

James Chavez

From: Agi Lontai [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:01 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Please do not implement these to seriously flawed rules under the guise of energy efficiency. No data exists to show this will achieve your goals. However, it WILL cause serious power outages in addition to exorbitant energy prices. All electric is NOT the answer, especially since you need coal plants to create that electricity. One bad idea after another in California!

Keep it up and all your paying taxpayers will migrate out of this state.

James Chavez

From: Alan Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:43 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Assemblymember.Dixon@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New Water Heater Rules

AQMD

Please do not impose a huge expense on me when I next replace my gas water heater in my home. If I have to install electric it will require a huge project tearing out walls and flooring at a cost I cannot afford. I'd be ok installing a very low NOX heater even if that will cost me more money. But an electric install would be a great problem for me.

Alan Brown
Huntington Beach, CA

James Chavez

From: Alastair C Fraser [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:24 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Alastair Fraser
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

I am opposed to implementation of Rules 1111 and 1121 by AQMD. These changes to building requirements are not needed to improve air quality. There are better solutions for water heaters and furnaces continuing to use natural gas rather than switching to electricity which will strain a poorly performing power grid and increasing energy/building costs

Best Regards

Alastair Fraser
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Ari Shaoul[REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: The Dixon Digest


My wife and I, as senior residents of Newport Beach, **definitely oppose** the new proposed rules 1111, and 1121, for the following reasons:

1. It creates enormous expenses and significant burdens to our lives and budgets.
2. It requires modification of existing equipment which we have already paid for in our homes and our rental property, eventually making rents less affordable.

NO NO NO to 1111 and 1121.

On Fri, Feb 7, 2025 at 3:22 PM Diane Dixon <Assemblymember.Dixon@outreach.assembly.ca.gov> wrote:

[View in browser](#)



Click here to [unsubscribe](#) or [update](#) your email address.

James Chavez

From: Ben Taitz [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:35 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

Hello,

I am writing to express my opposition to proposed rules 1111 and 1121.

As a resident of Orange County for my whole life, as well as a mental health professional, I understand the desire for cleaner air due to the many obvious benefits that would bring. However, when seeking to improve systems in the long term, we must always pay close attention to the short term as well. If the costs in the short term are such that they impede our ability to get to the long term benefits, then they are to be considered with extra weight. I'm all for improving air quality in Orange County, and everywhere, and I can see the benefits of electric water heaters and furnaces. However, I believe it would be in our best interests to work on transitioning to these technologies safely and with consideration to short term costs. The current proposed rules 1111 and 1121, I feel, would put too much of a financial burden on residents and businesses, especially if there are no concurrent improvements made to our existing electrical grid, which is already under strain as is.

Please consider revisiting these items and working towards more economically sustainable improvements. I look forward to working with you in the future to help make Orange County even more of a thriving place to live and work.

Benjamin Taitz, PsyD, MA
Registered Psychological Associate
Registration [REDACTED]
Working under the supervision of
Gregg Baringoldz, PhD, QME
License #: P [REDACTED] 1
Asher Johnson, PhD
License #: [REDACTED]

Co-Host of Mental Health Quest Podcast and My Hero Therapy Podcast

[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Bruce Schweitzer [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:37 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Hello SCAQMD,

I think the above rules are bad public policy. The cost to converting a furnace or water heater from natural gas to electric would be high and the benefit to air quality would small. I suggest that these two rules not be adopted.

Bruce Schweitzer

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:24 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Assemblymember.Dixon@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] District resident plea to prevent passage of SCAQMD rules 1111 and 1121

As a resident in the SCAQMD area I wish to notify you of my **strong opposition to rules 1111 and 1121** which are currently being considered by the members of the governing board.

These rules, impacting 17 million residents, are not in the best interests of the residents nor the state, nor the environment. They will unnecessarily increase costs for all of us in this area. Water heaters and furnaces are not luxury items. These are essential to our health and safety. Californians are facing a housing shortage and a housing affordability crisis. Now is the wrong time to put new, expensive mandates in place.

I consider myself an environmentalist and am in full support of efforts to improve our air quality. However, I do not believe that the proposed rules have been shown to make any substantive improvement. However, they would require that I and all of my neighbors be forced to spend money, build larger spaces for bigger devices, upgrade our electric service at considerable cost and pay for more, and very expensive, electricity. Not to mention the strain that all these devices will put on our electric grid.

As it is right now, California ranks 50th in energy cost and there is no doubt that the additional energy needs these rules will create can only drive energy costs even higher.

While a home owner, I know that the additional costs also will be a burden for renters in the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

PLEASE, listen to the requests of district residents and DO NOT ENACT rules 1111 and 1121.

