

James Chavez

From: JStenstrom [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 2:46 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote No

Sent from my iPhone

Please vote no on bills 1111 and 1121! Please don't force me to purchase electric heaters and water heaters.

Thank You

James Stenstrom

James Chavez

From: Janice Steele [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:35 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RULES 1111 and 1121

Please note that we are adamantly opposed to Rules 1111 and 1121. They will increase the burden of changing from gas furnace and water heating to electric without significant environmental change. Our electric bill is already inflated. They will NOT improve our quality of life!

Jan Steele
Newport Beach 92662

James Chavez

From: Jeanie [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:17 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose rules 1111 and 1121

I am writing to you to formally oppose thr proposed Rules 1111 and 1121!

These rules would increase our electric bills and increase the strain on our already overtaxed electrical grid. There would be no benefit to our environment, as natural gas fuel is one of the cleanest souces of energy.

I oppose Rules 1111 and 1121!

Jeanie Berger
Laguna Woods, CA

James Chavez

From: Jeff 431 [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 11:31 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Please do not implement new rules 1111 and 1121.

After the devastating fires in LA, that dumped billions of tons of pollution into the air, land and ocean (fires the California government is responsible for), you expect us to pay to transition from more affordable natural gas to electric? Seriously?

Just don't!

James Chavez

From: Jennie Austin [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:53 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Against New Air Quality Mandate!

Dear Sirs,

I am against the New Air Quality Mandate that contains two rules 111 and 1121. It's unacceptable to require homeowners and others to convert their furnaces and water heaters to electricity. Do NOT go there!!

Jennie Austin

Huntington Beach, CA

James Chavez

From: Jennifer Welsh Zeiter [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 6:11 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on Proposed Rules 1111 and 1121

Absolutely oppose both of these rules as being not only infective on our air quality (negligible if any benefit at all), but also incredibly harmful and cost prohibitive to most families struggling to make ends meet amid the high cost of living in this state. Stop fleecing the citizens of this state.

VOTE NO!!

JZ

Jennifer Welsh Zeiter
Law Offices of Jennifer W. Zeiter

[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: John Kraus [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 1:35 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

These rules will do nothing but hurt the California population. The expense to replace gas with electricity is absurd.

We don't have the electrical grid to accommodate all the new electrical requirements for these two new rules.

Thank you,

John Kraus

James Chavez

From: John Meindl [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 4:57 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rule 1111 and Rule1121

Gentlemen. As a homeowner for more than 50 years in California I oppose the approval of Rule 1111 an Rule 1121.

John Meindl
[REDACTED]
Newport Beach, CA 92660

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121 Under Consideration

I understand you are involved in the consideration of proposed rules 1111 and 1121 which would eliminate the use of gas stoves and furnaces in an attempt to improve air quality. There are several reasons this is not a realistic solution and should not even be considered or money spent promoting it. It is very costly for all required to implement this on their properties. It will further strain our already overburdened electrical grid and for little evidence that these changes improve air quality. Please consider any move in this direction very carefully. Thank you.

Joyce Norris
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: KAREN HINTON [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 1:20 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to Rules 1111 & 1121

To Whom It May Concern,

I am vehemently opposed to these two rules being enacted. There is no proof these measures will do any substantive to improve air quality. We are already saddled with huge taxes, fees, penalties here in California. Do not add these nuisance rulings which will increase the hardship of living in this state. Unless that is your goal?

Karen Hinton

James Chavez

From: Kathy Sporcic [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:54 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Kathy Sporcic. I have resided in Orange County since 1980 and have owned a home in Huntington Beach since 1990. I oppose the two rules (1111 and 1121) mentioned above since these proposed rules have not shown that they will make any substantive improvement. I am in full agreement with CA Assembly woman Diane Dixon that we should look for improvements and incentives instead of bans and mandates.

If you have any questions or need additional information, you may reply to this email.

Sincerely,
Kathy S. Sporcic

James Chavez

From: Kathy Ursini [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 1:19 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

To South Coast Air Quality Management District Board,

I am a resident of Newport Beach. I am writing to oppose Rules 1111 and 1121.

Water heaters and furnaces are not luxury items, they are essential. Californians are facing a housing shortage and housing affordability crisis. Now is not the time for more mandates that will increase costs to homeowners, landlords and ultimately tenants. Furthermore, these rules have not even shown that they will make any substantive improvements to air quality.

California already ranks 50th in energy costs. We pay 92% higher costs than the national average. The last thing we need is more demand on our electric infrastructure. Stop with the mandates! You've punished us enough.

