

1 Courtland L. Reichman (SBN: 268873)
creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com
2 Brian C. Baran (SBN: 325939)
bbaran@reichmanjorgensen.com
3 REICHMAN JORGENSEN LEHMAN & FELDBERG LLP
100 Marine Parkway, Suite 300
4 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Tel.: (650) 623-1401; Fax: (650) 560-3501
5

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Rinnai America Corp., Noritz
6 America Corp., National Association of Home
Builders, California Manufacturers & Technology
7 Association, California Restaurant Association,
California Hotel & Lodging Association, and
8 California Apartment Association*

9 ADDITIONAL COUNSEL ON FOLLOWING PAGE

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 RINNAI AMERICA CORP., NORITZ
AMERICA CORP., NATIONAL
13 ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
CALIFORNIA STATE PIPE TRADES
COUNCIL, CALIFORNIA
14 MANUFACTURERS & TECHNOLOGY
ASSOCIATION, CALIFORNIA
15 RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
RESTAURANT LAW CENTER,
16 CALIFORNIANS FOR
HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC., CALIFORNIA
17 HOTEL & LODGING ASSOCIATION, and
CALIFORNIA APARTMENT
18 ASSOCIATION

Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-10482

**COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT,
22

Defendant.
23
24

1 ADDITIONAL COUNSEL:

2 Sarah O. Jorgensen (*pro hac vice*
3 forthcoming)
4 sjorgensen@reichmanjorgensen.com
5 REICHMAN JORGENSEN
6 LEHMAN & FELDBERG LLP
7 1201 West Peachtree St., Suite 2300
8 Atlanta, GA 30309
9 Tel.: (650) 623-1403; Fax: (650) 560-3501

Matthew P. Gelfand (SBN 297910)
matt@caforhomes.org
CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP,
INC.
525 S. Virgil Ave.
Los Angeles, California 90020
Tel.: (213) 739-8206; Fax: (213) 480-
7724

6 Sean Kneafsey
7 skneafsey@kneafseyfirm.com
8 THE KNEAFSEY FIRM, INC.
9 707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 3700
10 Los Angeles, CA 90017
11 Tel.: (213) 892-1200; Fax: 213-892-1208

*Attorney for Plaintiff Californians for
Homeownership, Inc.*

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Rinnai America
13 Corp., Noritz America Corp., National
14 Association of Home Builders, California
15 Manufacturers & Technology Association,
16 California Restaurant Association,
17 California Hotel & Lodging Association,
18 and California Apartment Association*

Angelo I. Amador (*pro hac vice*
forthcoming)
aamador@restaurant.org
RESTAURANT LAW CENTER
2055 L Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel.: (202) 331-5913; Fax: (202) 331-
2429

*Attorney for Plaintiff Restaurant Law
Center*

13 John J. Davis, Jr. (SBN 65594)
14 jjdavis@msh.law
15 MCCracken, Stemerman &
16 Holsberry LLP
17 475 – 14th Street, Suite 1200
18 Oakland, CA 94612
19 Tel.: (415) 597-7200; Fax: (415) 597-7201

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff California State
21 Pipe Trades Council*

22
23
24

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief against enforcement of the
3 South Coast Air Quality Management District’s rule imposing a zero-NO_x standard on
4 certain categories of natural gas appliances covered by the federal Energy Policy and
5 Conservation Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 6201-6422 (“EPCA”). By design, the District’s zero-
6 NO_x rule will effectively prohibit the manufacture, sale, purchase, or installation of
7 certain natural gas appliances after set dates. Because NO_x is a byproduct of
8 combustion, banning NO_x emissions bans gas appliances, which operate by
9 combustion. But such *de facto* bans on gas appliances run afoul of EPCA. The Ninth
10 Circuit recently held that EPCA would undoubtedly preempt a ban on gas appliances,
11 and it therefore preempts a ban on gas piping that has the effect of banning gas
12 appliances. So too here: The District cannot do indirectly by banning combustion
13 emissions what it cannot do directly by banning gas appliances. This Court has federal
14 question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 to resolve this dispute.

15 2. The District’s zero-NO_x rule is already harming and will harm many
16 residents and businesses that use natural gas for furnaces and boilers, cooking
17 appliances, water heaters, and other equipment. Prohibiting the end use of natural gas
18 is at odds with the needs of individuals and businesses in the District for reliable,
19 resilient, and affordable energy. Banning gas-fired instantaneous (tankless) water
20 heaters, boilers, pool and spa heaters, or other appliances is fundamentally inconsistent
21 with the public interest and consumer choice, will exacerbate California’s problem of
22 housing affordability, and will shift energy demand onto already overburdened electric
23 grids. Plaintiffs support working to improve efficiency and reduce emissions, but
24 banning these natural gas appliances does little to advance those goals—and in all

1 events, the District must comply with federal law and binding Ninth Circuit precedent.

2 3. Plaintiffs Rinnai America Corporation, Noritz America Corporation,
3 National Association of Home Builders, California State Pipe Trades Council,
4 California Manufacturers & Technology Association, California Restaurant
5 Association, Restaurant Law Center, Californians For Homeownership, Inc.,
6 California Hotel & Lodging Association, and California Apartment Association are
7 manufacturers of gas appliances; affordable housing groups; labor union associations;
8 and associations of manufacturers, builders, owners of commercial and residential
9 buildings, hotel owners and operators, and restaurant chefs and owners. Plaintiffs and
10 their members are harmed by the District's effective ban on certain gas appliances.
11 Plaintiffs face significant costs in having to replace gas appliances with electric
12 appliances in existing buildings, which may also necessitate building modifications,
13 disrupt business operations, or require the temporary relocation of tenants. The
14 increased cost of retrofitting or building for electric appliances will raise the cost of
15 housing and limit supply. Plaintiffs also have members that include plumbers and
16 pipefitters who will see a decrease in the amount of gas plumbing work, affecting their
17 hours, job opportunities, and hiring and training in the industry. In short, the District's
18 rule will impose enormous financial costs and disruption on businesses and individuals,
19 including Plaintiffs.

20 4. The federal energy policy reflected in EPCA was born out of the oil crisis
21 of the 1970s and reflects concerns with energy independence, domestic supply, and
22 national security. The federal regulatory scheme requires a practical approach to
23 energy regulation that maintains neutrality on energy sources and recognizes the need
24 for a diverse energy supply. This is for good reason: A patchwork approach is

1 unworkable, undercuts a coordinated national energy policy, overlooks the public's
2 need for reliable and resilient energy, and denies consumers choice.

