

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Brad Anderson [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, June 6, 2025 6:07 AM  
**To:** COB  
**Cc:** District 4 Supervisor V. Manuel Perez; Assemblymember.Wallis@assembly.ca.gov; Cityclerk@ranchomirageca.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] PUBLIC COMMENT, Agenda Item: 28. (PUBLIC HEARING) - AQMD Governing Board Meeting of June 6, 2025 (9:AM)

June 6, 2025

South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)  
Governing Board  
21865 Copley Dr.  
Diamond Bar, CA. 91765-4178  
(909) 396-2500 - [www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov)  
Attn: Clerk of the Board

Re: Written (testimony) to be entered in the public record in regards to Agenda Item: 28. (PUBLIC HEARING) of the regular AQMD Governing Board Meeting scheduled for June 6, 2025 (9:AM)

Dear current AQMD Governing Board Members,

Please review my written statements listed below prior to the consideration of agenda Item: 28. (PUBLIC HEARING). Please be advised that AQMD listed requirement of submittal of \*\*\*Public Comments\*\*\* to the Clerk of the Board "on or before 5:00 p.m. on the Tuesday prior to the board meeting" is invalid in regards to California State regulations in regards to Public Hearing topics (Items). Please accept this correspondence (email) and distribute it among Interested parties in accordance with California State regulations and best practices protocols in regards to California State open Public meeting(s) procedures.

It's reasonable to consider that California State governmental agencies (Cities/Special Districts and other governing bodies) have and continue to abandon good governance in regards to California State open public meeting(s) procedures - because of little to NO governmental oversight and general public involvement. Citys such as Rancho Mirage located within Riverside County have and continue to perform unholy procedural changes to their controlled public meetings (PUBLIC HEARINGS) that clearly illustrates poor management along with potentially Illegal activities.

1) Agenda Item: 28. (Proposed amendments to rule(s) 1111 and 1121)

Position: In Opposition

Recently I was presented with an AQMD produced one page advertisement titled: "Myths vs Facts" (understanding the proposed space and water heating appliance rules (1111/1121)). That AQMD advertisement had misleading questions along with concocted precived answers. It's reasonable to

consider that AQMD officials are willing to mislead it's residents and businesses with incorrect information at taxpayer's expense in regards to proposed AQMD rule changes (1111 & 1121).

It's critical that the "RIGHT THING" be done (performed) for Southern California communities within the South Coast Air Quality Management District boundaries. Increased costs that will be produced with the imposed AQMD proposed rule changes will greatly burden everyone that lives and works throughout our region. Radical extremism political maneuvers such as AQMD proposed rule changes (1111 & 1121) should be abandoned and be recognized as a blatted attempt to remove financial resources from families under a false narrative.

The Golden Age of Californias rebirth will ONLY be postponed (temporarily) with AQMD proposed rule changes (1111 & 1121) if approved. It's highly recommended to oppose AQMD proposed rule changes (amendments to 1111 and 1121).

Sincerely,

Brad Anderson | [REDACTED] Rancho Mirage, CA. 92270  
[REDACTED]

Cc:  
Riverside County (Fourth Supervisory District)  
47th District Assembly Member  
City of Rancho Mirage

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 6, 2025 12:57 AM  
**To:** COB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Rule making 1121 and 1111 - Natural Gas appliances

Hello members of the SoCal Air Quality committee,

I am reminded of the Marshall Fire in Louisville, Colorado end of December, 2021. One of the reasons more than 1000 homes and structures were burned down is that the electricity failed for the city water pumps.

If the backup generators were natural gas fired, then the pumps would have been able to support the fire fighting effort.

There is great value that natural gas travels underground, and so can provide energy when the electricity is out, especially notable that the So Cal Edison seems obligated to turn Off the electricity during Santa Ana winds and/or Canute winds(Colorado).

Thomas Alva Edison originally envisioned that electric power would come from regional generators. It does seem that such an architecture is returning to the fold, as there are many natural gas peak generators about.