--

Thank you,
Kathy Ursini

James Chavez

From: Keith Wetmore [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 12:21 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Don't force electric water heaters!

Please pass my sentiments to the Board.

The proposal to compel a shift to electric water heaters in the ultimate luxury belief. First, we should have a right to choose. Second, for the foreseeable future, California will be buying peak electric energy from neighboring states using coal. Third, and most important, electric water heating is more expensive, making California even less affordable.

I am sure you think that every small step towards carbon zero helps; how about every small step away from middle-class affordability hurts?

Keith Wetmore
[REDACTED]
Newport Beach.
Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Ken & Carmen Rawson [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 7:00 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I am a owner/resident of housing in California and I am opposed to both rules 1111 and 1121. These rules will force me to remodel by home at great cost causing a hardship to my family.

Please cease any action on these two rules.

Ken Rawson

James Chavez

From: Lori Vu [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 5:13 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I oppose these rules 1111 and 1121! As a home owner it is my choice of what kind of stove I like to cook on! This is communism at its best for you to force homeowners to have to replace our preexisting stoves that are gas to electric. California can barely handle the electrical grid as it is! No on 1111 and 1121!

- Lan Mai Thi Vu

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Larry Swanson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:29 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Future Electric Furnaces and Heaters

Dear AQMD Clerk of Board,

I'm opposed to Rules 1111 and 1121 that mandate changes from gas to electric furnaces and water heaters in the near future. As a native Californian and retired engineer in the power sector, these changes will not have a significant impact on CA air quality and will drive high electric power costs upward to unaffordable levels.

Power has to be generated somewhere, often out of state using conventional power plants. Wind and solar power, although needed, aren't close to sufficient for this state. The CA power duck curve already stresses CA power availability, restricting power use (i.e., the 4 - 9pm mandate). Demanding more electrical power from the grid will expand restrictions on power use, further stress an archaic and dangerous grid, and likely cause unscheduled brownouts, blackouts, and more of those infamous spark-induced mega-fires.

We need to look at CA power challenges realistically, not through a very restricted idealistic lens. The policies driven by the false CO2 climate-change narrative, such as electrifying everything, are extremely naive and have helped bankrupt the state. I've studied CO2 impacts on the climate in great detail over the years - my Ph.D focus at UCLA was heat transfer.

I apologize for the diatribe, but hope it will help influence the path forward the AQMD takes on these and future electrification rules. Respectfully, LWS

Larry W. Swanson, Ph.D.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Larry W. Swanson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Linda Magginetti [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 9:27 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] My opinion as a tax payer

Please consider my opinion:

I am totally against the following bills

1111 and 1121

These are both unreasonable, and will likely have a very minimal impact on the environment but a LARGE impact on the citizens and residents of this state.

My daughter depends on regulated temperatures and if we only have electricity on an already taxed power grid this puts her health at risk.

Please reconsider this decision
Linda

Linda Deogny

[REDACTED]

Have a Blessed Day!

James Chavez

From: Lisa Dickstein [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 6:42 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I oppose rules 1111 and 1121

Do not pass these new rules for furnaces. More ridiculous things from the state of CA.

Please excuse any typos.

Lisa Dickstein

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 9:40 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NEW PROPOSED RULES 1111 & 1121

We, financially strained residents, hope to convince you to please consider withdrawing your proposed new rules 1111 and 1121.

These rules truly may improve air quality; but the costs to homeowners (and others affected) will be quite enormous.

In addition, the air quality improvement it is intended to bring may not be that impactful and significant.

Having and implementing these rules may not really show a dramatic improvement in air quality; and therefore, it is not worth the costs to us financially struggling homeowners and businesses and others.

Having these rules will be quite expensive to already struggling homeowners and businesses.

There probably are other better and more cost-effective ways to improve our air quality.

We hope you understand where we are coming from.

Thank you and sincerely,
Lydia Radke

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: hydrangeas4ailurophile [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:54 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1111 and 1121

Please reject proposed rules 1111 and 1121 as removing gas furnaces and water heaters from homes makes no notable impact on air quality. Switching to electric furnaces and water heaters is expensive and puts more load on the electric grid. These rules are not justified or wanted. Let's keep natural gas appliances.

Thank you,

Marianne K.

Sent from [Proton Mail](#) for iOS

James Chavez

From: Roger Davisson [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 11:34 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear AQMD Board,

We strongly oppose the adoption of

Rules 1111 and 1121. Our electric bills are already too high, and these rules will make them even higher. Furthermore, these mandates would have at most an infinitesimal effect on global warming. It's highly unfair to force these kinds of costly rules on Californians who already have the highest energy costs in the nation!