3 5. EPCA implements a national energy policy that, among other things,
4 regulates the energy use and energy efficiency of appliances. The thrust of EPCA's
5 appliance provisions is that nationally uniform energy use and energy efficiency
6 standards are the best way to promote conservation goals while ensuring energy
7 security and domestic supply, and that those standards should use consumption
8 objectives that do not favor one type of energy or appliance over another. To that end,
9 EPCA's preemption provision for consumer appliances states:

10 [E]ffective on the effective date of an energy conservation standard established
11 in or prescribed under [42 U.S.C. § 6295] for any covered product, **no State**
12 **regulation concerning the energy efficiency, energy use, or water use of such**
13 **covered product** shall be effective with respect to such product unless the
14 regulation [falls within certain enumerated exceptions not applicable here].

15 42 U.S.C. § 6297(c) (emphasis added). EPCA thus expressly preempts state and local
16 regulations concerning the energy efficiency and energy use of products for which
17 EPCA sets energy conservation standards, leaving only narrow room for concurrent
18 state and local regulations that meet certain stringent statutory conditions. EPCA's
19 default rule is federal preemption; Congress intended for national policy to control.

20 6. Indeed, the Ninth Circuit recently held that EPCA preempted Berkeley's
21 prohibition on gas piping in new buildings because it effectively banned covered gas
22 appliances. *See Cal. Rest. Ass'n v. City of Berkeley*, 89 F.4th 1094 (9th Cir. 2024).
23 The Ninth Circuit decision emphasizes that "EPCA would no doubt preempt an
24 ordinance that directly prohibits the use of covered natural gas appliances in new

1 buildings,” and that “States and localities can’t skirt the text of broad preemption
2 provisions by doing *indirectly* what Congress says they can’t do *directly*.” *Id.* at 1107.
3 Just as EPCA prohibited Berkeley from banning gas appliances indirectly by banning
4 gas piping, so too does it prohibit the District from banning those appliances indirectly
5 by prohibiting their NO_x emissions. Controlling precedent therefore resolves this case.

6 7. In short, the District’s zero-NO_x rule will cause substantial adverse
7 consequences for Plaintiffs and the public. The District’s effort to bypass federal law
8 to implement its own energy policy violates EPCA, is contrary to the public interest,
9 and causes irreparable harm to Plaintiffs and their members. Plaintiffs accordingly
10 bring this action seeking a declaration that the District’s zero-NO_x rule is preempted by
11 EPCA, as well as an injunction preventing its enforcement.

12 JURISDICTION

13 8. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331
14 because Plaintiffs’ claims arise under federal law.

15 VENUE

16 9. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) because
17 Defendant South Coast Air Quality Management District is the sole defendant and
18 resides in the Central District of California within the meaning of § 1391(c)(2). Venue
19 is also proper under § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the acts and events
20 giving rise to the claim occurred in the Central District of California, including because
21 the rule at issue will be enforced here.

22 PARTIES

23 10. Plaintiff Rinnai America Corporation is one of the leading manufacturers
24 and sellers of gas instantaneous (tankless) water heaters in the United States. Rinnai

1 has its headquarters in Peachtree City, Georgia, and in 2022, it opened the first gas
2 tankless water heater manufacturing facility in the United States. Gas tankless water
3 heaters provide greater efficiency and have longer life spans than traditional gas tank
4 water heaters and therefore result in substantial energy savings and emissions
5 reductions across the water heater market. Since their introduction in 2005, gas
6 tankless water heaters have been increasing their share of the water heater market and
7 represent about 10% of all water heater sales in 2022. Rinnai sells roughly 35% of gas
8 tankless water heaters in the United States, and it has significant sales of gas tankless
9 water heaters in California and in the District. Rinnai also sells commercial hybrid
10 tank/tankless water heaters, residential and commercial condensing tankless boilers,
11 residential condensing combination water heaters/boilers, and electric heat pump water
12 heaters. It sells all these products in California and in the District.

13 11. Rinnai is experiencing or will imminently experience harm in the form of
14 economic injuries, lost sales, and altered business practices because of the impending
15 ban on its appliances. Its distributors and sales personnel will no longer be able to sell,
16 offer for sale, or install gas tankless water heaters in new buildings in the District or in
17 replacement scenarios in existing buildings after the relevant effective dates. This will
18 also affect Rinnai's long-term investment, manufacturing, marketing, and distribution
19 plans.

20 12. Plaintiff Noritz America Corporation is a leading manufacturer and seller
21 of gas instantaneous (tankless) water heaters in the United States. Noritz has its
22 headquarters in Fountain Valley, California, and is a wholly owned subsidiary of Noritz
23 Corporation (Japan). Noritz's product line incorporates condensing and non-
24 condensing instantaneous water heaters, condensing combination gas boilers, and

1 integrated hybrid electric heat pump water heaters. It started doing business in the
2 United States selling gas tankless water heaters in 2002. Noritz sells roughly 10% of
3 gas tankless water heaters in the United States, and it has significant sales of gas
4 tankless water heaters in California and in the District.

5 13. Noritz is experiencing or will imminently experience harm in the form of
6 economic injuries, lost sales, and altered business practices because of the impending
7 ban on its appliances. Its distributors and sales personnel will no longer be able to sell,
8 offer for sale, or install gas water heaters or boilers in new buildings in the District or
9 in replacement scenarios in existing buildings after the relevant effective dates. This
10 will also affect Noritz's long-term investment, manufacturing, marketing, and
11 distribution plans. Additionally, as Noritz has its headquarters in California, Noritz
12 may be forced to consider leaving the state if its primary business is not allowed to be
13 conducted in the largest existing market for its products.

14 14. Plaintiff National Association of Home Builders ("NAHB") is a nonprofit
15 corporation organized under the laws of Nevada with its principal office in
16 Washington, D.C. It represents the U.S. residential building construction industry and
17 has approximately 140,000 members across all fifty states, including Plaintiff Rinnai.
18 About one-third of NAHB's members are home builders and remodelers, both single
19 family and multifamily. The rest work in closely related specialties such as sales and
20 marketing, housing finance, manufacturing, and building materials supply. The NAHB
21 is affiliated with 11 local organizations in California, and NAHB and its local
22 organizations have members in the District or who conduct business and operations in
23 the District (including Rinnai). The NAHB's mission is to protect and provide housing
24 opportunities for the American public while promoting the business interests of its

1 members.

2 15. The NAHB has one or more members that do business in the District and
3 are suffering or will imminently suffer harm to their revenues, business operations, and
4 compliance burdens as a result of the zero-NO_x rule. Because of the zero-NO_x rule,
5 some NAHB members in the District will lose the option of installing certain gas
6 appliances, and some members that own multifamily buildings will be forced to replace
7 certain gas equipment with electric equipment, which will require enormously
8 extensive remodeling to incorporate electric service. Moverover, NAHB's
9 manufacturer members will lose sales and be forced to alter their business practices
10 because of the rule. Members of NAHB accordingly are experiencing or imminently
11 will experience harm in the form of economic injuries, altered business practices, and
12 compliance burdens because of the District's zero-NO_x rule.