Natural gas is good for the money, good for the environment, and win-win as an alternative energy source that is delivered underground. Why burn natural gas in a distant generator when natural gas already piped to the home?

So, Rule making 1111 and 1121 should be considered over reach, a sweetheart deal for the electricity industry who have their own other problems.

Please cancel Rule making 1111 and 1121.

Thank you your time and consideration.

Edmond Burzycki

[REDACTED]  
Running Springs, California  
92386  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] wrote:

> Hello members of the SoCal Air Quality committee,  
>  
> Please be advised that my father, Matthew Burzycki, built the  
> northernmost ground source heat pump in the United States in 1949.  
> The site was Alfred, New York, 14802, at 4 Reynolds St.  
>  
> That heat pump served my family home until 1993, when it was replaced  
> by natural gas hot water heating. The events of the day were that my  
> father had passed in 1981, and the local commercial refrigeration  
> expert was retiring.

> This is also approximately when Freon-12 was banned.

>

> My father insisted that cooking would always be natural gas, as then

> there would be heat for the home if the electricity failed.

>

> Fast forward to 2023 Snow Maggedon, when 6 feet of snow appeared in

> front of my garage door in Running Springs.

> I am grateful the So Cal Gas services remained fully functional during

> this period, as there was lots of concern that snow overburdened trees

> would take out the electricity, including the drop line at my own

> home.

>

> Fast forward to September, 2024, when the Line Fire traveled 6 miles

> in 6 hours to almost overrun Running Springs.

> The town was saved mostly because the Line Fire was the first of

> three, and thus had first claim on resources. The So Cal Electric

> lines were shut down, originally for 8 days. This would have

> destroyed everything in the refrigerator, but So Cal Electric turned

> electricity On at the fourth day.

>

> It is very clear that if I want to self defend my home, I will need

> electricity for pumps, and a water reservoir tank, in addition to the

> standard issue defense items of brush clearance, etc.

> It is my understanding that the 300+ fire trucks assigned to the Line

> fire included 3 fire trucks to

> handle spotfires in my neighborhood. I am

> grateful to the firefighters, recognize that support for spotfires has

> improved since the prior Running Springs fire, but such is a matter of

> good fortune as well as competent planning.

>

> In this regard, I have purchased a natural gas generator. This

> generator served me well in January, 2025, when So Cal Edison was in

> full panic that they would be blamed for any and all wildfires.

> SoCal Gas thus has covered my emergency needs where So Cal Edison has

> disappeared for any and all reasons of its choosing.

>

> Thus, I fail to understand why So Cal Gas, providing a clean burning

> alternative to coal and petroleum, is being singled out for

> exclusivity in the current round of rulemaking consideration.

>

> Thus, I urge the So Call Air Quality district to abandon their

> rulemaking 1121, 1111 in regards banning the use of natural gas to

> heat and/or cool residences in California and beyond.

>

> Overall, the So Cal Gas pipelines provide important backup to

> electricity service. Storing propane and/or gasoline for emergency

> support is dangerous and far more pollution sensitive than natural

> gas.

>

> SoCal Gas pipelines are needed in the neighborhoods to provide cooking

> fuel, primary home heating, and should be supported as part of the

> emergency support when electric lines are obligated to be shut down,



> whether for emergency or maintenance.  
>  
> Thank you for your time and consideration.  
>  
> Edmond Burzycki  
> [REDACTED]  
> Running Springs, California 92382  
> [REDACTED]  
> [REDACTED]  
>  
>  
>

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** Dennis McWilliams [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 11:21 PM  
**To:** COB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Rule 1111 and 1121 - oppose

Hello AQMD,

I oppose these proposals. We do not need another tax/fee or anything else to make products cost more. We need the freedom of choice with reasonable costs for new construction and existing homes. Please reject these proposals of Rule 1111 and 1121. These rules are not beneficial.

