

Jennifer Vinh

From: F. Stephen Masek <stephenmasek@masekconsulting.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2025 9:44 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Rules 1111 & 1112

Dear SCAQMD Board:

Please do not allow the SCAQMD bureaucrats to lead you around by your noses, omitting important facts. Kindly consider these things:

1) The cost of conversion to electric space heating and water heating is tens of thousands of dollars per house, yet they omit or trivialize this in what they have given you. Consider the work needed at a typical single-family house - replacement of the main electrical panel and running cables to the furnace and water heater locations. If you want more detailed real data, ask a good real estate broker to provide two or three typical houses for you to use to obtain bids from three or four electrical contractors for this work. Do this yourselves, so the bureaucrats have no opportunity to select atypical houses where this is unusually easy.

2) I'm a member of Mensa, so math is easy for me, but this math is also easy for most people. First, convert the energy now used for space heating and water heating into gigawatts houses. Next, compare that to our present generating, transmission, and distribution capacity. The electrical system is already barely adequate. If you say that everyone needs solar panels and batteries, add more tens of thousands per house to the total cost of Rules 1111 & 1112.

--

F. Stephen Masek, President
Author: Illustrated Practical Asbestos
Masek Consulting Services, Inc.
Keeping You Out Of Trouble Is No Trouble For Us®
23478 Sandstone, Mission Viejo, CA 92692
cell: 714-878-5284 office: 949-581-8503

Jennifer Vinh

From: Sandy Toes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 – as released February 28

Hon. Vanessa Delgado, Chair
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 – as released February 28

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

I write to express opposition to the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121.

While the latest rule concept attempts to move in the right direction, it fails to address many of the fundamental concerns we have with the proposed amendments.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it.

Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses. PLEASE stop the overreach.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,

-Gina Petrikas
San Clemente Resident

Jennifer Vinh

From: joyce hoffman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 9:26 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Oppose Rules 1111 & 1121

Forwarded Conversation

Subject: Oppose Rules 1111 & 1121

From: **joyce hoffman** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, May 23, 2025 at 9:22 AM
To: <Jvinh@agmd.gov>

Hon. Vanessa Delgado, Chair
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: Oppose - Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 - as released 2/28

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

I strongly oppose the proposed amendments. Our electrical grid is already stretched thin. In addition, the cost to individuals will be substantial with little to no effect on our air quality.

The government needs to stop mandating choices that should be left up to the individual.

Sincerely,

Joyce Hoffman

From: **Mail Delivery Subsystem** <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
Date: Fri, May 23, 2025 at 9:22 AM
To: <[REDACTED]>



Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to **Jvinh@agmd.gov** because the domain agmd.gov couldn't be found. Check for typos or unnecessary spaces and try again.

[LEARN MORE](#)

The response was:

DNS Error: DNS type 'mx' lookup of agmd.gov responded with code NXDOMAIN Domain name not found: agmd.gov For more information, go to <https://support.google.com/mail/?p=BadRcptDomain>

Marissa Poon

From: Loma Webber <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 12:59 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 as publicly noticed on 04 29 2025

Hon. Vanessa Delgado, Chair
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 - as publicly noticed on April 29

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

I am writing to express my opposition to Proposed Amended Rules (PAR) 1111 and 1121, as publicly noticed on April 29, 2025, and discussed at subsequent hearings. My husband and I own and live in an older home in Mission Viejo that does not have the electric capacity to adjust to the proposed amended rules 1111 & 1121. I also own and rent out a duplex in San Juan Capistrano, with absolutely no capacity for additional electric load.

While the latest amendments attempt to move in the right direction, they fail to address many of the fundamental concerns I have with the proposed amendments.

SCAQMD Amended Rules 1111 and 1121 place higher costs on consumers and businesses. Both amended rules force consumers to choose a much more expensive option of "all-electric" space and water heaters that cost thousands more than natural gas appliances or require consumers to pay higher costs, through the fees imposed on manufacturers, to continue using natural gas furnaces and water heaters.