Chris Hosford

[REDACTED]
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Daniel Orozco [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:00 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Rule 1111 and 1121

Dear AQMD Board Members,

My name is Daniel Orozco and I am CFO of the Huntington Landmark Senior Homeowners Association in Huntington Beach ... a community of 1238 55+ homeowners.

We are STRONGLY opposed to the proposed Rule 1111 and 1121. This would have a significant negative impact on our Senior Community, would add more strain on our electrical grid, would be costly to homeowners and our Association and would only have minimal positive impact on the environment.

We stand behind several local government representatives, especially Diane Dixon, in opposing this rule. Please stop it now.

Thank you for listening to the people.

Daniel Orozco
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:34 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] opposition to rules 1111 and 1121

Hello,

I am writing to voice my opposition to rules 1111 and 1121. Our electrical grid is already strained and we need to keep diverse and affordable sources of energy for household use. I don't believe gas water heaters and furnaces in homes have a significant impact on local air quality.

Sincerely,
David Allison
[REDACTED]
Newport Beach, CA

James Chavez

From: Frank Mancini [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:49 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] south coast air management rules 1111 and 1121

I am opposed to these new rules, these will place an undue hardship on me and my low income tenants.

Frank Mancini

James Chavez

From: GARY POWELL [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:16 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric water heater and fau. Are you crazy

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: JASON HUDSON [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:09 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Elimination of natural gas water heaters/furnaces

I am writing to express my disagreement in your consideration of eliminating the subject matter appliances. With California having the highest gas tax, income tax, regulations etc., your utopian idea will make living and surviving in California worse for every day citizens. And how much will this proposal actually improve air quality that anyone can measure? With electric rates rising on a regular basis, no new power plants being built to keep up with demand and the unreliable reusable energy market, your proposal will turn California into a real third world power. How is the grid supposed to keep up with demand with increased electrical car charging, summer heat air conditioning demand and now your proposed increased demand that water heaters will add? If you want to clean up the natural gas, you should consider the new nuclear power generation or build hydroelectric facilities instead to make electrical power more affordable.

Better yet, let the American people and free markets decide instead of mandates from a bureaucratic agency.

Sincerely,

Jason Hudson

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Jennifer Kornoff [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:52 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to 1111 and 1121

Hello,

I am writing to express my opposition to 1111 and 1121. These bills that will mandate home owners switch out gas sources of power and heat will have detrimental effects on Orange County residents. Housing is already extremely expensive in Orange County and it is hard to afford housing, whether renting or buying. We should look for other ways to keep the air clean that are proven and have a lower cost to Orange County residents.

Jennifer M. Kornoff, MA OTR/L
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

James Chavez

From: Kara Kruse Lee [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:20 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1112 OPPOSITION

Board Members,


Please accept my email as a strong opposition to the two above proposed mandates. I am a homeowner and business owner opposing these proposals. Existing properties with existing gas usage should not be required to make this change. It is a costly process which is unnecessary with energy efficient use already in place.

Please listen to the people these changes would seriously effect.

Gratefully,

Kara Kruse Le |

[REDACTED]



James Chavez

From: Kathi Bialik [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:15 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Air Quality Management Board,

I realize these two rules are up for consideration. Here are my reasons I am against them.

- 1-Will electric furnaces and hot water heaters actually improve the air quality? If you absolutely know they will, can you give us definitive proof?
- 2-Where will the extra electricity come from? We already borrow from out of state when our grid is taxed.
- 3-How will we get heat and hot water during an electrical outage?
- 4-I am retired and live on a fixed budget. How do I afford the new equipment and the new wiring required for the installation?

Please keep in mind how this will affect every day, hard working people. It will affect each of you as well.

Thanks for listening to me.

Best,

Kathi Bialik

James Chavez

From: Kimberly Brady [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:16 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to rules 1111 and 1121

Hello,

The South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) consideration of two new rules - 1111 and 1121 - will strain our electrical grid further, increase costs to homeowners and have little effect on air quality.

These rules will require residents and businesses - more than 17 million people - to transition their furnaces and water heaters to electrical units and eliminate the use of natural gas. The proposed rules will go into effect for residents in less than two years, with new builds facing a 2026 start date.

Water heaters and furnaces are not luxury items; they are essential.

Californians are facing a housing shortage and housing affordability crisis; now is the wrong time to put new, expensive, rushed mandates in place.

I am in complete support of efforts to improve our air quality. These proposed rules have not shown that they will make any substantive improvement. Yet, the pain homeowners will feel to their pocketbooks as they are forced to construct spaces for bigger devices, rewire for new electric designs and pay for electricity - with appliances pulling from an already unstable power supply - will be significant.

