

Why did our last set of questions not get addressed?

These questions relate to request by the California Air Standard Board in regard to Assembly Bill 2276. Commentary on your Web sight has already been slanderous, detrimental and unfounded. It is understood that it is Prozone's right to ask legitimate questions to the board without further legal and biased impact and will be answered by legally responsible staff and be available to us and the courts. We are submitting these questions as defined by you.

Question #1 Recently we have evaluated and seen several air purification and sanitation systems that emit toxic chemicals and that include:

Chlorine dioxide

NOX

NO

NO₂

N₂O

N₂O₂

Nitrous Compounds

Hydrochloric Acid

Carbon Monoxide

Formaldehyde

Chloroforms

Carbon Tetra Chloride

Sodium Chloride

Potassium Chloride

Sodium Hypochlorite

Aldehydes

Aromatic Chemicals such as Vicks

Other keytones

These are all byproducts of other than our air purification systems and have all shown to function at toxic levels. UV ozone generators do not produce these byproducts as corona units do. How do you separate or discriminate between them?

Question#2 There is a new production of devices that use some of the above toxic chemical as air purifiers and these devices are a direct response to getting around your limitations on ozone air purification and sanitation systems and do not fall under the current guidelines of your present standards.

With each of these units emitting such by products at toxic levels how and why were these units authorized to be sold in California?

Question #3 Why is the production of air ducting ozone systems allowed and why do they not fall under the current guidelines of your present standard?

Question #4 If there is to be a limitation on the air quality devices, then control must be an "across the board evaluation" which should include consideration of all of the above

listed byproducts. If you are going to limit air quality devices why have you not established an across the board evaluation process which should include a list of all of the above mentioned by-products?

Question #5 Pure UV Ozone emitting devices are non-toxic and the irritants that can possibly be produced by such a machine have reversible biological symptoms that can be reverse within 24 hours of exposure unlike the above toxic components.

Why would you choose not to allow ozone emitting devices that are non-toxic and the irritants that can be produced by these machines have reversible biological symptoms that usually are reversed with in 24 hours of exposure unlike the above toxic components?

Question #6 The byproducts of a corona ozone generator system are NOX and are accumulative and have a toxic biological effect. Why would you allow a machine that gives off NOX which is accumulative and can have a toxic biological effect?

Question #7 Who is authorized to test independently within California for noncompliance and what is the formal controlled procedures and who pays for these services?

Question #8 Who was authorized to publish non-controlled testing of tested and ETL approved Prozone Products which were done in a non-controlled environment with detrimental negative comments and marketing impact having been portrayed on your web site as a violating product?

Question #9 In order to comply to your standards, all units must be marked "must be only used in an indoor environment" or unit must be able to be reduce Ambient California ozone from .09 ppm to .05 ppm? Label stating "for Indoor Use Only in California"?

Question #10 Why must California labeling with associated compliance costs be used on all products sold elsewhere?

Question #11 If price of conformity is required on all products sold elsewhere, all products should have an estimated cost of California conformity (\$15.00 plus markup=\$30.00) printed on all packaging? This is hardly "negligible for a product that costs \$99.00.

Question # 12 How are you going to enforce noncompliant Chinese duplicators of product from copying certification numbers and prevent bogus sales against U.S. manufactures and what is the U.S. manufactures recourse provided by California?

Question #13 How do you dictate non legislative values to nongovernmental agencies, over which you have no jurisdiction, with non verifiable data on pure ozone(atmospheric ozone)extracted from "ground level" ozone studies?

Question #14 In further consideration it should be noted that California some years ago had proposed legislation to ban the use of chlorine sanitation in all swimming pools because of the emissions of chloroform gas. This is a toxic gas that remains in the smog, has been highly documented. Just another example of this disproportionate considered legislation. Shouldn't toxic gases be eliminated before irritating gases?

Question #15 Why do you not allow Ozone producing devices to be used when there are no humans to be in occupied spaces until the unit has reduced the ozone below acceptable levels? Why not allow devices that generate and annihilate ozone in a cyclic manor when there are no occupants?

Question #16 This Legislation is based on irrational political hysteria. Shouldn't it be based sound impartial scientific studies not linked to EPA smog air quality standards?