These proposed amended rules will burden consumers and housing providers with over \$300 million annually or \$7.7 billion over the 25-year life of these appliances. With California's soaring cost of living and many consumers struggling to keep up, now is not the time to impose additional costs on consumers and housing providers.

A better approach to reducing NOx emissions would be to impose ultra-low NOx emission standards to make natural gas appliances even more environmentally friendly at no additional cost to consumers.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes, such as myself, will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners, many of whom can least afford it.

Additionally, I am concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas, to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While I understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, housing providers and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I respectfully urge the Board to oppose Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121 and explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents, businesses and housing providers.

Sincerely,

Loma Hopkins Webber
Mission Viejo, CA

Jennifer Vinh

From: MICHAEL PAQUETTE <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 10:56 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121

May 27, 2025

Hon. Vanessa Delgado,

Chair South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

My name is Michael Paquette, I write to express opposition to the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121.

While the latest rule concept attempts to move in the right direction, it fails to address many of the fundamental concerns we have with the proposed amendments.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it.

Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,

Michael Paquette

cc: Members of the Governing Board

Jennifer Vinh

From: Rachel K <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2025 8:50 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE Rules 1111 & 1121

May 24th, 2025

Hon. Vanessa Delgado, Chair
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 – as released February 28

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

As an Orange County homeowner, I write to express opposition to the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121.

While the latest rule concept attempts to move in the right direction, it fails to address many of the fundamental concerns we have with the proposed amendments.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it. Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,

Rachel and Ian Dunn

Jennifer Vinh

From: Sarah Moore <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 3:16 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please oppose Rules 1111 & 1121

May 27, 2025

Hon. Vanessa Delgado, Chair
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 – as released February 28

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

My name is Sarah Moore, I write to express opposition to the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121.

While the latest rule concept attempts to move in the right direction, it fails to address many of the fundamental concerns we have with the proposed amendments.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it. Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,
Sarah Moore

cc: Members of the Governing Board

Jennifer Vinh

From: Sue Montoya <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 12:58 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE Rules 1111 and 1121

May 23, 2025

Hon. Vanessa Delgado, Chair
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: OPPOSE – Proposed Amended Rules 1111 & 1121 – as released February 28

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

We are long time residents of San Clemente and wish to express opposition to the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121.

While the latest rule concept attempts to move in the right direction, it fails to address many of the fundamental concerns we have with the proposed amendments.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it. Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,

Sue and Rich Montoya

cc: Members of the Governing Board

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Jennifer Vinh

From: JA Ross <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Rules 1111 & 1121

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members:

I adamantly oppose any attempt to restrict my right to choose gas over electric. This is unacceptable government overreach.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it. Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,

The Ross Family

cc: Members of the Governing Board

Sent from my iPad

Jennifer Vinh

From: Billy Barker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 4:17 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE Rules 1111 & 1121

Dear Chair Delgado and Governing Board Members

My name is William Barker,

I write to express opposition to the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121.

Beyond the initial cost of the appliances, the amendments do not account for the substantial retrofit and infrastructure upgrade expenses that owners of older homes will have to bear to accommodate the new technology. These costs could amount to tens of thousands of dollars, placing an undue financial burden on homeowners, renters, and business owners—many of whom can least afford it. Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the increased strain these rules will place on an already aging electrical grid. This grid not only relies on nonrenewable sources, such as natural gas to generate power, but is also ill-equipped to handle excessive new demand, posing a significant public safety risk. Residents have already endured frequent blackouts and service interruptions, and since 2015, electric power lines have caused six of the 20 most devastating wildfires in our community. Furthermore, numerous residential and commercial projects are currently on hold due to a lack of available power.

Many Southern California families are already struggling with high living costs, and mandating costly retrofits or replacements will only exacerbate financial hardships. These rules disproportionately impact lower-income households, which are the least able to afford such expenses.

While we understand and support the Air District's efforts to improve air quality, the proposed amendments would impose an undue and significant burden on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully urge the Board to explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents.

Sincerely,

William Barker