Thank you,

Dennis McWilliams

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** EDWARD STOLL [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, June 6, 2025 6:43 AM  
**To:** COB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Gas water heater

Please don't tax my gas water heater

Thanks

Edward Stoll

Sent from my iPhone

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Anthony Villa [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 8:27 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121

Plainly said, do not pass these rules. Doing so would be a huge waste of taxpayers' resources, as the full weight of the Federal government will be brought to bear upon you to prevent the enforcement of these illegal PARs. To have your agency attempt to defend against the Federal government would be a fool's errand, as the Federal government has virtually unlimited resources, and your agency would be on the losing side both legally and historically. Furthermore, virtually nothing your agency does does anything to improve the atmosphere. California, specifically Southern California, is too minuscule an entity to have any impact on atmospheric gas levels, temperature fluctuations, or anything else your agency claims would be "improved" by passing these money-grabbing PARs.

To be more clear and concise, "Just don't."

Anthony Villa  
Santa Ana CA

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Al [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 8:15 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Cc:** Faye Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Regarding Phasing out of Gas Appliances and Water Heaters

Ms. Thomas,

I am writing to you to ask that you please vote against the proposal to phase out gas water heaters and appliances. You must know how much this will cost California taxpayers and residents. It is misleading to suggest that people will save money on these devices. After one adds up the cost of a new, more expensive piece of equipment, there is the added cost of converting from gas to electric.

It is deceptive, misleading, irresponsible, and unethical to suggest that lower utility bills will make the devices pay for themselves. Edison will raise their rates to cover their added costs of supporting a grid that can't handle the load, with most of that increase going to salaries and benefits and not to build an infrastructure. And, even attempting to build more electric plants would be met with severe opposition from environmental groups.

Anyone that remains on gas will pay higher costs because there will be few people on natural gas. Edison will have to raise rates to cover the increase in electric use, despite not having the grid able to handle such a surge. And, what about the fact that even Newsome has told Californians in the past to decide if they want to have air conditioning or the ability to charge their mandated electric vehicles? That statement alone means that even Newsome knows California cannot handle the surge in electric use.

Gas is a clean fossil fuel and uses less carbon emissions than is generated when using coal to provide electricity... we can't rely on wind and the sun. And if wind and sun worked so well, then why does CA buy electricity from outside of CA?

I was offered solar for years and each time I calculated the cost of getting it versus the alleged savings, I determined that I could recover my costs somewhere between 45 and 60 years, with the stipulation that my electric rates would remain the same for that 45 to 60 years.

Please stop taking our choices away from us. Gas is a clean alternative to electricity because electricity comes from coal power plants. The reality is that just because coal power is not produced in CA, does not mean we will have dream of pure clean air. It's not like smog stops at the CA border and decides to turn back. Cars and utility devices are cleaner and more efficient than ever before.

We, the California taxpayer, including you, deserve, and have the right to choose what is best for ourselves. The cost is too high... in increased electric bills, increased costs to convert our homes and businesses (don't think we won't get ripped off during the conversion), and in the higher costs to buy such units and in our overall utility rates.

Thank you.

Al W  
Resident - San Dimas

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Gas appliances

---

**From:** Merle Newman [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 5:31 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board <ClerkOfBoard@aqmd.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Gas appliances

DO NOT TAX OUR GAS HEATERS FOR APPLIANCES.

Merle Newman

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Katie McNamara [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 7:44 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board

Don't tax our water heaters.

Sent from my iPhone 5S 🍀

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** FW:

-----Original Message-----

From: ashley b [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2025 7:44 PM  
To: Clerk of Board <Clerkofboard@aqmd.gov>  
Subject:

Don't tax our water heaters

Sent from my iPhone 5S 🍀



**Faye Thomas**

---


**From:** 007mfred [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 7:41 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Don't Tax Our Water Heaters

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Ashley Kavanagh <5595ashley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 7:38 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] DONT TAX OUR WATER HEATERS.

Sent from my iPhone 5S 

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** Kevin Scherff <scherff3@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 6:51 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Electric appliance requirement

I'm asking that you refrain from implementing electric only appliances in my home. My cost to switch should one of my appliances fail will be almost cost prohibitive with all the necessary electrical wiring and service upgrade. I'm on social security and I'm not certain how I could afford the cost. Please please don't do this.

