

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	20-RENEW-01
Project Title:	School Energy Efficiency Stimulus Program
TN #:	237585
Document Title:	Corinne Vita Comments - Schools ask if AB 841 covers cost of Bi-Polar Ionization
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Corinne Vita
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	4/28/2021 3:31:05 PM
Docketed Date:	4/28/2021

Comment Received From: Corinne Vita
Submitted On: 4/28/2021
Docket Number: 20-RENEW-01

Schools ask if AB 841 covers cost of Bi-Polar Ionization

I read many Questions from the Jan 2021 CEC workshop on AB 841 from schools that asked if AB 841 money can be used to pay for bi-polar ionization system. These systems are not supported by science. The science community has published many articles stating bi-polar ionization is not independently proven to reduce Covid risk. Here is article: <https://medium.com/open-letter-to-address-the-use-of-electronic-air/no-to-ionizers-plasma-uvpco-bc1570b2fb9b>

Sacramento Schools purchased some shiny equipment for Covid and realized it did not work and may harm their students, <https://www.sacbee.com/news/equity-lab/article248965569.html>

Kern Schools stated in a meeting with California schools that they put in bi-polar ionization to prevent Covid.

Unfortunately, there is no independent proof these shiny systems do anything to improve indoor air quality. It is something schools are doing as a placebo to show parents, teachers, students they did something.

Can AB 841 provide leadership to schools to spend scarce money on proven ways to improve healthy air by improving ventilation, increase outside airflow, improve HVAC filters, and maintain temperature and humidity?

This doesn't have slick marketing videos but is the proven approach to Healthy Air for schools and buildings supported unanimously by all experts. Thanks