13 16. Plaintiff California State Pipe Trades Council ("Council") is a statewide
14 labor organization comprised of District Councils and Local Unions representing
15 35,000 plumbers, pipefitters, steamfitters, welders, refrigeration fitters, HVAC
16 technicians, and sprinkler fitters throughout California. The Council is a chartered
17 affiliate of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and
18 Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO CLC. The Council's
19 principal office is in Sacramento, California. The workers represented by the Council
20 help build California's homes, schools, hospitals, wastewater and water treatment
21 plants, and industrial facilities to the highest standards of safety and efficiency.

22 17. The Council's affiliates include Pipe Trades District Council No. 36,
23 which includes six Local Unions that represent more than 10,000 Union members who
24 work throughout the District. Their members provide sophisticated piping systems,

1 and their work spans from underground installations to final connections of fixtures
2 and equipment. District Council 36, the Local Unions, their signatory contractors, and
3 their Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committees spend tens of millions of dollars
4 annually in training apprentices and educating their members in work skills, plumbing
5 codes, jobsite hazards, safety practices, theory, and certification of all installations.
6 Their mission is to educate, train, and represent highly skilled journey workers and
7 apprentices; to support the working conditions and environment of their members; and
8 to protect the health of California residents by providing quality plumbing and pipe
9 fitting services.

10 18. The impending zero-NO_x rule is causing current and imminent harm to
11 the Council, District Council 16, its Local Union affiliates, and the workers they
12 represent. Union plumbers and pipefitters are losing work and wages as a result of the
13 gas ban. Members have already lost work and wages because residential construction
14 projects traditionally built with gas service for gas heating and appliances are now
15 being designed and built without gas service or appliances, and often without gas
16 infrastructure at all, in preparation for compliance with the District's rule. With the
17 gas plumbing work reduced or eliminated from many building projects, the projects
18 will involve substantially less plumbing work overall and therefore will employ fewer
19 plumbers. The loss of work on gas infrastructure will cost some of the Council's
20 members their jobs, reduce the need for their services, result in lower hours worked
21 and wages earned by members, or lead to hiring freezes.

22 19. Plaintiff California Manufacturers & Technology Association ("CMTA")
23 is a nonprofit organization organized under California law and headquartered in
24 Sacramento, California. Its members comprise 400 businesses from the manufacturing

1 community. The CMTA works to improve and enhance a strong business climate for
2 California's 30,000 manufacturing, processing, and technology-based companies, and
3 it has worked with the California state government since 1918 to develop balanced
4 laws, effective regulations, and sound public policies to stimulate economic growth
5 and create new jobs while safeguarding the state's environmental resources. It
6 advocates for California policies that assist manufacturers and their employees. As the
7 leading voice for California manufacturers, the CMTA promotes industry interests that
8 allow the sector to remain competitive.

9 20. The District's zero-NO_x rule is causing current and imminent harm to the
10 CMTA's members. One or more members are suffering, or are imminently facing,
11 increased costs, disruption to business, compliance burdens, and harm to profits and
12 operations from the zero-NO_x rule. At least one member has expressed concern about
13 the negative financial effects of the rule, which would result in significant business
14 disruption because of the size of the California market for the banned products.

15 21. Plaintiff California Restaurant Association ("CRA") is a nonprofit mutual
16 benefit corporation organized under California law with its principal office in the
17 County of Sacramento, California. It has over 18,000 members across California,
18 including both restaurant owners and chefs. It has members that own or operate
19 restaurants or work as chefs in the District whose interests will be directly affected by
20 the District's zero-NO_x rule.

21 22. The California Restaurant Association has one or more members that do
22 business in the District and are suffering or will imminently suffer harm to their
23 revenues and business operations along with compliance burdens as a result of the
24 District's zero-NO_x rule. Under the rule, CRA members who want to open a restaurant

1 in a new building may pay higher costs to own or lease a building for which certain
2 appliances must be electric. Restaurant owners and chefs will also be denied the use
3 of gas appliances subject to the rule in existing restaurants that require appliance
4 replacements, which may require electric panel upgrades, space reconfigurations, and
5 new venting or condensate management. This will impose significant costs on
6 members who own or lease buildings and will also disrupt business operations and
7 deprive restaurants of affordable and reliable energy.

8 23. Plaintiff the Restaurant Law Center (“RLC”), is a nonprofit, tax-exempt
9 organization incorporated in Washington, D.C. and with its principal office also in
10 Washington, D.C. The RLC was established in 2016 as an independent public policy
11 organization supporting the restaurant and food-service industry across the United
12 States. While the RLC is an independent organization with its own board of directors,
13 all members in good standing with the National Restaurant Association and State
14 Restaurant Associations are members of the RLC. As such, the RLC represents an
15 industry that includes over one million restaurant and food-service outlets employing
16 approximately 15.7 million employees, or approximately 10% of the workforce in the
17 United States. In California, the industry is the largest private employer in the state,
18 with approximately 85,000 restaurant locations and \$152.1 billion in sales. Despite the
19 industry’s size, 96% of restaurants in California have fewer than 50 employees. The
20 RLC’s member restaurants include thousands located across the District whose
21 interests will be directly affected by the District’s zero-NO_x rule.

22 24. The RLC has one or more members that do business in the District and
23 are suffering or will imminently suffer harm to their revenues and business operations
24 along with compliance burdens as a result of the District’s zero-NO_x rule. Under the

1 rule, RLC members who want to open a restaurant in a new building may pay higher
2 costs to own or lease a building for which certain appliances must be electric.
3 Restaurant owners and chefs will also be denied the use of gas appliances subject to
4 the rule in existing restaurants that require appliance replacements, which may require
5 electric panel upgrades, space reconfigurations, and new venting or condensate
6 management. This will impose significant costs on members who own or lease
7 buildings and will also disrupt business operations and deprive restaurants of affordable
8 and reliable energy. Many RLC members run on thin margins, making any increase in
9 costs significant. And many RLC members in the District are already struggling due
10 to a variety of unfavorable economic conditions. California restaurant owners still have
11 not fully recovered from the pandemic, and the rule will further exacerbate these
12 unfavorable economic conditions.

13 25. Plaintiff Californians For Homeownership, Inc. (“CFH”) is a California
14 nonprofit public benefit corporation and a § 501(c)(3) public charity. Its mission is to
15 address California’s housing crisis through litigation in support of the production of
16 housing affordable to families at all income levels.

