Makita U.S.A., Inc. Regulatory & Compliance Department

41850 Christy Street, Fremont, CA 94538, (510) 657-9881, Fax. (510) 657 -9910 www.makitatools.com

| DOCKET | |
|---|---|
| 09-AAER-2 | |
| DATE | Mar 15 2011 |
| RECD. | Mar 15 2011 |

March 15, 2011

California Energy Commission
Dockets Office, MS-4
Re: Docket no. 09-AAER-2
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

To: California Energy Commission:

RE: Follow-up Comments to the Staff Comments Provided to the Proposed Title 20 California Efficiency Standards for Battery Charger Systems CASE Report Version 2.2.2 (Docket no. 09-AAER-2)

Makita U.S.A., Inc., which is based in California, would like the California Energy Commission to consider the following additional comments to the proposed BC requirements provided in the CASE initiative For PY2010 Title 20 Standards Development version 2.2.2, modified October 1, 2010 and modified again in Staff Report dated March 2011.

**General Comments:**

As stated in our past comments Makita has been a global power tool manufacturer and distributor for over 50 years and is known as a global leader in battery power tools. Makita has more than forty overseas subsidiaries in over thirty countries with factories in seven countries including the United States.

Makita has always been concerned with using technology to develop more energy efficient chargers and was the first power tool company to have a battery charger approved by Energy Star.

The following are additional comments that we would like the Commission to consider in their review of the issues involved in this proposal:

**Power Factor Issue:**

- The analysis in annex "B" of the report indicates that 0.90 PF will only apply to about 2% of battery chargers. The reality is that this proposal will apply to all our chargers.

- The analysis indicates that the PF requirements can be met with no additional costs. Well we see a real cost that will be associated with the required changes for PF on our chargers and in some of our designs it would represent an increase in cost to the consumer as high as $23.00.

- The analysis also states that the "savings estimates given here are quite approximate"; This leads one to believe these numbers are not accurate for all cases and in fact the report suggests further research is recommended.

- The report also discusses the fact that the calculations used; "actually use some very simple assumptions for these quantities". It is believed that the assumptions do not properly reflect battery power tool charger use and causes us concern.

- The report uses a model that assumes our chargers would be charging for 3 hours/day.

    - This type of usage is not likely for our fast chargers which charges batteries in 15 minutes. If you run the numbers, the model assumes that the charger would charge 12 batteries /day which is obviously not a practical use of a cordless tool.

    - In addition the model assumes the charger would be used in this manner for 365 days / year another unlikely projected usage.

    - Using the report's model the charger would be charging 4,380 batteries/year a usage that would clearly never occur.

  This model is clearly not applicable to our product line and makes any type of calculated Energy Savings very suspect.

  We believe that the actual PF energy savings for battery power tool fast chargers is very minimal. At best, only a very small fraction of any of the estimated savings would be realized; making this required change not a cost effective energy saving means for the consumer.

  Therefore, the subject should be further studied for power tool type battery chargers before requiring such changes to this category of chargers or it should be removed from the requirements until proper research on the subject can be conducted.

## Effective Dates:

It has been proposed that these requirements would be published July 2011 with an effective date of 2012. This would give all manufacturers only one year to bring all of their products in line with the requirements.

The one year time frame is not a practical time period to make the necessary changes to a large number of charger products in our line.

As you can imagine due to the current economic situation many companies have kept their staffing lean in all departments in order to ride out the economic down turn. We are no exception to this trend, and due to the fact that our developmental resources are limited, it is not possible for us to be able to make all the changes to the many charger models affected by this proposal within a one year period.

There are design issues, performance testing, safety testing, parts procurement, applications to NRTL testing labs and manufacturing arrangements that just take time in order to produce something.

In light of these concerns we would request that an effective time period of 2 to 3 years be applied to this requirement. Our experience in the past with safety standards, where safety issues are addressed; the effective period of 2 to 3 years is used on a regular bases for effective dates. It is believed that if an effective date of 2 to 3 years can be used for safety related issues, this same time period should be more than suitable for this energy saving proposals.

**Chargers as Replacement Parts:**

The current proposal is allowing for the non compliant chargers to be sold as replacement parts up to 5 years after the effective date. We agree with the intention of this proposal however, we would like to recommend that this date be pushed out to 10 years for power tool chargers.

Our users tend to purchase a number of power tools that run on the same platform battery/charger systems. These tools, if cared for, can last a long period of time. Many times this collection of tools can run into the thousands of dollars and it would most definitely be a hardship for many end-users/contractors who have made the investment but it becomes worthless without a replacement charger.

We feel that after a 10 year period the impact of not having a replacement charger would be minimized to the end-user.

## In Conclusion

As stated in our previous comments and further highlighted in these follow-up comments, that there are major concerns for powered tool battery chargers with this proposal. The statements point out the fact that the energy efficiency levels selected are unrealistic, that preliminary testing is demonstrating many Energy Star approved chargers will not pass the proposed limits, that the proposed power factor of 0.90 would eliminated a very large percentage of chargers on the market with the actual energy gains being very unclear and that an unreasonable effective date is being proposed.

Due to all of the issues listed above it is recommend that the CEC consider the following options:

1) Breaking out the category for power tool battery chargers from this proposal and developing a separate category with efficiency limits that would more properly be representative of these type of products and their usages.

OR

2) Remove this product category from this proposal completely knowing that in the near future the DOE will be providing power tool battery charger requirements that are currently projected to be established by 2013.

Your time and effort in considering our comments to this proposal are appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stan Rodrigues
Manager, Regulatory & Compliance Dept.
Makita USA, Inc.