

**August 25, 2010 Comments on the EPA CASAC Particulate Matter Review Panel Draft Letter on
Policy Assessment for the Review of Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard—
Second External Review Draft (June 2010)**

**Bob Engel
Engel & Gray**

<http://www.engelandgray.com>
BOB@engelandgray.com

Bob Engel. I'm with Engel & Gray. I'm a small business person. Run a trucking company in a regional composting facility.

Large document so it's a lot to go through. My main comment is with the policy assessment that does not include secondary health effects. As being a small business person, I think the secondary public health effects are probably the crutch of the argument. I really would like you gentlemen to consider and go over because this means to so many people.

Some of the general questions I've come up with is, why does the study not include all of the evidence. In looking through the exhibits, some of the studies were dropped from, it seems that were dropped from the study that you based your letter on and then why have some of the studies been deleted and or omitted. I wanted to know the reason why they were omitted and it doesn't seem that the study addresses the geographical differences across the United States. And that seems that it's pretty crucial when you are developing a letter that other, other regulations are going to be tied to when they are not addressing the specific geographical regions. Thank you very much for your time.