CA RANKS 50TH IN ENERGY COST: 92% HIGHER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE.

Let's look for improvements and incentives; not bans and mandates. Renters will feel this pain, too. Orange County is already the 11th most competitive rental market in the nation. Adding these rules as another unnecessary expense will not help. If we are going to work to improve our air quality, which I support, we need to do it in a more affordable and effective way.

Thank you,
Kimberly

Kimberly Brady
[REDACTED]
Laguna Beach CA 92651
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone
(Please excuse typos as I am on the move!)
Make it a fabulous day!

James Chavez

From: Kyra Ytzen [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:13 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electrical Appliances

Hello:

I am a native Californian and homeowner. I am against mandating all electrical appliances, such as water heaters, stoves, etc. We dont have enough electricity and have the highest power rates, second to Hawaii.

Sincerely,

Kyra Ytzen

James Chavez

From: Laura Mohr [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:32 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to New Air Quality Rules 1111 and 1121

Please let it be recorded that as a resident of Aliso Viejo and a homeowner, I am opposed to the proposed air quality rules affecting my choice of gas over electric for water heaters and heating.

Years ago, I had inquired about tankless water heaters only to find out my home would require additional and expensive electrical work due to the way my home was built in the 90's. My spouse and I are on social security and can't afford nor are we interested in an all electric home, that's why we bought here.

New homes being built and that have been built in the last few years already meet the new standards, but forcing existing renters and homeowners to incur these costs on older structures against their wishes is untenable.

Sincerely,

Laura Mohr

[REDACTED]
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
Sent from my iPhone


James Chavez

From: Lisa Willis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I am opposed to 1111 and 1121. Please do not approve these mandates!

Best regards,



Lisa Willis
Balboa Real Estate, Inc.
BRE# [REDACTED]



Member Mensa International
As seen on Million Dollar Listing
As seen in A Slice of Orange
As seen as Co-Anchor in the Transformation of the Christ Cathedral

The information in this electronic mail message is the sender's confidential business and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee(s). Access to this internet electronic mail message by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it is prohibited and may be unlawful.

The sender believes that this E-mail and any attachments were free of any virus, worm, Trojan horse, and/or malicious code when sent. This message and its attachments could have been infected during transmission. By reading the message and opening any attachments, the recipient accepts full responsibility for taking protective and remedial action about viruses and other defects. The sender's company is not liable for any loss or damage arising in any way from this message or its attachments.

Nothing in this email shall be deemed to create a binding contract to purchase/sell real estate. The sender of this email does not have the authority to bind a buyer or seller to a contract via written or verbal communications including, but not limited to, email communications.

James Chavez

From: Maurice O'Sullivan [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SCAQMD proposed rules 1111 and 1121 -Vote NO

Daer SCAQMD,

I am writing regarding SCAQMD proposed rules 1111 and 1121. These proposed rules will mandate that homeowners covert existing furnaces and natural gas water heaters to electrical units. This will also required rewiring of existing electrical service not designed for these additional electrical loads.

This is a disaster for me as a homeowner. I cannot afford it.

Please do not approve these rules.

Regards,

Maurice Patrick O'Sullivan

[REDACTED]
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

James Chavez

From: Nanette Vodra [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:16 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 1112

Seventeen million people in California cannot afford to transition their furnaces and water heater to electric units. California does not have the infrastructure to support the use of more electric vehicles, more electric appliances, more electricity at all. These proposed rules have not shown that they will make any substantive improvement. Heating our homes is not a luxury, it is a necessity. California is ranked 50th in energy cost; 92% higher than the national average. NINETY-TWO PERCENT HIGHER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE!!

I oppose rules 1111 and 1112.

Nanette Vodra
"I'm sorry if my common sense is offending you"

Sent from my iPad

James Chavez

From: Noreen Nishiki [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Conversion to all electric water heaters and furnace

DO NOT MAKE THE TRANSITION MANDATORY!!!!

Thank you.

James Chavez

From: Norma Wilson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:22 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I'm writing to express my opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121.

While I completely support working to improve our air quality, we need to do it in a more affordable and effective way.

Sincerely,

Norma Wilson

Newport Beach, CA

James Chavez

From: Oliver [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:10 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stop New Mandate Rules 1111 and 1121

We all would love to have everything electric, but we need to improve the electrical infrastructure first and lower electricity costs! Stop putting the cart before the horse!!

Thank you,

Oliver Rathlen

James Chavez

From: Peetaah Jay [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:16 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121 are hopefully good for you and your family enjoy

Peter Holden

[REDACTED]
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Ryan Hinds [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:14 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Cc: Jeff Stevens; S Pilon
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I am strongly opposed to Rules 1111 and 1121, which will do very little to improve air quality but make this state even more expensive to live in given our high electricity rates.