17 26. CFH is an I.R.C. § 509(a)(3) supporting organization of the California
18 Association of REALTORS (“C.A.R.”), is organized for the benefit of C.A.R. and its
19 members, and receives the majority of its organizational and financial support from
20 C.A.R. C.A.R. is a voluntary trade association whose membership consists of
21 approximately 200,000 persons licensed by the State of California as real estate brokers
22 and salespersons and the local Associations of REALTORS to which those members
23 belong. Members of C.A.R. assist the public in buying, selling, leasing, financing, and
24 managing residential and commercial real estate. C.A.R.’s members are and will be

1 harmed by the District's zero-NO_x rule in several ways. First, the rule will increase the
2 cost to construct, own, and operate residential developments, reducing the development
3 of new residential dwellings and reducing the financial viability of for-sale
4 developments and conversions in particular, limiting residential transactions. Second,
5 concerns about appliance replacement are likely to disrupt real estate transactions.
6 Third, many of C.A.R.'s members own and operate multifamily residential properties
7 and under the District's rule will unnecessarily bear increased costs and experience
8 disruptions associated with the replacement of appliances.

9 27. CFH's purpose includes representing the interests of the future residents
10 of residential units in litigation. Because these individuals do not reside in the
11 residential units or potential residential units whose affordability or creation is affected
12 by a governmental decision, these individuals often do not receive advance notice of
13 the decisionmaking process, and they lack political recourse against the government
14 actors responsible for the decision. These individuals are and will be harmed by the
15 District's zero-NO_x rule because it will increase construction and renovation costs,
16 reducing the likelihood of development and availability of homes they can afford.

17 28. Plaintiff California Apartment Association ("CAA") is a § 501(c)(6)
18 nonprofit California corporation with its headquarters in Sacramento, California. CAA
19 is the largest statewide rental housing trade association in the country, representing
20 more than 50,000 property owners and housing operators who are responsible for
21 nearly two million rental housing units throughout California, including approximately
22 1,460 members within the District. It provides its membership with support,
23 information, and educational resources relevant to all aspects of California's rental
24 housing industry. CAA members are businesspeople, employers and landlords who

1 are subject to strict business, employment, and housing legal standards in California.

2 29. The CAA has one or more members that do business in the District and
3 are suffering or will imminently suffer harm to their revenues and business operations
4 as a result of the zero-NO_x rule. The impending zero-NO_x rule is causing or will
5 imminently cause at least one member of CAA to unnecessarily bear increased costs
6 associated with residential construction, ownership, and maintenance arising from the
7 prohibition of effective, available, and affordable fuel gas appliances subject to the rule.
8 The rule will impose serious disruption, as forced replacements may require electric
9 panel upgrades, new transformers, space reconfigurations, new supporting
10 infrastructure, new venting or condensate management, and potential tenant relocations
11 while compliance is achieved. For example, individual water heaters are often located
12 in rental units occupied by tenants. Replacing these appliances with compliant
13 appliances can require significant structural changes to the premises, such as
14 installation of additional ducting and venting necessary for heat pump systems to
15 operate properly and the addition of sound suppression materials to compensate for the
16 increased noise created by such systems. In older rental properties, this type of
17 construction activity carries with it the additional requirement to follow specific work
18 practices to prevent danger posed by hazardous materials such as lead-based paint and
19 asbestos. In addition to being costly, this type of construction activity is disruptive to
20 tenants, who may be unable to access significant portions of their home or may need
21 to vacate the premises temporarily. Accordingly, members of the CAA are
22 experiencing or will imminently experience harm in the form of economic injuries,
23 altered business practices, and compliance burdens because of the zero-NO_x rule.

24 30. Plaintiff California Hotel & Lodging Association (“CHLA”) is a

1 § 501(c)(6) nonprofit California corporation with its headquarters in Sacramento,
2 California. CHLA is the largest state lodging industry association in the country,
3 representing more than 3,000 hotel owners and operators who directly and indirectly
4 facilitate more than \$150.4 billion in travel-related spending across the state annually.
5 California's hospitality industry is a diverse cross-section of the state and includes
6 independent owner-operators, family businesspeople, first- and second-generation
7 immigrant entrepreneurs, large-scale operators, and many more. CHLA regularly
8 represents its members' interests in governmental advocacy as well as legal affairs and
9 provides its membership with educational and operational resources relevant to all
10 aspects of California's hotel industry.

11 31. CHLA has one or more members that do business in the District and are
12 suffering or will imminently suffer harm to their revenues and business operations as a
13 result of the zero-NO_x rule. The impending zero-NO_x rule is causing or will imminently
14 cause at least one member of CHLA to unnecessarily bear increased costs associated
15 with hotel construction, ownership, and maintenance arising from the prohibition of
16 effective, available, and affordable fuel gas appliances subject to the District's rule.
17 Within the District, hotels dating to the 1920s are still in operation and were constructed
18 with materials and structural plans that never contemplated such significant
19 modifications. Due to the size and use cases of the affected equipment, the rule will
20 significantly affect essential parts of hotel operations and may necessitate meaningful
21 reductions in or absolute cancellations of guest stays to provide space and time to
22 retrofit electric panel upgrades, install new transformers, reconfigure spaces, obtain
23 and install new supporting infrastructure, design and construct new venting or
24 condensate management, implement other ancillary modifications, and demolish

1 existing infrastructure. In some cases, retrofitting new systems to comply with the
2 District's rule may not be readily feasible and, particularly in currently depreciated
3 markets, could force complete overhaul or abandonment of the existing structure.
4 These cost pressures and revenue impacts come during a period of economic
5 vulnerability resulting from latent and persistent effects of COVID-19 travel
6 restrictions, digital telecommuting technologies, and the materializing evolution of
7 localized travel demands. Accordingly, CHLA members are experiencing or will
8 imminently experience harm in the form of significant economic injuries, altered
9 business practices, and compliance burdens because of the zero-NO_x rule.

10 32. Plaintiff associations each have standing to bring this action because the
11 interests they seek to address are germane to their fundamental purposes; each Plaintiff
12 association has one or more members that are being injured as a result of the rule and
13 would independently have standing; and the claims asserted seek only declaratory and
14 injunctive relief and therefore do not require individual members' participation.

15 33. Defendant South Coast Air Quality Management District is a public entity
16 existing under the laws of the State of California with the capacity to sue and be sued.
17 Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 40410, 40412, 40700, 40701(b); *see Beentjes v. Placer*
18 *Cnty. Air Pollution Control Dist.*, 397 F.3d 775, 777-86 (9th Cir. 2005).

19 34. An actual and substantial controversy has arisen and now exists between
20 Plaintiffs and the District concerning the validity of the District's zero-NO_x rule.
21 Plaintiffs contend that the rule's effective ban on certain gas appliances is preempted
22 by EPCA. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the District
23 disagrees with Plaintiffs' contentions and asserts that its rule is lawful and enforceable.

24 35. Enforcement of the rule will injure Plaintiffs or their members. Those

1 injuries will likely be redressed by a favorable ruling from this Court.

