGHT IN THE PROPOSAL. PLEASE LEAVE IT UP TO THE INDIVIDUAL CITY GOVT TO DETERMINE POLICIES WITH STACK HEIGHT IN THEIR OWN COMMUNITIES.

3) If you put any restrictions on OWB that will be installed in the future...Please do not use the terminology, "to the property line" or "surrounding neighbors", rather use the terminology from HPBA, "to the nearest dwelling not served by the OWB unit"  Example: Smaller acreage but 2 miles from the nearest neighbor...allows some common sense flexibility.

4) We believe that not "grandfathering" current units as they are currently installed is PREJUDICIAL. Linn County may have emission standards for commercial applications but should not try to move that over to boilers for residential use. A precedent was set by the EPA in the 1990's when they regulated INDOOR wood furnaces, fireplaces, and fireplace inserts. They regulated by stating that ALL INDOOR wood furnaces, fireplaces, or fireplace inserts manufactured after July 1, 1992 had to meet EPA stds and then were considered
"certified". However, all the current units were then "grandfathered". And according to a gov't website, they estimate that over 70% of the indoor units currently in use are UN-CERTIFIED. How many "un-certified" INDOOR wood stoves, fireplaces, fireplace inserts are in use in Linn County? 20,000? 50,000? More?
Do the MATH: # of Un-certified Indoor Wood Furn., Fireplaces TIMES their PM emissions VS. the estimated 175 - 200 Un-Certified OWB TIMES their PM emissions...would shock you...ask the Health Dept. to put together REAL numbers and put this into perspective. And include that one OWB can take the place of 2 - 3 individual indoor burners. Why are you singling out one device (OWB) and restricting even those units already in place? Can you pass this challenge? if you say NO emissions above 6 grams/hr, you have that right but you will impact fireplaces and un-certified indoor wood burning units. If you restrict the current units...then why not restrict INDOOR units...there can be several on one city block. Just because the chimney on an un-certified unit is high does Not mean there are less emissions.

5) Wood is Renewable Fuel. Wood is an abundant resource in this country that is easily sustained.

6) Burning Wood is CARBON NEUTRAL. Burning wood is completely safe in terms of "greenhouse gases" Wood is part of the natural carbon/carbon dioxide cycle. As a tree grows it absorbs carbon dioxide from the air and stores it in the wood as carbon. When the trees dies it releases the carbon dioxide back into the atmosphere. So whether it rots on the timber floor or we burn it, it is released back. Please note: That if instead of burning wood, I burned fossil fuels in my house furnace, and fossil fuels for our shop...then I would have left MANY carbon footprints! Just because you don't see smoke from your gas or oil furnaces, does not mean that you are not polluting. You may have a 95% efficient heating unit, however the efficiency of the non-renewable fuels such as coal, propane, or oil out of the ground and refining and transporting, etc. etc. reduces the overall efficiency of burning.

7) VERY important point. I truly believe that much of the wood that would be burned in an OWB would have been burned in a pile somewhere anyway. We live in 33 acres of timber. We have NEVER cut a live tree to burn. Even though we live in a timber, most of the wood we have burned is from farmers who call to clean out a fence row or scraps from tree trimmers or downed trees due to wind damage. These trees would have been bulldozed in a pile and burned if we had not salvaged it. We gathered, split, stored to season, and then burned the wood to heat our home, our domestic hot water, and our shop. We burn from around Halloween to May...and never burn anything but split, well-seasoned wood. MOST of the OWB owners have the same practices. I know of many elderly people still living in their homes but cannot afford the fuel in their big old house where they raised their families...their children spend a couple of weekends together to cut wood to supply their parents for the winter. How can you take this away from them? They will not be able to meet the unreasonable restrictions. As one OWB stated, "if I had not cleaned up the wood off of the river bottom last year and used it to heat my home...the next high water through the river bottom would have lodged the logs against, if not taken out, the Linn County Bridge below me"!