I am tired of the endless mandates government officials here have enacted under the guise of protecting the environment, including this proposed ban on natural gas furnaces/water heaters and the forthcoming ban on the sale of gasoline and hybrid vehicles. I use very little electricity, have a short commute in a car that gets 45+ mpg (which would become illegal to buy new in 2035 as it is not a plug-in hybrid) and have electricity bills below \$100/month. But apparently that is not good enough!

I love the weather and culture here, but if this passes, I will take my tax dollars with me and live elsewhere. We are tired of being pushed around!

Ryan Hinds
Huntington Beach, CA

James Chavez

From: Sandy Zimmer [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:29 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Elimination of Gas Water Heaters

Regarding Rules 1111 and 1121

I was informed by our representative that your board in it's infinite wisdom is looking at eliminating the most cost efficient source of heating our water and homes using natural gas. A resource that is available at a much more affordable rate versus electricity.

As a homeowner and native Californian, I would like to know who is paying your utility bills and how much pressure you feel the already over taxed electric grid can handle?

With the overabundance of electric vehicles being powered by the over taxed electric grid, recent fires in Alta Dena caused by Electrical Power Lines, why would you even contemplate placing a unnecessary excessive burden on an outdated electric grid?

I would ask that this board please use common sense and reach into your own pocket books as to how this will affect millions of Californian's.

Please listen to the people, we are struggling with already high energy costs, with electric being the most expensive resource we pay.

Sincerely,

Sandy Zimmer
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
[REDACTED]

From: T Collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:13 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rule 1111 and 1121

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes under **Rule 1111** and **Rule 1121**. As a concerned resident, I believe these rules will have significant and negative impacts on my life, the local economy, and air quality, and I urge AQMD to reconsider the implementation of these rules.

Concerns Regarding Rule 1111 (NOx Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Equipment):

1. Increased Costs for Homeowners:

Rule 1111 would likely impose stricter standards on natural gas appliances such as furnaces, water heaters, and stoves. Many homeowners, especially those in older homes, would face significant costs for replacing or upgrading their appliances to meet the new emissions standards. For many in the community, this could be a financial burden, particularly for low-to-middle-income households.

2. Availability of Compliant Equipment:

The availability of affordable and reliable compliant equipment may be limited. This could result in extended delays in repairs or upgrades, causing inconvenience to homeowners and potentially leading to an increased demand for alternative heating and water heating methods that may not be cost-effective or sustainable in the long run.

3. Impact on Property Value:

Homes with older, non-compliant appliances may see a reduction in property value due to the need for costly replacements. Homebuyers might be hesitant to invest in properties where significant upgrades or replacements are required to meet the new rules.

4. Technical Challenges for Homeowners:

Many homeowners may not be familiar with the technical requirements or the specific changes in their home's equipment. This could lead to confusion and frustration as homeowners try to navigate the complexity of upgrading their appliances to meet the emissions standards.

For example:

- The proposed restrictions on equipment will place a significant financial burden on me as a property owner, as many will need to upgrade or replace their equipment, resulting in high capital costs.
- The technical feasibility of meeting these new requirements may not be achievable with current technologies, especially for small businesses or households with limited resources.

Concerns Regarding Rule 1121 (Emissions from Industrial and Commercial Processes):

1. Indirect Impact on Residential Communities:

While Rule 1121 primarily targets emissions from industrial and commercial processes, its

implementation could indirectly affect homeowners through increased costs for utility services. If businesses are forced to comply with additional emissions controls, the costs could be passed down to consumers in the form of higher prices for goods and services, as well as higher utility rates.

2. Potential for Reduced Housing Affordability:

If compliance with Rule 1121 raises costs for builders and contractors (who may also need to comply with emissions standards in their processes), this could increase the price of new homes or home renovations. The added costs could make housing less affordable for homeowners, particularly in an already tight housing market.

3. Negative Economic Impact on Local Jobs:

Depending on how businesses respond to these new emissions regulations, there could be job losses in industries that are heavily impacted. If local businesses reduce their operations or close due to compliance costs, this could lead to a rise in unemployment in the community, which would ultimately affect homeowners' economic stability.

4. Increased Financial Burden on Residential Communities:

Although Rule 1121 addresses industrial emissions, residential communities could indirectly bear the financial impact through taxes, utility fees, or higher consumer prices. Homeowners already struggling with rising costs may feel further pressure from the rule's secondary economic impacts.