Please do not adopt these costly and impractical rules.

Respectfully,

Marji and Roger Davisson

James Chavez

From: Cox [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:22 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Margie von KleinSmid
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rule 1111 & 1121

Do not pass Rule 1111 & 1121 to go into effect!! It's a terrible idea to eliminate Natural Gas and force people to build with electric!!

Natural Gas is plentiful and reasonable. We should have a balance of both! One is not good for everything.

You can't store electricity very easily or at a reasonable cost. Batteries are not a great idea. Very expensive and poisonous to dispose of.

Natural gas is neither of those.

Electricity is clean power for our houses and the environment!

DO NOT pass these TERRIBLE bills.

Marjorie von KleinSmid

[REDACTED]
Orange County voter
Corona Del Mar, CA. 92625

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Oni Mod [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 7:07 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to changes in rules 1111 and 1121

I am opposed to the proposed changes to rules 1111 and 1121. Implementing the proposed requirement that existing homes switch from natural gas-powered to electricity-powered water heaters and furnaces is just too expensive. The rewiring costs alone would be many thousands of dollars.

- Mark Fowler
- Huntington Beach

James Chavez

From: Michael Davison [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 6:41 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Just NO!!! These rules are really dumb and increase the utility costs for Californians. **This sounds like the electric utility lobbyists hard at work spreading bad information.**

- Natural gas is far cheaper than electricity.
- Natural gas appliances and heating has a long safety history with electrical fires much more common.
- Our electrical grid is already stressed and becoming more unreliable, especially during high winds.
- The majority of our electricity is produced by natural gas anyway, so it is not zero emission.
 - **Generating electricity with natural gas is very inefficient. Generating heat using natural gas directly is far more efficient and therefore, creates less pollution.**

I am all for reducing our dependence on fossil fuels, but it needs to be done in coordination with other things. Converting now will cause more harm than good. **Do your homework.**

These must happen first:

- Our electric grid needs to be improved first.
 - Safer, more reliable grid. It already causes nearly all brush fires and many building fires.
 - Distributed battery and hydrogen energy storage to reduce the need for high-voltage lines in remote areas.
 - Distributed small atomic energy power plants to add local power to the grid when needed.
- More reliance on green energy sources and atomic power
 - Greatly reduced reliance on natural gas fired power plants. It makes no sense to reduce local usage of natural gas only to replace it with energy generated by natural gas.
- Cheaper electricity
 - Reduce reliance on out-of-state generated power
 - Find ways to drop the costs to compete with natural gas for heating applications.

Michael Davison
Lake Forest, CA

James Chavez

From: Michelle Larsson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 9:56 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New proposals #1111 and #1121

AQMD: You must be completely out of contact with reality thinking that California Electrical Grid has more capacity for energy. Please don't be surprised if your jobs get eliminated soon.

Get off your high horses & step into reality where most voters, residents & taxpayers live.

Don't be stupid!

James Chavez

From: Michelle Marciniac [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 8:43 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1111 & 1121

Dear AQMD,

Electric furnaces and water heaters should not be mandated for California homeowners.

Consumers should be able to choose electric or gas if they wish.

If your concern is the environment, natural gas is an excellent choice. It's clean burning and emits the lowest amount of CO2 of any fossil fuel source. Forcing consumers to buy electric will drive up the already extremely high electricity rates we pay, and cause customers to lose heat and hot water when electricity usage is high.

Eliminating choice and freedom in California for dubious reasons is not your prerogative.

Yours,

Michelle M Marciniac
Huntington Beach, California

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Michelle Tovey [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:59 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Air quality control

Stop increasing our costs!!!

James Chavez

From: Mike H [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:39 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric appliances

I am not in favor! Mandates are not necessary. Let common sense prevail in our state.

James Chavez

From: Mike Tocydlowski <michaeltochy@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 2:35 PM
To: COB
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns About Rule 1111 & 1121

Hello,

I am writing this email today to express extreme concern regarding rule 1111 & 1121. This will have far reaching impacts for communities that are already suffering financially. Real estate developers are screwing renters over and this will be another reason for them to do so. If these Rules pass, legal action will need to take place.

Best regards,
Concerned, impacted resident

James Chavez

From: Miles Safa <miles2010g@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:57 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Air Quality

I am in opposition to rules 1111 and 1121.