Conclusion: Please grandfather in without restrictions those units that are already installed. Eliminate Phase 1 or Phase 2 restriction - see #1 above.
Eliminate the distance restriction on 'grandfathered' units. Any distance restrictions on current units would be devastating to many of the OWB owners. There really have been VERY FEW people who have complained. Many complaints from a handful of people.
Eliminate any Stack restrictions as explained above in #2. The same policy as granted to indoor units. Allow the city governments to establish their own ordinances on distance and stack. Stack heights and distances are not typically important in most cases in the rural areas. Stacks do not lessen smoke but just help to disperse if have a really close neighbor.

Be careful of all the pollutor/emission numbers thrown at you. In a position paper dated Dec. 12, 2006, from the Maine Air Toxics Advisory Committee, to the Maine EPA, data was published with a reference to a study conducted by Boissevain, Brown and Callahan regarding an assessment to risk from particulate released from OWBs. This study has been the subject of an independent review by Gradient Corp., an international firm with a reputation of excellence in risk assessment and risk mgmt. In summary, Gradient Corp. found very serious flaws in the study, which resulted in hugely inflated and unreliable conclusions regarding the risks from OWBs. Wood burning units today...barbeque grills and campfires tomorrow...

We as OWB owners, can voluntarily operate our units by using split, well-seasoned wood, keep it covered from ice and snow, do not burn anything other than wood, and burn only wood that has not been painted, treated, etc.
Please use common sense and put this issue in proper perspective. Tailpipe emissions are probably the largest polluter in Linn County. With both Indoor and Outdoor Wood Burners you can educate about good burn practices. EPA has a lot of info. for just that purpose.

Thank you!    Kate Ehlts
Hodina, James

From: hi2ual2003@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 1:22 AM
To: Hodina, James
Subject: [LinnCleanAir.org] New Contact Form Received [3/20/2009]

Public Health
Prevent. Promote. Protect.
Linn County, Iowa

A new contact form has been received.

First Name: alex
Last Name: hatfield
Email: hi2ual2003@yahoo.com
Phone: 319-350-2540
Address1:
Address2:
City: cedar rapids
State: Iowa
Zip: 52403

Questions/Comments:
Please, with this economy, rising fuel prices & need to get away from fossil fuels-- do not stop out door wood burning furnaces. One option would to use the "Best Practices Ordinances" outlined at http://www.outdoorfurnacefacts.com/index.html. This site would have done the Linn CO health dept. well before jumping the gun & calling for a ban on out door furnaces.

Thanks, looking forward to moving to Jones Co,
Alex -hatfield
Mr. Hodina - Air Quality Supervisor,

My name is David McDonald and I work for Central Boiler Inc., manufacturers of Central Boiler outdoor furnaces. We are located in Greenbush, MN. Here is a link to the Central Boiler website: www.centralboiler.com. Central Boiler has been manufacturing outdoor wood furnaces since 1984. This information is in follow-up to additional information on the outdoor wood furnace industry.

The US EPA conducted tests of two outdoor wood furnaces that was published in EPA report 600/SR-98/017 in 1998. EPA report 600/SR-98/017 states that, "Compared to a wide range of residential heating options, these furnaces’ emissions were of the same order as other stick wood burning appliances." The US EPA bases their finding on a test done on a Central Boiler outdoor furnace, which is furnace B in their report. Comparing EPA report 600/SR-98/017 to EPA report 600/SR-00/100 shows that particulate emissions from a properly operated outdoor wood furnace are similar to indoor wood stoves. This entire test can be reviewed at http://www.outdoorfurnacefacts.com/wood-corn-heating-facts/emissions-reports/.

The outdoor wood furnace industry is exempt from 60 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 40; Subpart AAA, which apply to the indoor wood stove industry. The NSPS (New Source Performance Standards) was developed for an entirely different class of wood burning appliances (indoor wood stoves), and imposed limits were rigorously derived from demonstrated emission control technologies for that class of appliance.

The Outdoor Furnace Manufacturer's Caucus began working on an ASTM standard for testing emissions and efficiency of our appliances in 2004. The standard passed in 2008: http://www.astm.org/Standards/E2618.htm. Manufacturers, test labs, state air regulators, USEPA and other interested parties participated in this process. ASTM E2618-08 has been incorporated into the EPA HH Phase 2 Program.

