

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:15 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Akshay Kant

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

The financial implications for homeowners are substantial. The SCAQMD's own Draft Socioeconomic Impact Assessment acknowledges that the proposed rules will affect nearly all residents in the four-county region, with households expected to finance the capital and installation costs of zero-emission appliances . In California, the cost to install a heat pump ranges from \$8,000 to \$20,000 . Additional expenses, such as electrical panel upgrades, can add between \$1,000 and \$10,000 . These upfront costs are particularly burdensome for low- and middle-income families, many of whom may not have access to sufficient financing or rebates to offset these expenses. The HVAC industry is already grappling with supply chain constraints and labor shortages. Lead times for critical HVAC components are expected

to grow in 2025 . Moreover, the industry faces a shortage of trained installers, which could delay the implementation of these regulations and increase costs for consumers . The rapid transition mandated by the proposed rules may exacerbate these issues, leading to further delays and financial strain on both contractors and homeowners. The proposed regulations may disproportionately affect disadvantaged communities. The SCAQMD's assessment notes that the rules will mostly apply to residential buildings, but a small-business analysis was not conducted . Without targeted support and incentives, residents in these communities may face greater challenges in complying with the new requirements, potentially leading to increased financial hardship and reduced access to essential heating and hot water services. While the SCAQMD projects long-term public health benefits and theoretical cost savings, these outcomes rely on optimistic assumptions about energy prices and the efficiency of new technologies. Real-world experiences suggest that the anticipated savings may not materialize as expected. For instance, a homeowner in Northern California reported that, despite leveraging substantial rebates, their total upfront cost for electrifying their home exceeded \$41,000, and their electric bills nearly doubled due to high electricity rates . While the goal of reducing NOx emissions is commendable, the proposed amendments to Rules 1111 and 1121 may impose undue financial burdens on homeowners, strain the HVAC industry, and disproportionately affect disadvantaged communities. A more balanced approach that includes phased implementation, comprehensive support for affected residents, and consideration of alternative compliance options would better serve the region's environmental and socioeconomic objectives.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:46 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Atishma Kant

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

While the environmental intentions behind proposed Rules 1111 and 1121 may be well-meaning, their implementation represents a classic case of regulatory overreach that disregards the economic realities of working and middle-class residents. The transition to zero-emission appliances imposes significant upfront costs on homeowners and landlords—ranging from expensive equipment replacements to electrical upgrades—at a time when inflation, housing costs, and utility rates are already straining household budgets. The assumption that long-term savings will compensate for these costs ignores a fundamental truth: many Californians are struggling to afford the present, let alone invest in theoretical future savings. Worse yet is the circular logic being used to justify this proposal. The government introduces a costly mandate, then

offers financial assistance funded by taxpayer dollars to mitigate the very burden it created. This isn't equity—it's an unsustainable economic loop that punishes productivity and personal responsibility while expanding dependency and bureaucracy. The AQMD should not be in the business of forcing technological shifts through coercive regulation—especially when the market has not yet matured to make such options affordable or practical for most households. This rule will disproportionately impact fixed-income seniors, working families, small landlords, and renters—all without offering a realistic pathway for compliance. I urge the AQMD to halt these proposed rules and allow the natural market adoption of zero-emission technologies to evolve voluntarily as they become cost-effective, rather than mandating premature adoption at great personal expense to the public.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:47 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Brent Longbrook

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

If the legislature and SCAQMD wants millions of Californians to not be able to pay their bills, lose their homes, or not be able to put food on the table, go ahead and make the asinine rules for 1111 and 1121 even worse. Then watch millions more taxpayers leave because they cannot afford to be here. Stop this nonsense and repeal the rules at best, or keep them as they are at worst.

Jennifer Vinh

From: D T <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 2:22 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121

To whom it may concern, please OPPOSE Proposed Amended Rules 1111 and 1121. These are terrible ideas that have not been thought through. California is already expensive and has electric blackouts, this would OBVIOUSLY make both problems worse????!!! Is anyone there in touch with reality? Imagine you come home after work, say 530 and the electric company imposes a black out on your family. No electric stove, no microwave?? No problem, I'll just DRIVE MY CAR or order DOORDASH and have someone BURN FOSSIL FUELS TO BRING ME MY DINNER!!! Has anyone thought about anything????
LOL!!!! What are you people thinking???