Miles Safa
Aliso Viejo, CA

James Chavez

From: Millicent Rhoades [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:36 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Switching to electric water heater and furnace. Not at this time. Too expensive.

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: mimi d newport [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 6:56 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to rules 1111 and 1121

I STRONGLY AM OPPOSED TO THESE TWO NEW RULES WHICH WILL ONLY CAUSE MORE EXPENSES FOR HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS ALIKE. IT DOES NOT HELP CLIMATE CHANGE. PLEASE LISTEN TO YOUR CITIZENS !

James Chavez

From: Nancy Kerr [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 4:22 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Hello, I would like to voice my opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121. Phasing out gas appliances is expensive and has not been proven as a reliable way to improve air quality. The US has a lot of natural gas resources, making use of them until such time as we have more affordable options which are proven to help air quality makes the most sense. Thank you, Nancy Kerr

James Chavez

From: Nick Ralston [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:19 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 & 1121

Absolute NONSENSE! WE can barley afford our electric bill and have been running only 2 small plug in heaters! Thank God for my tankless water heater which only uses electric to start, My house had two outages of nearly 30 hours during these last fires! Electric power is NOT a solution to reducing carbon emissions. It can barley support our current County's needs! Spending more money for a stupid proposal is NOT what California needs. I DO NOT SUPPORT EITHER OF THESE ABSOLUTELY STUPID RulesNick Ralston

[REDACTED] Laguna Beach

James Chavez

From: Pat Mahoney [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 9:21 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Rules 1111 & 1121 -

Dear SCAQMD - please do not pass these proposed rules. Natural gas is still a viable energy source. Do not overload the electrical power grid.

Or better yet, put it on a ballot, and let us vote on it.

Thank you, I'm sure common sense will prevail.

Pat

--

*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: * This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender by return email and delete this email and any attachments from your system.

James Chavez

From: Pilar Hernandez [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 6:32 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote NO

I Maria Del Pilar Kantounias Vote NO on 1111 & NO on 1121

Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Prem Kumar [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 11:19 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

It is very important that this message is conveyed to your Board. We are homeowners in Huntington Beach and vehemently oppose proposed Rules 1111 and 1121. Please stop adding more regulations! It is so expensive to own and maintain a home already.

James Chavez

From: Rand Tanner [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 12:38 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Diane Dixon
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121.

To the Board, Our family wants cheaper utilities and better air quality. We are on a fixed income. Is California really the highest state in energy cost? Why are we mandating we must purchase new water heaters, furnaces and other appliances that are electrical and do not require natural gas? Why not look at the PUD's and their cost of doing business? I pay SoCal Gas for their "infrastructure" but pay a much cheaper price for gas through XOOM. So the approach you suggest is to do away with gas, further putting more strain on our electric grid. Or of course we could always go back to coal and wood burning as another source of heat. I apologize for being facetious but certainly mandating a change of this significance with the short lead time suggested (two years) is not the right approach. How about explaining your proposed solution in common sense language to a problem that has not been fully articulated?

Respectfully, Rand E. Tanner CDR USN RET
[REDACTED]. Laguna Hills,, CA 92653.
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Rick Ingram [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:58 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I am STRONGLY opposed to AQMD rules 1111 and 1121. Natural gas furnaces and waterheaters are safe, efficient, and reasonably priced. Natural gas as a fuel source for these two heating purposes is more energy efficient than electricity.

Natural gas is used to produce the majority of electricity used in California. The use of Natural gas to replace older, coal and oil burning power plants has been the single greatest contributor to California's reduced carbon emissions.

There is no good reason to impose these highly expensive and disruptive all-electric water heaters and furnaces upon the citizens of California.

I urge you to NOT approve either of these two insane rules.

Sincerely,

Rick Ingram
Huntington Beach, CA
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Rima Nashashibi [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:20 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121.

Dear Clerk of the board,

This email is to register my opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121. Thank you

Sincerely,
Rima Nashashibi

James Chavez

From: Robert Gray [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I am opposed to these proposed rules. I greatly prefer my gas hot water heater and furnace. I cannot afford to replace those items nor the cost to provide hot water and heat using electricity. I moved here from another state with much cheaper electric rates. I also had an electric hot water heater and furnace there. They were not efficient. I can barely afford to live in this state now. These rules would force me over the edge and I would have to move out of state.

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: ROSS MAINWARING [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Against Rules 1111 and 1121

I am retired and living on social security. My house is almost paid off.
My Furnace and Water Heater are both less than 5 years old.
I cannot afford to replace both of these items.
If these rules pass, I will have to sell my house and leave California for a friendly state.
It's too bad, since I was born here, and have raised my family here.