2 36. Plaintiffs challenge the facial validity of the District’s zero-NO_x rule.
3 There is no set of circumstances under which the rule can be valid under federal law.

4 **ALLEGATIONS**

5 **The District’s Zero-NO_x Rule**

6 37. This case involves the District’s Rule 1146.2, titled “Emissions of Oxides
7 of Nitrogen from Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers and Process Heaters.” In
8 June 2024, the District amended the rule to phase in zero-NO_x emission limits for
9 appliances within the rule’s scope. The amended rule is attached as Exhibit 1.

10 38. As amended, the rule applies to “manufacturers, distributors, retailers,
11 Resellers, Installers, owners, and operators of Units fired with, or designed to be fired
12 with, natural gas that have a Rated Heat Input Capacity less than or equal to 2,000,000
13 British Thermal Units (Btu) per hour.” S. Coast AQMD R. 1146.2(b). A “Unit” is
14 defined as “any Boiler, Water Heater, or Process Heater,” except “Water Heaters
15 subject to the limits of Rule 1121,” which governs some residential storage (tank) water
16 heaters. *See* S. Coast AQMD R. 1146.2(c)(28), (c)(30), (k)(1)(B); *see also* S. Coast
17 AQMD R. 1146.2(c)(1), (18), (31) (defining “Boiler,” “Process Heater,” and “Water
18 Heater”).

19 39. Rule 1121 applies to tank-type natural gas water heaters with heat input
20 rates below 75,000 Btu per hour. S. Coast AQMD R. 1121(a), (b)(14); *see* Ex. 2 at 2.
21 Residential tankless water heaters are not covered by Rule 1121 and thus are covered
22 by Rule 1146.2.

23 40. According to the District, “Rule 1146.2 applies to more than one million
24 units.” Ex. 2 at 2.

1 41. The amendments to Rule 1146.2, which set limits on NO_x emissions for
2 regulated appliances, set a schedule for phasing in zero-NO_x limits depending on the
3 type of appliance and whether it is in a new or existing building. S. Coast AQMD
4 R. 1146.2(d)(1)-(2); *see* Ex. 2 attach. G at 1-1.

5 42. The first zero-NO_x limits for appliances in new buildings will take effect
6 January 1, 2026. Those limits cover natural gas tankless water heaters with a rated heat
7 input capacity of 200,000 Btu per hour or less, along with all other “Type 1 Units”
8 (those with a rated heat input capacity less than or equal to 400,000 Btu per hour)
9 except pool heaters and “High Temperature Unit(s).” S. Coast AQMD
10 R. 1146.2(d)(1)-(2); *see id.* 1146.2(c)(8) (defining “High Temperature Unit” as “any
11 Unit that is designed and used to produce steam or to heat water above 180 degrees
12 Fahrenheit”); *id.* 1146.2(c)(12) (defining “Instantaneous Water Heater” as “a tankless
13 Water Heater with a Rated Heat Input Capacity less than or equal to 2,000,000 Btu per
14 hour that heats water only on-demand when it flows through a heat exchanger, which
15 is a device used to transfer heat between two or more mediums of different
16 temperatures”). These limits will be applied to existing buildings in 2029.

17 43. The second phase of appliances subject to zero-NO_x limits are pool heaters
18 (whether Type 1 or Type 2) and all other Type 2 units (those with a rated heat input
19 capacity greater than 400,000 Btu per hour) except Type 2 High Temperature Units.
20 S. Coast AQMD R. 1146.2(d)(2); *see id.* 1146.2(c)(29) (defining “Type 2 Unit”). The
21 Phase II limits take effect in 2028 for new buildings and 2031 for existing buildings.
22 *Id.* 1146.2(d)(2) tbl.3.

23 44. The third phase covers Type 1 and Type 2 High Temperature Units. S.
24 Coast AQMD R. 1146.2(d)(2). Zero-NO_x limits for those appliances take effect in

1 2029 for new buildings and 2033 for existing buildings. *Id.*

2 45. Once a zero-NO_x limit takes effect, Rule 1146.2(d)(2) provides that “[n]o
3 person shall manufacture, supply, sell, offer for sale, or Install, for use in the South
4 Coast AQMD” any appliance exceeding that limit.

5 46. The rule is not limited to new appliances; it also mandates the eventual
6 scheduled replacement of existing appliances with new ones that satisfy the zero-NO_x
7 limit. In general, once a zero-NO_x limit takes effect, appliances in existing buildings
8 must be replaced with zero-NO_x appliances after the appliances are 15 years old (for
9 Type 1 appliances except tankless water heaters and High Temperature Units) or 25
10 years old (for all other appliances). S. Coast AQMD R. 1146.2(d)(3); *see id.*
11 1146.2(d)(2) tbl.2 (listing maximum unit ages); *id.* 1146.2(e)(1) (unit age calculation).

12 47. Appliances installed in “Residential Structures” or “Small Business[es]”
13 are exempt from these scheduled replacements, but owners and operators must still
14 comply with the zero-NO_x limits whenever they choose (or are forced by a breakdown)
15 to replace their appliances. *Id.* 1146.2(k)(4)-(5); *see also id.* 1146.2(j)(9)
16 (recordkeeping and reporting requirements for the small business exemption). A
17 “Residential Structure” is “any structure which is designed exclusively as a dwelling
18 for not more than four families, and where [the covered] equipment is used by the
19 owner or occupant of such a dwelling.” *Id.* 1146.2(c)(24). A “Small Business” is “a
20 business which is independently owned and operated” that has 10 or fewer employees
21 and either is a “not-for-profit training center” or has “total gross annual receipts [of]
22 \$500,000 or less.” S. Coast AQMD R. 102 at 10; *see S. Coast AQMD*
23 *R. 1146.2(c)(25).*

24 48. In certain limited circumstances, the rule allows appliance owners or

1 operators to apply for extended compliance deadlines. For example, appliance owners
2 or operators may receive an extension if they “will encounter delays beyond [their]
3 reasonable control” in meeting zero-NO_x limits “because a utility upgrade is required
4 and the applicable utility company is unable to provide the necessary power to operate
5 the Unit.” *See* S. Coast AQMD R. 1146.2(i)(1), (i)(2)(C); *see also id.* 1146.2(i)(2)
6 (extension for owners or operators of five or more appliances that must all meet zero-
7 NO_x limits within a two-year period); *id.* 1146.2(i)(4) (extension for certain “short-term
8 replacement[s] due to sudden Unit failure” where “an electrical upgrade is required to
9 increase the power supply capacity to operate a” zero-NO_x replacement); *id.*
10 1146.2(i)(5) (alternative compliance date for certain tankless water heaters in mobile
11 homes); *id.* 1146.2(i)(6) (extension for tenants of leased property facing installation
12 delays beyond their reasonable control); *id.* 1146.2(i)(7) (extension for delays caused
13 by the need for construction to accommodate a zero-NO_x unit).

