

## Jennifer Vinh

---

**From:** Bill Tomlinson <constituent@civiclick.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 2:56 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] URGENT: Please Oppose Rules 1111 and 1121

Dear Jennifer Vinh,

Today, I write as a resident in strong opposition to Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121, publicly noticed on April 29, 2025. I will be severely impacted if these rules are passed. These rules directly affect the general public, not just large facilities or industries, but everyday homeowners and renters, like me.

Under the newly amended proposed rules, similar to the older rules, the consumer will be left with a higher price tag, and in this case, renters and homeowners will bear the brunt of the manufacturer's fee at the end of the day. The "revised" language introduced in February does not address my concern for the proposed amended rules that will force higher costs onto residents like me. 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.

With these amended rules, SCAQMD adds to the cost of living crisis by creating an impossible scenario where Southern California residents must decide between 1) having to install a more costly electric heat pump with an estimated price tag of \$6,000 or 2) replacing their current gas water heater at an average cost of \$1500 or more plus additional fees!

Additionally, upgrading buildings with new electric appliances and wiring is a costly expense. Electrical system upgrades are required, which I understand costs in excess of \$40,000. These high costs will likely lead to rent increases, placing additional financial pressure on tenants in a region already struggling with housing affordability. At a time when the housing market is already under strain, increased costs and the potential for tenant displacement will only make it more challenging for renters and landlords alike, worsening Southern California's housing affordability crisis.

Finally, my friends, neighbors, and most residents are unaware of the upcoming requirements and the significant costs involved. Despite holding public workshops, the SCAQMD has not conducted sufficient outreach to inform and engage the broader community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

I respectfully urge the Board to oppose Rules 1111 and 1121.

Sincerely,  
Bill Tomlinson  
[REDACTED]  
Brea, CA 92821  
[REDACTED]

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 9:52 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Aaron Singer

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

I would like to submit clear and direct public opposition to such limitations being suggested. Although I assume this will fall on deaf ears unwilling to remove blinders. Regarding the health benefits detailed in the assessment report. The attached reported detailed an estimated reduction of death of 2,490 deaths. I am bewildered that these enforcements on the public (without ability to vote on such implementations) is being tied to a reduction of 2,490 deaths to reduce NOx. If public health is the goal, then perhaps funding would be better spent on the top leading causes of death in the US. From the CDC: (1) Heart disease, (2) Cancer, (3) Unintentional Injury. One might argue that NOX contributes to 1 & 2 but that would be a clear stretch with the primary cause of the closest affiliated death sources being clogged arteries and

smoking. Let alone, the amount of NO<sub>x</sub> released from the quantity of such natural gas equipment speaks for itself in the numbers of the report. I would personally be embarrassed to publicly detail such data in support of a position. Secondly, savings from these enforcements listed herein estimate rather stretched assumptions. 1) it is clear that our states legislation has attempted to criminalize any oil or combustible fuel to date. This drives up consumer cost per Therm, and thus this rate is totally skewed by legislative cuts to supply. When companies and product availability is scarce/heavily regulated these costs are passed to the consumer. The rate for KW is also skewed by an assumption that electric utility providers will not dramatically increase rates in response to the states pressure on regulation of fire safety. Key causes of fire are: power lines and arson. And each time a fire breaks out from a power utility the legal firestorm erupts and those legal fees get passed right along to the rate payer. Just a simple search would appear to reveal there are relatively minimal major catastrophic fires from Natural gas lines. One of the key metrics that appears to have been neglected from this report is reliability of the 1) power source and the 2) new product. Speaking to item 1, How does the state plan to keep up with the electric grid demand and to keep the source affordable? How does a single energy source in the region lead to economic sustainability? History has not shown favorable conditions when this is the case. Does SCAQMD plan to look to issue legislation to bring back incentives for solar? Recent bill AB 942 appears to speak of different plans. And these are just basic and simple question posed by one of the future constituents of these bad policies blanketed with poor statistical data trying to whitewash and champion useless bureaucratic policy. Speaking to item 2, what type of metrics were assumed for reliability of the new heat pump equipment? Having my brand new heat pump AC mother