For example:

- Rule 1121 may lead to job losses in industries that are unable to absorb the additional compliance costs.
- The rule could disproportionately impact low-income communities and small businesses, further exacerbating environmental justice concerns.
- While the goal of reducing emissions is commendable, the implementation of this rule without further analysis may lead to unintended consequences that harm rather than help.

Request for Further Review:

I strongly urge AQMD to conduct a more thorough cost-benefit analysis of these rules and engage in additional public consultations to ensure that the voices of impacted stakeholders, including businesses, homeowners, and the broader community, are taken into account. It's crucial to find a balance between achieving air quality goals and supporting economic vitality.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I trust that AQMD will reconsider these rules in light of the feedback provided by stakeholders like myself, and work towards an outcome that effectively addresses air quality issues while minimizing unnecessary burdens on the community.

Sincerely,

--

Tom Collins

James Chavez

From: James Shyu [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:02 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Dine Dixon:

Thank you for your letter about the Air Quality Mandate below.

While air quality is undoubtedly one of our essential concerns, please ensure the necessary conditions are met before the two rules are approved.

The "necessary conditions" refer to whatever it takes to accomplish the goals.

For example, 1. we have increased our clean energy supply and 2. have quality (efficient) appliances made in the USA at competitive prices. 3. We may also offer incentives for installing the electrical appliances.

Most people who are using Gas Dryers aren't willing to change to electric ones because electricity is much more expensive than gas in the history of utilities.

Please don't hesitate to pass these two rules until the prices of electricity and appliances are down.

Thanks,
James

James Chavez

From: John Hazlin [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:56 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STOP rules 1111 and 1121

Please STOP rules 1111 and 1121 that will strain the electrical grid, raise my costs and accomplish nothing to improve air quality.

California energy costs are 92% higher than the national average and this additional requirement to eliminate natural gas is unnecessary.

Do something that will actually work to help the environment long-term and stop piling on extra costs that interfere with the economy and hurt people.

John Hazlin
[REDACTED]
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Pamela Arends-King [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:47 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Protest passage of Rules 1111 & 1121

This email is to formally protest the passage of Rules 1111 & 1121. Requiring the conversion of heating our homes and apartments with electric heat does not make sense. The electric grids cannot handle the volume it currently has, how will it be able to take on the extra burden Rules 1111 & 1121 will create without a proven change in the air quality? Right now in my area of Huntington Beach, the SCE grid is so bad. We have power outages that have lasted over 12 hours.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Pamela Arends-King
[REDACTED] Huntington Beach, CA 92646

James Chavez

From: Pamela Plotkin [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:41 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stop The Nonsense---Don't Vote for Rules 1111 and 1121

Please stop the nonsense. It's exhausting to read and listen to the next ridiculous environmental scheme proposed by elected and appointed people. It's always in our best interest for climate change. Is anyone else going off the grid like Californians are being forced to do? No. Our gas is double the national average. Electric car batteries are like bombs in a fire! Their batteries if on fire can't be extinguished with water. They are miserable for the environment. Yet we are told over and over it's the way.....the way to where? Take a break. Stop the madness. Do not pass "RULES 1111 and 1121."

James Chavez

From: Ronald Bergen [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:02 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on 1111 & 1121!!!

Californians already have among all states the highest cost of housing and living in general due to an oppressive degree of over regulation, and AQMD 1111 & 1121 will add hugely to that burden. Regulations like this make life harder for Californians. Stop with your pie in the sky ivory tower environmental extremism already! Stop smothering the hard working people of California with your nanny-state oppression! We can't afford any more of it! NO ON 1111 & 1121!!!

-Ronald Bergen

James Chavez

From: Aaron Peluso [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 1:38 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1112

Hello,

I am writing to express my opposition to proposed Rules 1111 and 1121. These ill conceived rules are overburdensome and will not result in any life improvement for California residents.

Sincerely,

Aaron Peluso
California Resident

--

CCH Management LLC | Manager

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Amy Haggard [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:50 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I oppose the proposed new air quality mandate!

Vote no on rules 1111 and 1121

James Chavez

From: Amy Moylan [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:15 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to PAR 1111 & 1121

I'm writing in response to these proposed rules to express my disappointment that CA is yet again considering putting new burdens on the middle class. Our family cannot afford more environmental restrictions that will eat away at our ability to simply exist, much less afford the luxury of helping our kids get through college. Please stop doing this in the name of "environmental progress." Please find other ways to help the environment that don't involve more direct financial burdens for people who already cannot afford to live in California. You are perpetuating an elitist culture that puts the environment ahead of people. I wish we had the luxury to live like this.

If CA wants to be a state only for the wealthy, that's fine, but you go work in the fields, harvest your food, transport it, stock it in the grocery stores, shop for it, cook it and serve it to yourself.