14 49. The District’s Final Staff Report regarding the zero-NO_x rule, Ex. 2
15 attach. G, repeatedly acknowledges that the effect of zero-NO_x limits is to prohibit gas
16 appliances subject to the rule and that the rule will require the replacement of existing
17 gas appliances with electric appliances. For example, the report contends “that there
18 is a range of heat pump and electric resistance units available to replace gas units
19 subject to this rule” and predicts that “manufacturers will continue development to
20 improve and expand zero-emission products.” Ex. 2 attach. G at 2-8; *see also id.* at 2-
21 11 (suggesting that “fuel cell technology has the potential to replace existing units to
22 meet the zero-emission limits” while recognizing that “[n]atural gas fuel cells produce
23 some NO_x emissions”). Similarly, its cost-effectiveness analysis assumes that the rule
24 would require natural gas appliances to be replaced with electric appliances. *See, e.g.,*

1 *id.* at 2-14 (considering the increased installation costs for heat pumps relative to the
2 gas appliances that could be installed absent the rule); *id.* (considering the costs of
3 upgrading electrical panels); *id.* at 2-15 (comparing “[h]eat pump pool heaters” with
4 “natural gas-fired pool heaters”). In particular, the report “considered the cost impacts
5 of transitions from conventional combustion heating that uses natural gas to zero-
6 emission technologies that use electricity as part of the cost-effectiveness assessment.”
7 *Id.* at 2-16; *see id.* at 2-16 to -17 (“Estimating Fuel Switching Cost”); *id.* at 2-17
8 (describing a methodology that involves determining the gas costs for “the existing
9 natural gas fired unit” compared to the electricity costs for “the electric unit which will
10 be replacing” it).

11 50. Similarly, the Final Socioeconomic Impact Assessment for the zero-NO_x
12 rule acknowledges that the rule will force a “transition[] from natural gas to zero-
13 emission water heating technologies that use electricity.” Ex. 2 attach. H at ES-2.

14 51. In sum, the intent and effect of Rule 1146.2’s zero-NO_x limit is to ban
15 natural gas appliances in the covered categories, including by forcing their replacement
16 with electric appliances in existing buildings.

17 52. The District is considering similar rules for other appliances. The District
18 has proposed amendments to Rule 1111 covering gas residential and commercial
19 furnaces and to Rule 1121 covering gas tank water heaters that, if approved, would
20 phase in similar zero-NO_x emission limits. *See Proposed Amended Rules (PAR) 1111*
21 *and 1121*, S. Coast AQMD, [https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules](https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-1111-and-rule-1121)
22 [/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-1111-and-rule-1121](https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-1111-and-rule-1121).

23 **Federal Energy Policy and Regulation**

24 53. Born out of the oil crisis the United States faced in the early 1970s, the

1 Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, 42 U.S.C. §§ 6201-6422, establishes a
2 “comprehensive energy policy” designed to address “the serious economic and national
3 security problems associated with our nation’s continued reliance on foreign energy
4 resources.” *Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Inst. v. Energy Res. Conservation &*
5 *Dev. Comm’n*, 410 F.3d 492, 498 (9th Cir. 2005), *abrogated in other part by Puerto*
6 *Rico v. Franklin Cal. Tax-Free Tr.*, 136 S. Ct. 1938 (2016). Among other topics,
7 EPCA regulates the energy efficiency and energy use of covered appliances and
8 equipment.

9 54. Congress has amended EPCA several times since it was first enacted in
10 1975, progressively moving away from a laissez-faire approach to appliance efficiency,
11 which relied on consumers to choose more efficient appliances, and toward binding
12 federal standards. Each amendment to EPCA further emphasized the government’s
13 intent to regulate appliance energy use and energy efficiency at the federal level and to
14 limit further state and local government authority in this area.

15 55. EPCA’s original provisions regarding consumer appliances focused on
16 requiring labeling of appliances, reasoning that consumers would choose more efficient
17 appliances if they had access to accurate information about efficiency. Thus, the statute
18 “required manufacturers to label their appliances and provided that the Secretary of the
19 Federal Energy Administration should utilize energy efficiency standards if the
20 labeling program proved ineffective.” *Air Conditioning*, 410 F.3d at 499. The
21 legislative history memorializes Congress’s intent at the time: “[I]t is the Committee’s
22 hope that voluntary efforts by manufacturers and better consumer information will
23 make energy efficiency standards unnecessary; however, should the labeling program
24 not suffice, energy efficiency standards should be utilized to achieve the goals of the

1 legislation.” H. Rep. No. 94-340, at 95 (1975).

2 56. In that early form, EPCA permitted significant state involvement,
3 allowing “state regulations that differed from the federal regulations if the state
4 regulations were justified by a substantial state or local need, did not interfere with
5 interstate commerce, and were more stringent than the federal standard.” *Air*
6 *Conditioning*, 410 F.3d at 499.

7 57. In 1977, President Carter created the federal Department of Energy to
8 coordinate a federal response to the nation’s energy problems. And the next year,
9 Congress passed a range of statutes known as the National Energy Act, which gave the
10 federal government broader authority over energy policy and sought to ensure national
11 security, decrease energy consumption, reduce dependency on energy imports,
12 generate a strategic petroleum reserve, and broadly develop reliable sources of energy
13 for sustained economic growth.

14 58. As part of that 1978 effort, Congress amended EPCA. Rather than relying
15 exclusively on labeling, the new approach “required the [Department of Energy] to
16 prescribe minimum energy efficiency standards” for certain products. *Air*
17 *Conditioning*, 410 F.3d at 499. The amendment also strengthened EPCA’s preemption,
18 allowing state regulations “*only* if the Secretary [of Energy] found there was a
19 significant state or local interest to justify the state’s regulation and the regulation
20 would not unduly burden interstate commerce.” *Id.* at 499.

21 59. Despite these new requirements, the Department of Energy did not adopt
22 federal minimum energy standards. Instead, it “initiated a general policy of granting
23 petitions from States requesting waivers from preemption. As a result, a system of
24 separate State appliance standards ha[d] begun to emerge and the trend [was] growing.”

1 S. Rep. No. 100-6, at 4 (1987).

2 60. Congress responded in 1987 by again amending EPCA. Among other
3 changes, Congress added the preemption provision at issue here. *See* National
4 Appliance Energy Conservation Act of 1987, Pub. L. No. 100-12, § 7, 101 Stat. 103,
5 117-22.

