

Dragon, Karen E. (CDC/NIOSH/EID)

From: dauphin_65@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 9:07 AM
To: NIOSH Docket Office (CDC)
Cc: Chen, Jihong (Jane) (CDC/NIOSH/EID) (CTR)
Subject: 221 - NIOSH Regulatory Agenda for updating 42 CFR Part 84 Comments

Name
A .J

Organization
PSI Tech / hydrostatique test tech

Email
dauphin_65@hotmail.com

Address
401 . 14th street
Val d or, Qc J9p 5k7
Canada

Comments

i do alot of inspection on all kind of cylinder.
luxfer , catalina , isi , csi , pst drager etc.....

i find that out of the way to not accept other cylinder
42 CFR Part 84 should be modified ,if this is not modified NIOSH provides approvals for
"entire SCBA ensembles only"

MSA , SCOTT etc..that have cylinder made by LUXFER for them .
should do there own cylinder and not by Luxfer .
this is not right for other Manufacture like ISI CSI etc...
They do Cylinder that are safe !

i think that it is (discrimenary)excuse my english .
To other manufacture that do good cylinder that are safe .
Yes keep the first cylinder the same as manufacture APRIA but the second cylinder if it is
safe and the good valve on it whit the right degre for the apria and it is safe Why not ?

whit the NIOSH 42 CRF Part 84 that will cost alot of money to all the small munucipality that
have almost no budget and the GOUV why spen all that money when it can be USE for other
priority!

to save live and the well being of all .
let s be a little more humain.

Yes every apria as to be safe !
But a cylinder is a cylinder when it past whit the DOT it is safe ! get the good vale on it
that is all.