When will CA start listening?!

Concerned CA resident,

Amy Moylan

James Chavez

From: Andre Brysha [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:35 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on Rules 1111 & 1121

STOP making California even more expensive with laws that only hurt residents. I say a BIG NO on 1111 & 1121.

Best Regards,

Andre Brysha | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Newport Beach, CA 92661

James Chavez

From: J Andrew Branam [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:29 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

Hello,

I am vehemently opposed to these new proposed rules, (1111 and 1121) and their impact on energy cost for consumers in California. Our energy prices are high enough, there is no substantial basis to believe these rules will substantially affect our Air quality, and consumers are going to continue to be punished by poorly thought out rule making. Especially when it comes to heating homes . This is a basic necessity.

Please do not pass these rules.

Respectfully,

Andrew Branam

James Chavez

From: Andrew Campbell [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 6:20 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New Furnace and Water Heater Rules

I urge you NOT to approve proposed rules 1111 and 1121. I live in a house built in 1960. To be forced to change my water heater and furnace to electric will force me to rewire my house at great expense. Your proposed rules have no proven substantial effect on air quality. The California electrical grid is currently inadequate to avoid brownouts during peak demand. Electric car mandates put added strain on the grid.

Please do not approve these proposed rules.

Thank you for your attention.

ANDREW CAMPBELL
[REDACTED]

Sent from Andy's iPhone

James Chavez

From: Andrew Scherz [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 10:47 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Regulator,
Please do not approve these regulations. Their impact is not minor.

I have a large house with a high efficiency tankless water heater. The configuration of my home will not allow me to use a standard tank style water heater. To replace my existing unit with a comparable electric unit will require:

- I completely replace my house panel from a 100A to a 300A service – 300%! This will require rewiring all the way up to the pole.
- I then must run a 150A service to my garage. The panel and heater has absolutely no easy way to run these wires; let alone giant cables!

The cost to do all this work is literally astronomical. People cannot afford this.

Thank you,
Andrew Scherz

James Chavez

From: Angela Cortright [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:07 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] please do not approve rules 1111 and 1112

We can barely afford to make ends meet as it is, we don't need another cost increase which these rules would require.

Thank you

James Chavez

From: Annie Lindt [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 3:44 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STOP 1111 and 1121

I am adamantly opposed to 1111 and 1121.

These measures promise financial hardship to many California residents, and unnecessary strain on our current electrical grid. There are more pressing issues now.

I would support different, less expensive and less intrusive clean air legislation.

Thank you,
Anne Lindt

James Chavez

From: Anthony Siok [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:58 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric Conversion

I'm against the rule 1111 and 1121 and want the board to vote it down. It doesn't make any sense to force anyone to not be able to choose their own appliances.

James Chavez

From: C Pilz [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:38 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Rule 1111 & 1121

I cannot afford and will never transition my gas furnace to electric.
How foolish to demands homeowners to transition in an already stressed california economy.
Please know I oppose these 2 rules # 1111 & 1121 Thank you, C. Pilz

Sent from my iPad

James Chavez

From: Cheri Johnston [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:26 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1111 and 1121

As a lifetime resident and voter in the State of California, I am requesting that you DO NOT move forward with the new rules you are proposing, #1111 and #1121. Forcing residents and businesses to transition furnaces and water heaters to electrical units is unacceptable. Your position that it will dramatically improve air quality is not valid or true. Our energy costs are already higher than the rest of the country and to impose this additional cost for no legitimate reason is suspicious at the least.

Please remove these rules from your future agenda and vote.

Thank you ~ Cheryl Johnston

James Chavez

From: Chris Winners [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:26 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I oppose Rules 1111 and 1121

AQMD Clerk of the Board

As a citizen of California, I want to register my opposition to proposed Rules 1111 and 1121 as costly, unnecessary and ineffective.

Respectfully,

Christopher Winners

James Chavez

From: Chuck Burns [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 11:51 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rule 1111 & 1121

To whom it may concern

I urge all members to vote No. This will cause an extreme financial burden for most of us, especially we retirees on a fixed monthly income.

A reply will be appreciated.

Thank you
Chuck Burns
Huntington Beach CA

James Chavez

From: Cindy Ludington [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 3:33 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New rules 1111 and 1121

I am writing this to strongly oppose these new rules.

As a life long, second generation Californian I have seen prices on everything here skyrocket to a level that is making the state unliveable for many of us, especially in the areas of home prices and rent. This will make matters even worse as it puts an even heavier financial burden on already financially stressed homeowners and renters and do little or nothing to improve air quality and we all know it. It will also put an even heavier stress on our already strained electrical grid. Our children are having to move out of the state because they can't afford to live here. Most of the pain will be felt by the poor and middle class. I urge you to please, please reconsider putting these rules into effect.