Kevin Scherff

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Amended Rules of 1111 & 1121

---

**From:** Mountain Biker <godownthetrails@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 6:28 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board <clerkofboard@aqmd.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed Amended Rules of 1111 & 1121

Please do not vote for this. You are placing a direct and immediate financial hardship on me and my family, and friends.  
We are all on fixed incomes and will not be able to afford this when our hot water heaters break or our forced air systems need to be replaced.  
This is a direct threat to our health and well being. You will be taking healthcare and food directly from us to try to afford this proposed rule change.

Respectfully,

A retired tax payer.

## Faye Thomas

---

**From:** Carmen Rawson <carmen\_rawson@att.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 6:21 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board; Jennifer Vinh  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment - Opposition to SCAQMD Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121

To Whom It May Concern,

As a Southern California's homeowner and resident (Balboa Peninsula, Newport Beach) **I urge you to vote NO on the SCAQMD proposed Amended Rule 1111 (Space Heating) and Rule 1121 (Water Heating).**

These rules are punitive to the consumer by establishing hefty new manufacturer's fees, for gas appliances, that will be passed along to the end user. Such fees will negatively impact home owners, landlords and tenants, and business owners/operators. It is just another "tax" that SCAQMD will saddle us, SoCal residents, with. And many Californians are already just getting by financially so we do not need or want more expenses that frankly may not be justified.

Water heaters and furnaces are not luxury items; they are essential. The proposed amended rules will further worsen the housing affordability crisis we have in our state.

I am in support of efforts to improve our air quality but the proposed amended rules are not the answer. SCAQMD's heart may be in the right place but the focus is definitely in the wrong place.

### **Where the focus should be:**

Wildfires produce nitrogen oxides (NOx) and are a very substantial contributor to air pollution with NOx being considered one of the main pollutants emitted from large-scale wildfires alongside particulate matter and carbon monoxide; essentially, burning biomass during a wildfire releases nitrogen oxides into the atmosphere. Wildfires are a main contributor to global warming.

Rather than focusing on penalizing the use of natural gas appliances the main focus should be in preventing wildfires by developing better early/advance detection/monitoring systems that would result in a faster wildfire fighting response potentially limiting the size of the wildfire and its related NOx emissions.

Additionally, the focus should be working with So Cal Edison to improve their distribution system so sparks do not start wildfires, etc.

In conclusion, **I urge the SCAQMD Board to vote NO on the proposed Amended Rule 1111 and Rule 1121.**

Sincerely,  
Carmen Rawson

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** Ry <rylandwatts@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 6:04 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Disageement with SCAQMD proposed rules 1111 and 1121

Hello,

I do not agree with SCAQMD proposed rules 1111 and 1121. Cost of living is way too high and this will increase prices for those buying water heaters and furnaces or heaters. Also, the cost of home panel retrofits is extremely high to support electric water and heat pumps, along with the upfront increased cost of those appliances.

I work in the electric utility industry as well, and I can tell you first hand that our grid is not going to be ready for this. It takes years to install the amount of infrastructure needed to support the huge loads added to the bulk power system that these rules will cause. It will further put pressure on electric rates as now we have to rebuild and install new infrastructure to support home and water heating which is running just fine with existing gas infrastructure. It is going to cost us more in the long run so this proposal your team has needs to stop right now.

Having diversity of energy is better overall because we are not reliant on any one source. Also, gas water heaters and furnaces are extremely efficient with respect to the use of gas.

Stop trying to control our energy sources. We are taxed to the brim right now and we need a break from these constant new regulations on us.

Thank you

**Ryland Watts**

Email: [rylandwatts@gmail.com](mailto:rylandwatts@gmail.com)

**Faye Thomas**

---

**From:** South Coast AQMD <sitefinity@aqmd.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025 12:38 PM  
**To:** Clerk of Board  
**Subject:** Contact Form

## Contact Form

**Name:** Linda Huddleson

**Email:**

[REDACTED]

**Phone:**

[REDACTED]

**Message:**

**Don't tax our water heaters or other gas appliances !**