I do not believe that these rules will help the quality of the climate or air in the world at all!
You are punishing us for nothing in return.
Regards,
RLMAIN

James Chavez

From: Russell Neal [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 12:41 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Please vote No on proposed rules 1111 and 1121. Thank you.
Russ Neal
Huntington Beach

James Chavez

From: S. [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:55 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RULES 1111 and 1112

I oppose these proposed MANDATES as they will further strain our grids and will do nothing for air quality.

Stella Henry
Newport Beach Ca

James Chavez

From: Mark and Sharon Simmons [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 9:25 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121.

To Whom It May Concern:

We are completely opposed to Rules 1111 and 1121. It does not make sense to change water heaters from gas to electric! Our current infrastructure cannot handle charging cars and air conditioner usage during the summer...now the government wants electric water heaters?!?! Also, it is so wasteful to discard water heaters that have been working efficiently and cost effectively for many decades.

With inflation, insurance rate increases, and senior citizens being on a fixed income, it is not financially feasible and unaffordable to everyone that we know!

Also, most importantly, property owners should be allowed to *choose* whether they want to use electric or gas water heaters.

Sincerely,
Sharon Simmons

-Sent from Sharon's iPhone

James Chavez

From: s g [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 6:49 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on 1111 and 1121

I am a registered voter of Orange County California and do not support the proposal to convert all furnaces and water tanks to electric per Rule 1111 and 1121

Thanks Sheila
Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Shirley Ritsch [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 12:58 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 & 1121

I strongly oppose rules 1111 & 1121, we do not need more drain on our electrical grid. California keeps passing things to require using more electricity but changes are not being made to supply the electricity we need. Every summer there are rolling blackouts because we are not supplying the electricity we already need. Before more rules requiring increased electricity are passed California needs to build infrastructure to supply that electricity. Please use some common sense.

Thank You,
Shirley Ritsch

James Chavez

From: Stanford Rosenblatt [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:57 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Assemblymember.Dixon@outreach.assembly.ca.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Sirs:

As a resident and tax payer in South Orange County, CA. I would like to register my firm and unshakable opposition to both of these rules that seek to impose mandates in So. California to convert residential natural gas heating of private homes and residential hot water to electric furnaces and water heaters.

The California legislature needs to get its facts straight. When you include the indirect use of energy by commercial and industrial sectors, the amount of greenhouse gasses produced eclipses the combined residential use in California. Once again seriously flawed statistics are being used to beat up the very people who generate the tax base in California and pay the salaries of the California legislature.

Somebody needs to THINK AND STUDY PROBLEMS COMPLETELY AND THOROUGHLY BEFORE SETTING CALIFORNIA ON A COURSE FOR FINANCIAL DISASTER WITH A FIX THAT IS NO FIX AT ALL!

Please come back when you have a REAL solution that actually serves the citizens of California rather than the political aspirations of the Left!

Stan Rosenblatt
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Stephanie Rubio [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Clerk of AQMD:

I oppose rules 1111 and 1121. Replacing natural gas fired furnaces and water heaters will not reduce CO2 emissions as is hoped. The full lifecycle of appliance manufacturing means we will need to first dispose of millions of these appliances and then manufacture their replacements and then ship them across the Pacific (since the majority are manufactured in Asia) with smoke belching cargo ships. The manufacturing emission controls in Asia are not as strict as in the USA, thereby we will be polluting greatly to manufacture these “clean” appliances. The electric for these appliances will mostly be from natural gas fired power plants. Those supplied by solar and wind are also polluting via the manufacture of these sun and wind collectors that are mostly manufactured in China, the high emissions country. Think of all of the millions of disposed appliances, many of them new! What a waste of energy. In addition, the supply chain will not support the replacement of all of these appliances. The prices will skyrocket and the wait times will be years. Remember the one year wait times during COVID for simple routine purchases? This mandated replacement will be many times worse than that.

I appreciate the desire to reduce emissions, but this is not the solution.

I would recommend focusing on wasteful uses of energy instead. How about all the electricity wasted on automated faucets, paper towels, bill boards, electronic gaming, automation of appliances and toys, excessive lighting, etc. There are so many ways to reduce wasted electricity consumption which in turn will reduce power plant usage and waste, including need for more environmentally damaging solar panels and wind mills. Focus on the full cycle of energy supply, not just the end use. A no emissions tail pipe on a car or a furnace does not mean that the car or appliance produces no emissions. It means it does not produce emissions at the site; but their manufacture, transport, and disposal often produce much more waste and emissions than just simply burning the already available natural gas which is transported through established pipeline systems and extraction practices.