Sincerely,
Cindy Ludington

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 9:20 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 & 1121

Dear Board,

I am opposed to these rules being considered. This puts all of our options in one basket and that basket is (messed up) not reliable. How about using your influence to make the overhead utilities go underground at the expense of their shareholders? It may take one hundred years but at least it is a start.

Thank you,
Clarence Christie

James Chavez

From: Clarence Costa [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 6:34 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

I am retired and am on fixed income.

Please do not pass these rules.

They will increase our costs: removal of existing gas furnaces and water heaters; structural code work for new equipment; rewiring electrical; paying for the unstable cost of electricity (who knows where that is going to go if the electricity utilities are found liable for the recent wildfires in any way?).

There is no material air quality offset for these new costs.

I do not want to be forced out of my home state of California by such rules.

I love California, but not for its increasing cost of living.

Thank you for considering what you are doing to the people who thought they were living the American Dream.

Clarence Costa
[REDACTED]
92625

James Chavez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 4:56 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to Rules 1111 & 1121 Air Quality Mandate

To: South Coast Air Quality Management District

Your proposed Rules 1111 & 1121 are onerous and ill timed and will have dubious merit in regard to improving air quality. As a homeowner, I am outraged that you would even think of forcing this expensive option on your constituents. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

DO NOT PUT THESE RULES INTO EFFECT.

Clay Seger
[REDACTED]
Newport Beach, CA 92660
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may contain privileged and/or confidential information belonging to Clay Seger and is intended only for the use of the addressee. No addressee should forward, print, copy, or otherwise reproduce this message in a manner that would allow it to be viewed by an individual not originally listed as an addressee. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender, delete the message, and destroy any paper copies that have been made.

James Chavez

From: Conovergirlies [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 9:23 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric furnace and water heaters mandate

Please drop your plans to mandate electric furnaces and water heaters. Whatever benefits we as a state would get (which will financially harm all) get quickly wiped out with just one small wildfire. So there is no positive gain and a whole lot of harm. Have any of you actually talked to an affordable apartment building contractor? It is extremely expensive to plan to install electric water heaters because they need to have maintenance done on them, so they need to be placed where the maintenance people can have access without entering the apartment. That puts them on the one- hour rated corridors in these multi-level complexes. That just added thousands to the contruction and installation of this “affordable” housing. You need to look at the bigger picture and weigh the benefits and the costs. It comes out as a NO for me.

Sent from my iPad

James Chavez

From: Cynthia Rich [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 2:16 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to 1111 & 1121

Southern Californians are already severely struggling with cost of living and any change toward more electric and less gas piles more burden upon people who live in the edge to survive here.

Do not pass these rules.

Cynthia Rich
Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Slvr Fx 🗨️ [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:22 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1111 and 1112

No, no, no. Whereas I support better air quality, this is not a viable solution. I implore you to look somewhere else to try to eliminate pollutants.

D Tustin



James Chavez

From: David Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 12:52 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE Rules 1111 and 1121

James Chavez

From: David Fleet [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 11:07 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric Furnace Mandate

Dear Sir,

I am against this new measure even though I am an environmentalist. Yes, we need to move over time to electric, however, let's not further ravage our housing market with expensive fixes, especially when the future of our public utilities (and the cost of electricity) are under pressure due to litigation related to the wildfires. My kids cannot afford to buy a home, and soon won't be able to afford rent, yet we are sixth generation Californians. We are creating an environment where only wealthy foreigners can afford to buy and rent in my area. Enough is enough, please desist for now. Thank you,

David Dan Fleet
Newport Beach

James Chavez

From: Denise Benner [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:09 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] All Electric?

This is not enforceable. Governor knows this; you should, too. California citizens are prepared to fight this via Presidential intervention.

Where do you people come from?

DR Benner

[REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: Dennis Barry [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:34 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

To Whom It May Concern -

Please consider my opposition to the above rules. As prices for nearly everything skyrocket California homeowners cannot be burdened with another well meaning yet ineffective “rule”

While I can appreciate the desire for clean air I’d venture to say that CA has done a very good job and that these rules will have little to no effect while causing immediate and ongoing strain on homeowners.

Thank you for listening to a 50+ year resident who feels California has lost its way through well meaning but ill placed priorities.

Dennis

James Chavez

From: Diane Saunders [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 7:46 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gas/electricity

I totally disapprove of your propositions 1111 and 1121. These are terrible ideas and punitive to everyone. Please do not even think of approving them.