6 61. The purpose of the 1987 amendment was “to reduce the regulatory and
7 economic burdens on the appliance manufacturing industry through the establishment
8 of national energy conservation standards for major residential appliances.” S. Rep.
9 No. 100-6, at 2. As Congress recognized, varying state standards created “the problem
10 of a growing patchwork of differing State regulations which would increasingly
11 complicate [appliance manufacturers’] design, production and marketing plans.” *Id.* at
12 4; *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 100-11, at 24 (1987) (“Section 7 is designed to protect the
13 appliance industry from having to comply with a patchwork of numerous conflicting
14 State requirements.”).

15 62. EPCA now broadly preempts state and local regulations concerning the
16 energy use or energy efficiency of covered appliances, while allowing narrow
17 exceptions for state and local governments to regulate. States can still seek permission
18 to establish their own standards, but “achieving the waiver is difficult.” S. Rep.
19 No. 100-6 at 2. The statute requires showing an unusual and compelling local interest,
20 and the waiver cannot be granted if the “State regulation is likely to result in the
21 unavailability in the State of a product type or of products of a particular performance
22 class, such as frost-free refrigerators.” *Id.*; *see* 42 U.S.C. § 6297(d)(4).

23 63. In 1992, Congress again amended EPCA, expanding its federal appliance
24 program to include commercial and industrial appliances.

1 64. Congress has made a handful of minor amendments to EPCA’s
2 preemption provisions since 1987, none of which are relevant here.

3 **EPCA’s Express Preemption Provisions**

4 65. EPCA expressly preempts state and local regulations concerning the
5 energy use or energy efficiency of covered appliances, subject to a few narrow
6 exceptions. State and local regulations that do not satisfy the exceptions’ detailed
7 conditions are preempted.

8 66. EPCA regulates the energy efficiency and energy use of a variety of
9 consumer and industrial products, which the statute calls “covered product[s].” Its
10 standards for “consumer product[s]” cover a range of appliances, including water
11 heaters, furnaces, dishwashers, pool and spa equipment, and stoves. 42 U.S.C.
12 §§ 6291(1)-(2), 6292(a). It also contains standards for “industrial equipment,”
13 including furnaces and water heaters. *Id.* § 6311(2)(A). Those definitions are not tied
14 to who is using the product. A product qualifying as a “consumer product” but used in
15 a commercial enterprise is still a “consumer product.” *See id.* §§ 6291(2), 6292(a),
16 6311(2)(A)(iii).

17 67. The express preemption provision in EPCA’s consumer product
18 regulations states that “effective on the effective date of an energy conservation
19 standard established in or prescribed under [42 U.S.C. § 6295] for any covered product,
20 no State regulation concerning the energy efficiency, energy use, or water use of such
21 covered product shall be effective with respect to such product unless the regulation”
22 falls within certain enumerated exceptions. 42 U.S.C. § 6297(c).

23 68. “State regulation” is defined to include “a law, regulation, or other
24 requirement of a State or its political subdivisions.” 42 U.S.C. § 6297(a)(2)(A).

1 69. “Energy use” is defined as “the quantity of energy directly consumed by
2 a consumer product at point of use.” 42 U.S.C. § 6291(4). “Energy” is defined as
3 “electricity, or fossil fuels.” *Id.* § 6291(3).

4 70. Putting these definitions together, EPCA preempts regulations relating to
5 “the quantity of [fossil fuel] directly consumed by” covered consumer appliances at the
6 point of use. *Cal. Rest.*, 89 F.4th at 1101.

7 71. Similarly, EPCA’s industrial equipment provisions expressly preempt
8 “any State or local regulation concerning the energy efficiency or energy use of a
9 product for which a standard is prescribed or established” in the federal statute. 42
10 U.S.C. § 6316(b)(2)(A). In the industrial product standards, “energy use” means “the
11 quantity of energy directly consumed by an article of industrial equipment at the point
12 of use.” *Id.* § 6311(4). And “energy” is defined in the same way as for the consumer
13 product standards. *Id.* §§ 6311(7), 6291(3).

14 72. EPCA thus preempts regulations relating to the “quantity of [fossil fuel]
15 directly consumed by” covered industrial equipment at the point of use.

16 **The District’s Zero-NO_x Rule Is Preempted by EPCA**

17 73. The District’s zero-NO_x rule is preempted by EPCA’s express preemption
18 provisions. The rule concerns the energy use of appliances covered by EPCA in that it
19 “prevent[s] the operation of natural gas appliances” by prohibiting them from using
20 any gas. *Cal. Rest.*, 89 F.4th at 1106.

21 74. As the Ninth Circuit recently held, EPCA’s “plain text and structure”
22 preempted Berkeley’s ordinance that, instead of banning covered gas appliances
23 outright, “prohibit[ed] natural gas *pip*ing in [new] buildings from the point of delivery
24 at a gas meter, rendering the gas appliances useless.” *Cal. Rest.*, 89 F.4th at 1098. The

1 Ninth Circuit recognized that “EPCA would no doubt preempt an ordinance that
2 directly prohibits the use of covered natural gas appliances in new buildings.” *Id.* at
3 1107. “And a building code that bans the installation of piping that transports natural
4 gas from a utility’s meter on the premises to products that operate on such gas
5 ‘concerns’ the energy use of those products as much as a direct ban on the products
6 themselves.” *Id.* at 1103.

7 75. As the Ninth Circuit explained, “a building code that prohibits consumers
8 from using natural gas-powered appliances in newly constructed buildings necessarily
9 regulates the ‘quantity of energy directly consumed by [the appliances] at point of
10 use.’” *Cal. Rest.*, 89 F.4th at 1102 (alteration in original) (quoting 42 U.S.C.
11 § 6297(c)). Berkeley’s gas ban thus was preempted by EPCA “because it prohibit[ed]
12 the installation of necessary natural gas infrastructure on premises where covered
13 appliances are used.” *Id.* That Berkeley’s ban regulated gas piping instead of gas
14 appliances themselves was of no matter; “States and localities can’t skirt the text of
15 broad preemption provisions by doing *indirectly* what Congress says they can’t do
16 *directly*.” *Id.* at 1107.

17 76. The District’s zero-NO_x rule is functionally indistinguishable from
18 Berkeley’s preempted ordinance. Instead of banning gas piping as an indirect route to
19 banning gas appliances, the District banned gas appliances from emitting any NO_x—a
20 byproduct of the combustion needed to run those appliances—which has the intent and
21 effect of prohibiting their use. On information and belief, no existing gas appliance
22 can satisfy the District’s rule. And while the Final Staff Report gestures at the
23 possibility that in the future such gas appliances theoretically could be developed
24 (which would then potentially make the rule fuel neutral), the District’s own analysis

1 acknowledges that complying with the rule involves replacing natural gas appliances
2 with electric alternatives. By effectively banning gas appliances covered by EPCA,
3 the zero-NO_x rule does exactly what the Ninth Circuit held that EPCA preempts.