Sincerely
D Taylor
Yucaipa resident

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 11:07 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Danny Wurl

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I am opposed to this proposed rule. I have upgraded my water heater to a on demand gas water heater last year. I total cost was just under \$5,000. I don't see how a middle income family could afford this cost. A regular water heater is less than \$1,500 to replace. In regards to going electric, my power has been turned off about 4 times last year and during the fires in January I was without power for 2 days, which was far shorter than many people I know that live around me. I know the goal is to reduce green house gases, but California is expensive place to live and rulings like this will continue to make middle class Americans unable to live here. I urge you to oppose this rule.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:25 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Dawn Sylvester-Dunn

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

Californians are already struggling to buy groceries, we can't afford this! Not only would we have to replace appliances but the cost to add wiring for electric appliances would be beyond our means. We looked into an electric dryer, it was so cost prohibitive we couldn't do it. Plus, Electric appliances are more expensive! And what do we do during all the rolling blackouts all over Southern California? This just isn't feasible. Lastly, if you do this you would be sending a lot of perfectly good appliances to landfills, creating tons of unnecessary waste — how is that “green”?

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:48 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Debashish Ghosh

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

The AQMD should not be in the business of forcing technological shifts through coercive regulation—especially when the market has not yet matured to make such options affordable or practical for most households. This rule will disproportionately impact fixed-income seniors, working families, small landlords, and renters—all without offering a realistic pathway for compliance. I urge the AQMD to halt these proposed rules and allow the natural market adoption of zero-emission technologies to evolve voluntarily as they become cost-effective, rather than mandating premature adoption at great personal expense to the public. While the environmental intentions behind proposed Rules 1111 and 1121 may be well-meaning, their implementation represents a classic case of regulatory overreach that disregards the economic

realities of working and middle-class residents. The transition to zero-emission appliances imposes significant upfront costs on homeowners and landlords—ranging from expensive equipment replacements to electrical upgrades—at a time when inflation, housing costs, and utility rates are already straining household budgets. The assumption that long-term savings will compensate for these costs ignores a fundamental truth: many Californians are struggling to afford the present, let alone invest in theoretical future savings. Worse yet is the circular logic being used to justify this proposal. The government introduces a costly mandate, then offers financial assistance funded by taxpayer dollars to mitigate the very burden it created. This isn't equity—it's an unsustainable economic loop that punishes productivity and personal responsibility while expanding dependency and bureaucracy.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:02 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Deborah Knowlton

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

California residents cannot afford to pay these artificially increased extra costs created by Amended Rules 1111 and 1121. These Rules will just encourage more businesses and residents to leave California as well as increasing the homeless population for those who stay.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:50 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Denise Peters

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

It amazes me that you can possibly believe that going all electric will change our environment or our world. Where do we get electric energy from? While we do get some from windmills and solar, the vast majority comes from the same fossil fuels source it always has. Additionally, California does not have the infrastructure to support more electric consumption. We already have rolling blackouts because we have insufficient power to sustain all of California's current electrical energy needs. If we go to all electric cars and all electric appliances it will likely crash the system that we have now and require huge amounts of money and time to recover from it. In addition to all of that, how many California households can afford to add \$1,510 of expense to their budgets. When is the California legislature going to come down

out of the clouds and look at the realities of life that majority of people in our state face on a daily basis.? Please vote no on these proposals.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:52 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Douglas Winicki

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

Not in favor of rule Change - 1111 & 1121 🤔

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 11:13 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Gabriel Rodriguez