James Chavez

From: Drew Spiker [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:53 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 and 1121

It is ridiculous to mandate electric heat and hot water heaters. I am amazed you have the authority to do so in the first place. This should be a decision of those who live here and pay the bills.

I myself would heat the house with a wood fire, another one of your favorites, no burn day or not....

Drew Spiker

James Chavez

From: Eleni Hapsis [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 1:13 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Rules 1111 and 1121

To Whom it May Concern:

I am opposed to Rules 1111 and 1121. They bring no substantial difference to our air quality. Will strain our already strained grid and place a huge financial burden on homeowners. This will continue to strain our already difficult ability to have affordable housing because of California's over regulations which is the real cause of a shortage of affordable housing.

The best option is to allow all sorts of options to build our homes with emphasis on improving our current systems for our environment and allowing the private sector to figure out how to do that.

Sincerely,
Eleni Hapsis

James Chavez

From: Elise Fischer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 10:52 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Rules 1111 & 1112

I vehemently oppose these two new rules being proposed! Heating with furnaces underwater heaters are essential. I cannot afford my electricity bill as it is and I live in a small condo and limit the amount of time my a/c is on in the summer when it is grueling hot. This is ridiculous and a small group of people should not have this much power over one of the largest economies in the world. I imagine most of you cannot even afford your bills after you pass these types of rules. Even electricity comes from somewhere.

Please pass feedback along.

Elise Fischer
Laguna Hills

James Chavez

From: Elizabeth Putman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 1:40 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1111/1121

Hello Clerk,
I do not support the following bills 1111 and 1112.
California has the most expensive electricity in the nation.
These two initiatives are extremely expensive and wasteful.
They will add to the landfill and make it harder for those with less income to be compliant.
It is rather TRUMPISH and extreme.

Please hear my voice.

Elizabeth Putman RN,MSN, WHNP
Professor of Nursing,
Cypress College

"The purpose of our lives is to be happy."
Dalai Lama

James Chavez

From: Frank Artura [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 7:04 AM
To: COB
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules under consideration 1111 & 1121

I am not sure what the latest is on this issue, but a local Official is circulating the document below and also below is what I looked up on your site. They don't seem to align.

I would sincerely oppose "mandating" retrofitting existing homes and businesses.

I would recommend looking at new construction, especially those requiring Solar anyway and start engaging the larger home builders.

I do appreciate my 3rd Electric car, but also realize we are a long way from that being practical since we do not have the power supplies and infrastructure to support everyone driving electric and retrofitting electric. Additionally it's concerning to have So Cal Edison as a monopoly providing a single power source to our communities.

If you want an industry professionals perspective, let me know.

I am very opposed to mandating this for existing buildings. It would be very burdensome for the people of the State.

Frank Artura - President
TVM COMMERCIAL REALTY GROUP INC
[REDACTED] Claremont, CA 91711
Direct Line [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



James Chavez

From: Fred Barnes [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 5:49 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Rules 1111 and 1121

I strongly oppose adoption of Rules 1111 and 1121 by the Air Quality Municipal District.

Fred J. Barnes Phone - [REDACTED]

James Chavez

From: gary davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 5:14 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1111 and 1121

No on 1111
No on 1121

James Chavez

From: gina bergstrom [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 7:14 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Rules 1111 and 1121

These proposed rules are complete overreach! Everyone I know strongly opposes. Furthermore, no serious person believes the application of these rules will improve air quality. Enough already!
Sent from my iPad

James Chavez

From: ingrid skidmore [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2025 1:19 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Rules 1111 and 1121

To The South Coast Air Quality Commission:

I am writing to oppose the proposed rules 1111 and 1121. Everyone cares about air quality but these proposed rules will strain our electrical grid further, increase costs to homeowners and have little effect on air quality. These rules will require residents and businesses - more than 17 million people - to transition their furnaces and water heaters to electrical units and eliminate the use of natural gas. This is ridiculous!

Water heaters and furnaces are not luxury items; they are essential. Californians are facing a housing shortage and housing affordability crisis; now is the wrong time to put new, expensive, rushed mandates in place. I am in complete support of efforts to improve our air quality but the proposed rules have not shown that they will make any substantive improvement. Yet, the pain homeowners will feel to their pocketbooks as they are forced to construct spaces for bigger devices, rewire for new electric designs and pay for electricity - with appliances pulling from an already unstable power supply - will be significant.

CA RANKS 50TH IN ENERGY COST: 92% HIGHER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE.

Other things can be done that serve the public interests better. The citizens of California have had enough of regulations that serve no purpose.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Skidmore

[REDACTED]
Huntington Beach, CA. 92649