Please do what is good for Callifornia and do not go forward with these two egregiously damaging rules. California cannot take another financial hit like this for a program that will not reduce air pollution but will ruin many lives instead.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Rubio
Huntington Beach, Ca
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Steven Mink [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 6:35 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to SCAQMD Rules 1111 & 1121

Dear SCAQMD Board Members,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed amendments to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rules 1111 and 1121, which impose stringent NOx emission limits on residential and commercial natural gas-fired appliances. While I fully support efforts to improve air quality and reduce emissions, these regulations present significant economic and practical challenges that outweigh their intended benefits.

Concerns Regarding Rules 1111 & 1121

1. **Technological and Economic Feasibility** – The ultra-low NOx technology required to comply with these rules is still in the early stages of widespread adoption. Manufacturers and HVAC contractors face supply chain limitations, increased production costs, and installation challenges. The additional costs associated with compliant equipment will disproportionately impact homeowners, landlords, and small businesses.
2. **Impact on Consumers and Businesses** – Compliance with these regulations will significantly increase the cost of new furnaces and water heaters, making replacements unaffordable for many consumers. Furthermore, installation complexities and potential performance issues may result in unintended consequences, such as increased energy use due to reduced efficiency in real-world conditions.
3. **Market Disruptions and Economic Hardships** – The enforcement of these stringent emission standards may result in limited product availability, leading to market disruptions that negatively affect contractors, distributors, and consumers. Many existing units in homes and commercial spaces may be forced into premature replacement, further exacerbating financial burdens on working-class families.
4. **Alternative Approaches** – Rather than imposing rigid mandates, SCAQMD should consider alternative, incentive-based strategies to encourage voluntary adoption of cleaner technologies. Expanding incentive programs, providing tax credits, and supporting research into cost-effective NOx reduction technologies would yield more sustainable results while minimizing economic hardships.

Given these concerns, I urge the SCAQMD Board to reconsider the implementation of these rules and engage with stakeholders to explore more balanced, practical, and economically viable solutions.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response and further discussions on how we can achieve our shared environmental goals without unduly burdening businesses and consumers.

Steven Mink
Huntington Beach, CA
m: [REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 8:16 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am strongly opposed to the new rulings numbered 1111 and 1121 proposed by the SCAQMD. While I support improving air quality, this is not the way to achieve it. Requiring every homeowner to convert to electric appliances, including heaters, is shortsighted and unreasonable. Our electric grid is simply not robust enough to handle that kind of power draw - which means that homeowners (and renters) will go without heat when they need it most. It also puts an unreasonable financial strain on homeowners who are already struggling to pay their current bills and taxes. And finally, doing this conversion will not get the results you seek - it won't impact air quality significantly enough to warrant the hardships Californian residents will face. Air quality must be improved, yes, but it will require a different way - not by converting all existing gas appliances to electric.

Thank you,
Susan Seger
Homeowner, Orange County

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Susan's Gmail [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:49 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 & 1121

To whom it may concern,

Please note that as homeowners in Laguna Beach, we strongly oppose rules 1111 & 1121. We're all for clean air, but this does not get us any closer & it will cause more negative impact on the power grid. Stop the greenwashing.

Sincerely,
Susan Kinsey
Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Tamara Berardi [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:48 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

AQMD Board,

I am writing to express my opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121. I am an advocate for cleaner air which is why I have driven hybrid Priuses for the last 20 years. I am very aware of the things I can do to help slow the destruction of our air quality and planet. However, I feel that forcing people to convert to electric water heaters and furnaces is a strong move that is going to cause many families financial hardships for a very small benefit. My electric bill is already over \$300 a month. Alternatively, my gas bill is \$30. Our grids are often pushed to the brink already during high usage periods. Already many have replaced appliances with electric from gas voluntarily. Gas usage in the homes are much lower than years before and they continue to drop. If you want to enact a rule for new construction, fine. You must know that natural gas is used to generate electricity so this seems like an unnecessary mandate for a small benefit.

Therefore, I would like to see these rules rejected.

Respectfully,
Tamara Berardi
45 yr Huntington Beach Resident
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Margo Saldivar [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:04 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Diane Dixon
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

The implementation of these two rules to change our use of fuel are both unaffordable and unreasonable. Our already outdated electrical grid will not be able to support what will be a significant increase in electric useage.