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I am opposed to PAR 1111 - Reduction of NOx Emissions from Natural-Gas-Fired Furnaces and PAR 1121 - Reduction of NOx Emissions from Residential Type, Natural-Gas-Fired Water Heaters. The amounts of NOx emissions from these sources are minuscule compared to the amounts of greenhouse gasses discharged from jets flying into California on a daily basis. Same with trucks unloading at the docks. I am on fixed income and am already suffering from the high costs associated with living in California. These proposed amendments will create more demand and shortages during the fall, spring, and winter. California already has an inadequate supply of electrical power and these proposed amendments will only make thing worse - and

**more expensive. Please contact me if you have any questions.
Thank you.**

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:35 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: gary berndt

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

Now is not the time for this amendment. The current caos and blows Mr. Trump has done to the cost of living for the average American is already hurting Americans. This amendment if approved will only add to the financial burden. Vote no on this amendment.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 9:49 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: George White

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I applaud that an effort is being made to reduce climate change I think the stick instead of the carrot method is ineffective. Why isn't the use of tankless water heaters being incentivized? This proposal is essential a tax and therefore should be put on the ballot. The estimated utilities seems conservative and does not include the impact on the already fragile CA electrical grid and financial impact to consumers that have purchased/installed solar to fit their needs. There does not seem to be a consideration of other electrical items being added to the grid such as EVs, not to mentioned increased climate control (A/C) due to hotter temps. Furthermore, with the CA PUC (which should be an elected position) granting the endless increases requested, especially electric. The cost analysis does not factor the inevitable cost

'gouging' (for lack of a better term) that the manufacturers of the units will impose. In addition, from a real world perspective, will the proposed changes have enough of impact to warrant the proposed change? Unfortunately this will just lead to another negative impression on CA (even though this is primarily Southern CA) potentially depressing real estate values. Is this verifiably necessary or a 'feel good' solution by SCAQMD.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 9:56 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Jan Hudson

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

We cannot afford this!

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 4:19 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Jeff Archuleta

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

These proposed amendments are unfair, punitive and unnecessary! They will result in a major financial burden for many households, while not reducing NOx emissions to a meaningful degree. Why not just require the eventual phasing out of gas heaters and appliances over time, rather than forcing people to replace them at great cost?

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:56 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Jim Hudson

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

If amended, Rules 1111 and 1121 would mandate higher costs by forcing consumers to either 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 a fee to continue using natural gas space and water heaters. It is estimated that the proposed amendments could result in an average increased costs of \$1,510 per household to more than 10 million single-family homes, mobile home parks, multi-family residences, office buildings, grocery stores, schools, and other small businesses.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 11:15 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Laura Cowen

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

Message:

I oppose these new regulations on natural gas.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Martin Hamilton

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I oppose this amendment!

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 11:19 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Meri Dawn Thompson

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I am a retired teacher. I cannot afford to retrofit my home with electric water heaters and appliances. I am already struggling to make ends meet. In addition, Edison turns off electricity several times a year. I have already had to purchase expensive generators to keep some electricity on in the house. You are penalizing hard working Californians with these bills. Stop and pay attention to what you are doing to people!

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:38 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Michele Tracy

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

Just STOP with these ridiculous rules that cost Californians thousands of dollars with NO NET IMPROVEMENT to our health and the environment. Why does anyone wonder why businesses and middle income people are FLEEING this state.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:25 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Paul Stratton

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

At what point will the onslaught of regulations and costs be enough? Proposal 1111 and 1121 will add significant costs to California homeowners in an already unaffordable state. People are leaving California because of the high cost of living and yet here are two more proposals to add more cost! The only people that will be left in California will be the wealthy or the homeless. Everyone else will be living in states that have common sense leadership.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 8:24 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Sandy Mishodek

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I am against proposed rules 1111 and 1121 for many reasons. One, it is too expensive. Two, I live in the San Bernardino mountains where we have many electrical outages. If I didn't have a gas stove and water heater, I'd be resigned to cold food and water. No, I can't afford a generator, nor should I have to buy one. Let's focus on the big polluters, not us trying to survive. Thank you.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:21 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Shammarie Barnett

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

Message:

I urge you NOT to amend these bills. Placing an increased fee to natural gas users will make the financial burden even worse. Increasing the mandate for home owners to use electric appliances will overwork our already declining electricity grid, further more dangerous fires in our state. Fires, overworked grid, financial burden are not what Californians need right now nor in the future. Thank you for your time, Mrs. Barnett Highland, Ca

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 4:16 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Shammarie Barnett

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

Message:

I urge you NOT to amend these bills. Placing an increased fee to natural gas users will make the financial burden even worse. Increasing the mandate for home owners to use electric appliances will overwork our already declining electricity grid, further more dangerous fires in our state. Fires, overworked grid, financial burden are not what Californians need right now nor in the future. Thank you for your time, Mrs. Barnett Highland, Ca

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 6:30 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Stacey Wymer

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

Message:

Implementing these PAR 1111 and 1121 are absolutely wrong for California residents! My gas bill doubles from summer to winter because of increased usage. My electric bill quadruples from winter to summer because of increased usage!! And that is if my electric provider can provide my electricity needs! How can it make financial or reliability sense to force all residents to depend on electricity when it is double the cost and must be rationed? This is WRONG for California!!

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:34 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Thomas Fincher

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I am writing in firm opposition to the proposed Rules 1111 and 1121. My opposition is in agreement with the May 5, 2025 letter by Ontario Mayor Debra Porada in the Redlands Daily Facts - <https://enewspaper.redlandsdailyfacts.com/html5/reader/production/default.aspx?pubname=&edid=999b93a8-ffbe-44fa-adde-e9bfe86497c7> - and the analysis detailed in the Cost of Living Council March 2025 report on the decidedly anti-resident proposal. The continued "blind" and "deaf" proposals from an unaccountable, overpaid bureaucracy make living in California more costly for all, and unachievable for many of the younger generation that could carry on its former vision of creativity, growth and freedom.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:53 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Tiffany Leszczynski

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

While the environmental intentions behind proposed Rules 1111 and 1121 may be well-meaning, their implementation represents a classic case of regulatory overreach that disregards the economic realities of working and middle-class residents. The transition to zero-emission appliances imposes significant upfront costs on homeowners and landlords—ranging from expensive equipment replacements to electrical upgrades—at a time when inflation, housing costs, and utility rates are already straining household budgets. The assumption that long-term savings will compensate for these costs ignores a fundamental truth: many Californians are struggling to afford the present, let alone invest in theoretical future savings. Worse yet is the circular logic being used to justify this proposal. The government introduces a costly mandate, then

offers financial assistance funded by taxpayer dollars to mitigate the very burden it created. This isn't equity—it's an unsustainable economic loop that punishes productivity and personal responsibility while expanding dependency and bureaucracy. The AQMD should not be in the business of forcing technological shifts through coercive regulation—especially when the market has not yet matured to make such options affordable or practical for most households. This rule will disproportionately impact fixed-income seniors, working families, small landlords, and renters—all without offering a realistic pathway for compliance. I urge the AQMD to halt these proposed rules and allow the natural market adoption of zero-emission technologies to evolve voluntarily as they become cost-effective, rather than mandating premature adoption at great personal expense to the public.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Tina Townsend

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: US +1

Message:

I am adamantly opposed to 1111 and 1121. Californians are already at the breaking point financially. Please do not add another financial burden.

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 11:31 AM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Tracy Meyers

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

Asa a property owner/retiree there is no way I can afford any of this. People just need to leave things alone!

Jennifer Vinh

From: South Coast AQMD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 2:34 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: Contact Form

Contact Form

Name: Vincent E Dudziak

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Message:

I strongly disagree with Amendments 1111 and 1121. Converting to "all-electric" water heaters, space heaters, and appliances would cost consumers to rewire their homes to accommodate these appliances. This state has a problem with delivering electricity on a consistent basis. We experienced that during the latest windstorms. Natural gas is the most affordable option for the citizens of this state. Passing these amendments will add unnecessary expenses to the average family budget. Please vote not to pass

Jennifer Vinh

From: Wendy Walker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 10:23 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,
Wendy Walker
[REDACTED]
Perris, CA 92571
[REDACTED]