**board (required for the intricate equipment communication necessary to provide the hoped efficiencies) get fried in a 10min power outage does not speak well to a sustainable future for data heavy equipment . Meanwhile, natural gas regulation and use is pretty darn simple, reliable, and cost effective. I know that I am not a professional in this field, and I know there are far more capable of detailing significant stats on both sides. However, there really appears to be a missing the forest for the trees circumstance here and much more effort and care need be taken before hastily pushing forward policy for the sake of policy.**

## Jennifer Vinh

---

**From:** Catherine Youngerman-Hernandez <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:36 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Oppose Rules 1111 and 1121

On behalf of multifamily property owners like myself, I write to express our opposition to Proposed Amended Rules (PAR) 1111 and 1121. Our opposition is reflective of the revised language publicly noticed on April 29, 2025, and discussed at subsequent hearings. While the latest amendments attempt to move in the right direction, they fail to address many of the fundamental concerns we 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 amended rules will burden consumers 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. 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 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, we are 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 oppose Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121 and explore alternative approaches that balance air quality improvements with economic feasibility for all residents. Sincerely,

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 9:30 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Cindi Schmitz

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

**Dear SCAQMD Board and Fellow Residents, I'm writing to express deep concern over the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121 that would phase out natural gas appliances in favor of all-electric units. While I support clean air and environmental responsibility, this mandate represents a serious injustice to families, homeowners, and small business owners across the Inland Empire and surrounding counties. Forcing a transition from gas to electric—especially under the threat of penalties or steep fees—is not only unreasonable, it's economically devastating for working families. The estimated costs of \$40,000 to \$47,000 to retrofit homes are simply unattainable for the average resident. And to add a \$1,510 per-appliance "regulatory fee" on top of that is nothing short of punitive. This proposal would drive up the cost**

**of living at a time when inflation, housing prices, and utility costs are already pushing people to their financial limits. Renters will feel the squeeze as landlords pass along costs, and homeowners may be forced to delay critical repairs or upgrades due to the financial burden. Let's be clear—this isn't just about clean air, it's about economic survival. There must be a balanced solution that protects our environment without punishing the very people who are just trying to live, work, and raise families in our communities. I urge you to pause, listen to the people this will impact most, and explore more reasonable, phased, and affordable alternatives. Sincerely, Cindi Schmitz Concerned Inland Empire Resident**

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 6:47 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Gary Tolle

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

No....no...nnoo....absolutely not....no more green bad deal...eli.i  
eating gas appliances will NOY PRODUCE the results..the libs  
want



**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 8:36 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Holly Clark

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

I have been a resident of southern California my entire life - 45 years. I have been a homeowner in Riverside since 2004. While I support the overall mission to improve air quality, I am concerned that this new bill will put too much of a burden on homeowners. My home is 100 years old, and is in a neighborhood of similarly aged homes. They are well maintained, but the cost to retrofit to all electric appliances is expensive, and potentially is not sustainable with the city's current infrastructure grid. Additionally, any time there is a power loss, we at least can maintain our hot water and cooking stoves. My family in San Dimas was without power for almost 1 week after the fires in January, they were able to have hot water during that time. Even requiring all new construction to have only electric appliances

**seems shortsighted, given the unstable electrical grid and above ground power lines throughout California. Please reconsider this rule. Thank you.**

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 8:57 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Jesus Gonzalez

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

I would not vote for this nonsense now California is becoming communist dictators tell was to do thanks

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:55 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Joshua Marberry

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

In times of imposed tariffs, high housing prices, high cost of food and gas; such a proposal shows how out of touch law makers currently are as they are unaware of the financial burden of the typical California resident.

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 8:55 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Kenneth Cramm

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

This rule is crazy. Just look around and you will see busses using natural gas advertised as clean vehicles. Why are these unelected people allowed to make rules that are beyond common sense and reason? Please stop them!

**Jennifer Vinh**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 7:30 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Sharon Kizuel

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Phone:** [REDACTED]

### Message:

**Seniors can not afford this bill. Can our electric grid take this change? Electric cars are already straining the grid.**