

James Chavez

From: joy markman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:18 AM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed rules

I , as a Southern Calf. homeowner who is also retired , will not comply with any rule requiring me to replace my good functioning water heater with some electric heater based purely on political hysteria and a hair-brained scheme to get taxpayers to switch to all electric.

Try to extract from me unconscionable fees if I resist-I will go to my local representatives and to news media to explain why I am so angry at this idiocy.

Our electric grid is already at the breaking point and yet you want to add to that unbearable load.

The state legislators are radical climate extremists that could not pass a seventh grade science exam.

Sent from my iPhone

James Chavez

From: Randy Knight [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 5, 2025 5:35 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Heat pumps

I am emailing you because your website contact list is too confusing and complex to find the chair or closest rep.

Please forward to all board members.

I am against your proposed heat pump rules for water heaters and ac/furnaces.

What I've read about heat pump water heaters is that require much more space than current gas water heaters. I currently have a gas water heater and furnace in a garage between an access door and the wall of my house. There is not space required for the HP water heater let alone increased space for a heat pump furnace.

I also found that HP water heaters are much less efficient so a family of 4 risks running out of hot water if all need to shower consecutively.

Your proposal does not address these issues.

I also think you over estimate the health benefits. I'm sure you will defend your numbers but we all know numbers DO lie.

The worst air quality issue where I live is fine particle pollution. This is from tires, diesel, dirt and other sources. However you choose to go after homeowners because they don't have unions or industry funded lawyers.

Just another example of the impact of regulations in California with minimal positive impact.

Our high tax/low efficiency beauracracy knows no limits.

Example: no one in government even wants to know what happened to \$24 billion spent on homelessness with no impact.

California needs a DOGE.

California needs transparency and accountability for all money spent.

Government employees need to be incentivized to reduce cost and increase efficiency.

The coastal elites don't care about the impact their agenda has on the working or retired tax payers.

Thanks for listening.

James Chavez

From: Tim Steele [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 2, 2025 11:59 AM
To: Janice Steele
Cc: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: RULES 1111 and 1121

I agree with you.

On Sat, Feb 8, 2025 at 8:34 AM Janice Steele [REDACTED] wrote:

Please note that we are adamantly opposed to Rules 1111 and 1121. They will increase the burden of changing from gas furnace and water heating to electric without significant environmental change. Our electric bill is already inflated. They will NOT improve our quality of life!

Jan Steele
Newport Beach 92662

James Chavez

From: Gregory Brittain [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 2, 2025 10:42 AM
To: COB
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gas Water Heaters and Furnaces

Keep your hands off our gas water heaters and furnaces.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

James Chavez

From: S Wong [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:32 PM
To: COB; [REDACTED];
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Amended Rule 1111 and Proposed Amended Rule 1121

South Coast Air Quality Management District Mandates

Date May 5, 2025
To South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) (cob@AQMD.gov)
Cc: [REDACTED]
From Sam Wong, MD FACP
Subj **Opposition to Proposed Amended Rule 1111 and Proposed Amended Rule 1121**

I understand that SCAQMD is proposing a mandatory transition to zero-emission appliances under Rule 1111 (Natural Gas-Fired Furnaces) and Rule 1121 (Water Heaters). The reported intent of this new policy was to eliminate nitrogen oxide emissions which are reported to be a key contributor to smog. I oppose the **Proposed Amended Rule 1111 and Proposed Amended Rule 1121**.

<https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-1111-and-rule-1121>

While there may be financial incentives for those who implement such a transition, those incentives ultimately are sourced from taxpayers – NOT the state or local governments. In addition, such financial incentives are often given as a single episode as the resident transitions at the beginning but not throughout the course of the use of the zero-emission appliance(s). As a taxpayer, I am opposed to such misleading “incentives.”

Conversion costs are often not cost-neutral to those who have limited and fixed income. Implementing such a costly and unnecessary mandate would be discriminatory (particularly age and race/national origin). I would not be surprised if costly litigation arises against SCAQMD on the implementation of such a mandate. Although you may brush such legal costs aside since “the government” will often absorb the costs, I would not be surprised if the tax-paying public will be informed of who specifically signed off on such costly mandates. Un-elected officials are also accountable to the taxpayers.

Sole reliance on a single energy source is fraught with energy-delivery vulnerabilities. We have seen major societal catastrophes when communities relied only on electricity during freezing climate. All successful and well-planned communities have source and process redundancies. That is so very basic to safe and intelligent governance! (Why do you suppose God created humans to have two arms, two legs, two lungs, etc.?)

Respectfully,

Sam Wong, MD FACP
Clinical Professor of Medicine

Disclosure

The content, opinions, and statements provided in this email and/or email thread do not necessarily reflect those of the institutions, organizations or entities mentioned of which the author is affiliated.

James Chavez

From: Franki Torres [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 2:08 PM
To: Clerk of Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rules 1111 & 1121.

Sent from my iPhone

I respectfully urge you to oppose Rules 1111 & 1121.

L Torres

Jennifer Vinh

From: King Sheila <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2025 2:18 PM
To: Jennifer Vinh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSE Rules 1111 & 1121

May 9, 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:

We write to you 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,

Eric & Sheila King
Individual Rental Property Owners