4 77. The rule does not qualify for any of EPCA's narrow exceptions to
5 preemption.

6 78. On information and belief, neither the District nor the State of California
7 has applied for a waiver from the Secretary of Energy, as would be required for
8 § 6297(d)'s exception. Nor could it lawfully obtain such a waiver. The Secretary is
9 authorized to grant waivers only where the "regulation is needed to meet unusual and
10 compelling State or local energy . . . interests." 42 U.S.C. § 6297(d)(1)(B); *see id.*
11 § 6297(d)(1)(C)(i) (interests must be "substantially different in nature or magnitude
12 than those prevailing in the United States generally"). Even then, EPCA prohibits the
13 Secretary from granting waivers that would "significantly burden manufacturing,
14 marketing, distribution, sale, or servicing of the covered product on a national basis,"
15 *id.* § 6297(d)(3), or where "the State regulation is likely to result in the unavailability
16 in the State of any covered product type (or class) of performance characteristics
17 (including reliability), features, sizes, capacities, and volumes that are substantially the
18 same as those generally available in the State at the time of the" waiver, *id.*
19 § 6297(d)(4).

20 79. Nor can the rule satisfy the exception for certain building code
21 requirements for new construction. The rule is not "contained in a State or local
22 building code" and, in any event, could not meet the exception's seven narrow
23 requirements. 42 U.S.C. § 6297(f)(3).

24 80. Similar to the consumer product provisions, EPCA contains only limited

1 exceptions to the default rule of preemption of state regulations concerning the energy
2 use of industrial appliances. 42 U.S.C. § 6316(b)(2). The District’s gas ban does not
3 qualify for any exception because it is not in a building code (and, in any event, could
4 not meet the building code exception’s requirements), *id.* § 6316(b)(2)(B); is not
5 enumerated in § 6316(b)(2)(C); and has not received and is ineligible for a waiver, *id.*
6 § 6316(b)(2)(D).

7
8 **CAUSE OF ACTION:
FEDERAL PREEMPTION BY THE
ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT**

9 81. Plaintiffs re-allege the preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully
10 herein.

11 82. The District’s zero-NO_x rule is preempted by EPCA.

12 83. The zero-NO_x rule concerns the energy use of EPCA-covered gas
13 appliances by subjecting some of those appliances to zero-NO_x emission limits and
14 thus preventing them from using any energy.

15 84. The rule does not qualify for any of EPCA’s exemptions from preemption
16 because:

- 17 a. The rule has not received—and is not eligible for—a waiver of
18 preemption;
- 19 b. It is not in a building code for new construction and would not qualify
20 for the building code exception even if it were;
- 21 c. It bans gas appliances even when those appliances meet federal
22 standards.

23 85. Plaintiffs and their members will be irreparably harmed if the zero-NO_x
24 rule is enforced. Plaintiffs and their members are already experiencing and will

1 continue to face economic injuries, including lost sales, lost work hours or jobs, the
2 cost to replace appliances and make associated building upgrades and modifications,
3 and the cost of business disruptions or interruptions; their business planning,
4 infrastructure investments, and hiring decisions and job opportunities are and will be
5 affected; and they face compliance burdens associated with the rule.

6 86. Plaintiffs and their members have no adequate remedy at law for these
7 irreparable harms. Unless the District is enjoined from enforcing the zero-NO_x rule,
8 Plaintiffs and their members will continue to be denied their legal rights.

9 87. There will be no significant harm to the District from an injunction
10 because it has no legitimate interest in enforcing invalid regulations. The balance of
11 harms thus favors injunctive relief.

12 88. An injunction is also in the public interest. The public interest is not
13 served by enforcing invalid regulations. Moreover, EPCA embodies a strong public
14 interest in the uniform national regulation of energy conservation and use policy,
15 encouraging diverse domestic supply of energy, ensuring energy security, and
16 protecting consumer choice, all of which is undermined by conflicting local regulations
17 of appliances, including the District's rule.

18 89. Plaintiffs therefore request that the Court (i) declare that the zero-NO_x rule
19 is preempted by EPCA and (ii) enjoin the District from enforcing the rule.

20 **REQUESTED RELIEF**

21 90. Plaintiffs therefore request that the Court award the following relief:

- 22 a. a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) that the District's
23 Rule 1146.2 is preempted by federal law because it concerns the
24 energy use of appliances covered by the federal Energy Policy and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

- Conservation Act and is therefore void and unenforceable;
- b. a permanent injunction enjoining the District from enforcing or attempting to enforce Rule 1146.2's zero-NO_x emissions limits;
 - c. costs of this suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and
 - d. such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

1 Dated: December 5, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

2
3 John J. Davis, Jr. (SBN 65594)
4 jjdavis@msh.law
5 MCCRACKEN, STEMERMAN &
6 HOLSBERY LLP
7 475 – 14th Street, Suite 1200
8 Oakland, CA 94612
9 Tel.: (415) 597-7200; Fax: (415) 597-7201

/s/ Courtland L. Reichman
Courtland L. Reichman (SBN 268873)
creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com
Brian C. Baran (SBN 325939)
bbaran@reichmanjorgensen.com
REICHMAN JORGENSEN
LEHMAN & FELDBERG LLP
100 Marine Parkway, Suite 300
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Tel.: (650) 623-1401; Fax: (650) 560-3501

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff California State
Pipe Trades Council*

Sarah O. Jorgensen (*pro hac vice
forthcoming*)
sjorgensen@reichmanjorgensen.com
REICHMAN JORGENSEN
LEHMAN & FELDBERG LLP
1201 West Peachtree St., Suite 2300
Atlanta, GA 30309
Tel.: (404) 609-1040; Fax: (650) 560-3501

8 Matthew P. Gelfand (SBN 297910)
9 matt@caforhomes.org
10 CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.
11 525 S. Virgil Ave.
12 Los Angeles, California 90020
13 Tel.: (213) 739-8206; Fax: (213) 480-7724

Sean M. Kneafsey (SBN 180863)
skneafsey@kneafseyfirm.com
THE KNEAFSEY FIRM, INC.
707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 3700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel.: (213) 892-1200; Fax: (213) 892-1208

12 *Attorney for Plaintiff Californians for
13 Homeownership, Inc.*

14 Angelo I. Amador (*pro hac vice
15 forthcoming*)
16 aamador@restaurant.org
17 RESTAURANT LAW CENTER
18 2055 L Street, NW, Suite 700
19 Washington, DC 20036
20 Tel.: (202) 331-5913 Fax: (202) 331-2429

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Rinnai America
Corp., Noritz America Corp., National
Association of Home Builders, California
Manufacturers & Technology Association,
California Restaurant Association,
California Hotel & Lodging Association,
and California Apartment Association*

19 *Attorney for Plaintiff Restaurant Law
20 Center*