The cost of replacing appliances and refitting from gas to electric will also be unaffordable for many, many people. The time involved with all the re-fitters servicing all of the requests cannot work in the timeframe that is being proposed.

These are not well thought out rules, with repercussions that are predictable and unavoidable.

Please do not forward these two rules any further; there will be years of work to build such a support system before any changes are made.

Best Regards,

Toni Saldivar
[REDACTED]
Huntington Beach, Ca 92647

James Chavez

From: Tracey Leyvas [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:31 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to All Electric

Hello,

I am writing to you in opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121. Going all electric on water heaters and furnaces on an already strained electric grid makes no sense. Natural gas is clean, efficient and less expensive to run these items. The cost for conversion to electric for the average home owner is too much. Stop the madness and be realistic in keeping choices available for home owners working within a budget.

Thank you for listening,

Tracey Leyvas

James Chavez

From: udo helferich [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:21 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] rule 1111 and 1121

Sent from my iPhone
You have got to be kidding! Power
outages constantly and you want
to add more demand on the system! No thank you udo helferich

James Chavez

From: Vickie Collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:25 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] opposition to rules 1111 and 1121

vickie collins
property owner of properties in Laguna Niguel, Dana Point and Laguna Beach
I object to the passage of rules 1111 and 1121. Please vote NO on these issues.
Vickie Collins
[REDACTED]
Laguna Niguel, Ca. 92677

James Chavez

From: Sue and Wayne Martin [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:24 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I am against rules 1111 and 1121. They would require me to replace the electric panel (cost \$6,000) and add wires to the water heater and heater.

Pay more for electricity than gas. Also, I recently replaced my HVAC system for \$16,000. You want me to replace the new HVAC unit with a new all electric unit (\$18,000) that will cost more to operate. If everybody did this, we would have electrical black outs when we turned on the heaters. As for the air quality, this increase in electricity usage would come from coal fired generators in other states. We already use coal generators now from other states. FACT!!! CA does not produce enough electricity now to meet demand. More transmission would be required to bring electricity from other states.

It is clear to me that CA only care about CA. It's OK to pollute in other states, but not CA. Buy electricity from other states, let them pollute the air burning coal and not GAS.

Wayne Martin

James Chavez

From: Nancy Rader [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 10:32 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose - Rules 1111 and 1121

Natural gas is clean and reliable.

In the power outages, our family has been able to have hot water for sanitary purposes.

We have also been able to prepare a meal.

And use gas to stay warm.

Plus gas is LESS expensive than electricity!

By the way, the solar plants use gas as a back up, why take ours away?

James Chavez

From: Denis LaBonge [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Senator.Min@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember Petrie-Norris; Kate Sanchez for Assembly; Assemblymember Dixon; Grant, Robyn; Katrina.Foley@ocgov.info; Cynthia Quimby
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stop the madness 1111 &1121

I am totally opposed to the ill - thought out mandate ACMD is proposing in Rule 1111 & 1121 [to mandate elimination of natural gas water heaters for all, which is especially hard on low income families, not to mention the age old adage of "don't mess with something that is working well "].

Please, please get the hell off your high horses that appears to be recklessly riding you up your privileged, progressive, ivory tower haze and get real.

Until there is adequate electric grid capacity in the state of California you need to stop piling on regs that strain its capacity.

E-vehicle charging stations are adding to this demand faster than supply exists.

Stop the madness!

Denis LaBonge

[REDACTED]
Newport Coast CA
92657

James Chavez

From: Stacia Nadelman [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 12:20 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed - 1111 & 1121

I thoroughly oppose these measures - once again stop these ridiculous mandates .

James Chavez

From: Victoria Rafa [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 12:27 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposals 1111, 1121

Please do not place a larger burden on your senior citizens who are trying, amid outrageous inflation, to remain in their homes. Vote NO on 1111 and 1121.

Thank you
Victoria Rafa
Orange County voter

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 11:14 AM
To: COB
Cc: Shannan Maust
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns About Rules 1111 and 1121

SCAQMD Governing Board:

I am very concerned about your impending rules over eliminating gas water heaters and gas heaters. There is no reason why your organization should ban these items from CA. Is your organization going to pay for the new appliances and the increased cost over the lifetime of these appliances to the owners? I know the answer is no. Where is the additional electricity to run these appliances supposed to come from? The state is already trying to force the electric companies to pay damages for climate change, how are they going to generate additional electricity to cover these items. You need to find something else to focus your time that will have a bigger pay off. I can't imagine that the financial burden and the projected environmental impact is worth this move.