On January 29, 2007, the US EPA announced an emission reduction program for the outdoor wood furnace industry. This is the first program that has been developed and made available for this class of wood burning appliance. The EPA OWHH (Outdoor Wood-fired Hydronic Heater) Phase 1 Program includes a test method (Test Method 28 OWHH) and an emissions limit that must be met in order to participate in the program. The Phase 1 emission limit is 0.60 lbs/million Btu heat input. The Outdoor Wood-fired Hydronic Heaters that meet the program requirements will be referred to as "Program Compliant" and they will receive a permanent label "qualifying label" and "hang tag". The "hang tag" for Phase 1 appliances is orange.
On October 23, 2008, the US EPA announced the EPA HH (Hydronic Heater) Phase 2 Program which includes Test Method 28 OW/HH and ASTM E2618-08 an emissions limit that must be met in order to participate in the program. The Phase 2 emission limit is 0.32 lbs/million Btu heat output. Hydronic Heaters that meet the program requirements will be referred to as "Program Compliant" and they will receive a permanent label "qualifying label" and "hang tag". The "hang tag" for Phase 2 appliances is white. There is a slight name change between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Programs because "continuous feed" models or automatically fueled (pellet appliances) are allowed into the program. This program also would allow for testing and qualifying "indoor" wood furnaces as well. In order to meet an output based emission limit the appliance must be very clean and extremely efficient. Very few indoor EPA certified woodstoves would be able to meet the Phase 2 output based emission limit.

I understand that Linn County officials may be relying on information from NESCAUM regarding the industry. Please review our response to the NESCAUM report which is attached.

Two very important issues should be considered when looking at outdoor wood furnaces.

1.) SAFETY: In 1983/1984 when home heating costs rose dramatically, home fires caused by indoor wood stoves also rose dramatically because of the increased use of wood to help supplement home heating. By taking away the safe choice of an outdoor wood furnace, indoor wood burning would again increase the risk of home fires that could result in millions of dollars of property loss. Outdoor wood furnaces remove the threat of devastating chimney fires and the dangerous carbon monoxide buildup or oxygen depletion associated with burning wood indoors. There is a reason that insurance companies have a "rider" policy for indoor wood burning. Over the period from 1980-1998, indoor wood burning was responsible for 1,541,800 fires; $1.024 billion dollars in property loss; and 3,275 deaths (The (NFPA) National Fire Protection Association Fire Analysis and Research, U.S. Home heating Fire Patterns, June 2001).

2.) EMISSIONS: Burning wood has environmental advantages over fossil fuels because heating with wood is "carbon neutral". Wood is a renewable energy source, which, when burned results in no net CO2 increase. CO2 is part of the natural plant-growth cycle and occurs naturally when trees are allowed to rot on the forest floor. Fossil Fuels, when burned, release CO2 which otherwise would stay trapped in the earth. Wood, when burned produces less sulphur dioxide (SO2) and nitrous oxides (NOX) than fossil fuels - EPA emission document AP-42.

For thousands of people, outdoor wood furnaces provide a cost-effective means of home heating versus the high cost and price fluctuation of fossil fuels (oil and gas). Using wood as a heat source reduces our dependency on foreign energy sources. When sited and operated properly, outdoor wood furnaces provide a safe and cost effective means of providing home heating.

Please call or email me if you have any questions or concerns. I will follow up with additional information. My office hours are 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM CST, Monday through Friday.

Respectfully submitted,

David McDonald
Environmental Relations
Central Boiler, Inc.
20502 150th Street
Greenbush, MN 56726
(218) 782-2575 ext. 287
fax: (218) 782-2580
davidm@centralfireplace.com
Hodina, James

From: Langston, Linda
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2009 5:52 PM
To: Hodina, James
Subject: FW: Outdoor Wood Boilers

Linda Langston
Linn County Supervisor
930 First St. SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 52403
(319) 892-5000

From: BRYAN BARB CONNER [mailto:brbcnr@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 22, 2009 8:02 AM
To: Board Internet Address
Subject: Outdoor Wood Boilers

To supervisors,

In the discussion of Outdoor Wood Boilers, I have not heard any mention of the same issues caused by fireplaces and indoor wood stoves. Why not? There are houses in my neighborhood with fireplaces and wood stoves that fill the air with smoke. How can you single out a small portion of this type of pollution?

Bryan Conner
352 Sussex DR NE
Cedar Rapids