Susan Berk

Upland CA

James Chavez

From: Brian Jaramillo [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 8:23 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Clerk of the Board,

As a resident of Riverside, a degreed engineer, and a 40-year active licensed general contractor, I am writing in opposition of the proposed amended Rules 1111 and 1121 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rules will place a significant additional demand on our already highly regulated, over stressed, and unreliable electrical grid.
2. Electricity is primarily generated by the burning of fossil fuels outside the district but does include peak demand facilities within the district that will be employed more often with the additional demand of these rules.
3. HUD requires all habitable spaces to have a conventional heating system. Reliance on electrical heating systems is already interrupted more than gas fueled heating systems and will pose an increased risk to our aging and health compromised populations during electrical grid outages which are happening even more now with the increased risk of fire.
4. The financial burden of these rules will have an impact on the entire population AQMD is trusted to represent and especially low-income populations. Capital costs for replacement projects will burden owners and increase rents. Our state is demanding the construction of more homes to ease access to home ownership. These rules work against the state as they unnecessarily increase the cost of home ownership creating more barriers to home ownership.
5. These rules require unnecessary replacement and remodeling projects. They wastefully call for existing efficient gas heating systems to be replaced with new less efficient electrical systems. These capital projects are an ecological waste of resources.
6. These rules will unnecessarily increase government and regulation costs.

The amount of public awareness of these significant cost and quality of life rules has been insufficient. One hundred percent of the people I have shared this news with were unaware the board was considering such a significant change without more public awareness. I urge the board to reconsider these proposed amended rules and ensure they perform more public awareness up to placing this significant issue on a ballot.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Brian and Vesta Jaramillo

[REDACTED]
Riverside, CA 92506
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Diana Green [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 1:10 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

I oppose moving heaters and water heaters to electric versus natural gas option. Leave natural gas appliance use alone !

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 2:16 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gas Appliances

People should be able to choose the type of appliance they want.
Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 10:18 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 & 1121

Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Rules 1111 and 1121.

We are residents of Huntington Beach. We like to breathe clean air. However, we are opposed to these proposed rules for the following reasons:

1. These rules will require more than 17 million people, residents, and businesses, to transition their furnaces and water heaters to electrical units and eliminate the use of natural gas. These are not luxury items. Gas-powered furnaces and water heaters are less expensive to operate. It will cost these 17 million people to spend more money on their utility bills, and to upgrade/retrofit their electrical systems to accommodate the new appliances. This will make it difficult for lower, middle, and fixed-income (senior citizens) people to pay their bills.
 - a. Businesses will, of course, pass along the cost of complying with these new rules to their customers.
 - b. Landlords, will, of course, pass along the cost of complying with these new rules to their tenants.
2. California's electrical power grid is not currently adequate to handle these new electrical appliances, especially at a time when California is pushing people to purchase electric cars. Also, people will be without heat and hot water if the electricity is turned off because of fire danger.
3. Electric power in California is generated by a variety of sources, many of which are not zero emissions. It is an illusion to believe that replacing gas-powered furnaces and water heaters (or other gas-powered appliances) with electric appliances will significantly make the air cleaner. Natural gas is a clean-burning fossil fuel.
4. Mandating the use of these electrical appliances instead of gas appliances will create a monopoly of the electric utility companies.

We believe that, rather than force the change, it is better to provide incentives to develop cleaner gas-powered/fired appliances and incentives to those who wish to purchase electric furnaces and water heaters. This would accomplish the goal of cleaner air with less economic hardship to the residents and businesses in California, and give more time for the electrical power grid to "catch up" with the increased demand.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brian and Leanne Hendricks

James Chavez

From: warren.felson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 10:17 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Sir or Madam,

I understand that Southcoast Air Quality Management District is considering two new rules which will require residents and businesses to transition their furnaces (Rule 1111) and water heaters (Rule 1121) from natural gas to electric powered.

While I support efforts to improve our air quality, I respectfully request that you do not adopt these rules.

California's electricity costs are already among the highest in the nation and we are likely looking at additional charges following the recent fires in Los Angeles (I am an SCE customer). In addition, demand for electricity will continue to grow with increasing EV usage and data center development and these rules would create additional power demand. Renewables aren't currently capable of providing the 24/7 power we need so allowing customers to continue to use gas powered furnaces and water heaters, at least for the foreseeable future, would relieve additional strain on the grid.

I believe it makes sense to reconsider these rules until we have more 24/7 power generation capacity and lower electric charges.

Thank you,

Warren Felson