



KYLE PITSOR

Vice President, Government Relations

October 20, 2011

Submitted via email

Ms. Karen Douglas
Commissioner
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

NEMA Comments on CCR Title 20 45 Day Language Regarding Exit and Life Safety Signage

The National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) appreciates the opportunity to provide the attached comments the subject 45 Day Language as published by CEC along with the Notice of Proposed Action on October 7, 2011.

As you may know, NEMA is the association of electrical equipment manufacturers, founded in 1926 and headquartered in Arlington, Virginia. Its member companies manufacture a diverse set of products including power transmission and distribution equipment, lighting systems, factory automation and control systems, and medical diagnostic imaging systems. Worldwide annual sales of NEMA-scope products exceed \$120 billion. These comments are submitted on behalf of NEMA Emergency Lighting section companies.

NEMA reiterates our position that not just Exit Signs, as defined in Title 20 Section 1602 (l) be exempt from energy efficiency regulations, but also Egress Lighting products due to their similar status as Life Safety equipment. These categories are exempt from Federal Regulation owing to their safety-related function, and the already stringent and detailed application and performance requirements placed on them by both the State of California and National Electrical Codes. The fact that life safety lighting equipment is situated in so many buildings is because it is required for safety reasons. The equipment's prevalence and associated power consumption should not be misconstrued as a potential for energy savings.

We also propose the current definition of an Exit Sign as per the above mentioned clause 1602 (l) be clarified to ensure that combination units which have both an Exit Sign and Egress Lighting fall under the Exit Sign definition as pertains to energy efficiency requirements for battery chargers. Exit Signs are exempted in the draft proposal due to their Life Safety service. Combination units typically have a single battery and charging circuit which powers both features. One cannot modify one without affecting the other. We suggest modifying the scope exemption for Exit Signs in the proposed amendment document (CEC-400-2011-005-45-DAY) to read: 1601 (w) (3) used to charge a battery or batteries in an illuminated exit sign, as defined in Section 1602(l) (this includes combination Exit Sign and Egress Lighting units);

If you have any questions on these comments, please contact Alex Boesenberg of NEMA at 703-841-3268 or alex.boesenberg@nema.org.

Sincerely,

Kyle Pitsor
Vice President, Government Relations

**National Electrical
Manufacturers Association**

1300 North 17th Street, Suite 1752
Rosslyn, VA 22209
(703) 841-3274
FAX (703) 841-3374
kyl_pitsor@nema.org

NEMA comments to August 31, 2011 CEC Scoping Workshop to Discuss and Seek Comments from Interested Parties Regarding Potential Topics for Future Appliance Efficiency Rulemakings

Background

A Stakeholder meeting was held August 31, 2011 at the CEC Sacramento offices to review proposals and presentations regarding recommendations for Potential Topics for Future Appliance Efficiency Rulemakings. Following this meeting, NEMA and its members have reviewed and discussed the proposals and discussions made there and provide the below response to those topics as well as our own observations for where resources would be best applied.

General Remarks

NEMA again thanks the Commissioner and the CEC for the opportunity to attend and comment and for your past efforts and collaboration to develop more, better standards which increase energy savings. The lighting industry has a long history of innovation and progress.

One of the points that stood out in the presentations given on lighting energy usage is that while lighting continues to be a noticeable portion of national energy usage, the actual percentage would appear to be in steady decline. If this impression is accurate, it bears witness to the energy savings already realized through lighting improvements. While some of the technologies presented at the workshop would seem to be increasing energy use through increasing sales, lighting products are reducing overall energy use despite the increase sales of products. We believe this is because the products being sold are so much more efficient than their forebears, and because building codes (such as Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations) have reduced energy use in buildings by requiring the use of some lighting controls. The adoption and deployment of high-efficiency lighting is successfully decreasing lighting-related energy use.

Comments on Investor Owned Utility Presentations:

Regarding the presentations made on behalf of the IOUs, NEMA provides the following feedback: (file titled "IOU_Title_20_August_31_2011_Scoping_Workshop_FINAL")

- 1) Regarding Dimming Ballasts: We suggest that Ballast Luminous Efficacy (BLE) be the preferred criteria for efficiency and note that an approved test procedure exists at the Federal level. NEMA is working on proposals for BLE limits in the Federal Rulemaking process. Stand-by power limits have not been discussed by industry, although a DOE test procedure does exist.
- 2) Regarding Multifaceted Reflector Lamps: We do not agree with the estimates on sales volume, and believe the resulting energy-savings forecasts are overly optimistic. Furthermore, as presented the proposal is more along the lines of a lighting quality standard, not an energy standard and as such should not be included in Title 20.
- 3) Regarding proposals for LED/SSL Lamps: We see any effort in this area as detrimental for two reasons. Firstly, there is great opportunity for conflict and discord with the Energy Star Lamps program, which applies to these products. Secondly, because this technology is still emerging and evolving it is unwise to regulate in this area because it may stifle innovation. Leaving aside top-tier products for a moment and addressing concerns of inferior products and potential harm to consumer acceptance of SSL, NEMA echoes these concerns and is finalizing a standard (NEMA SSL-4) which addresses minimum performance criteria for SSL products.
- 4) Regarding Outdoor Lighting: NEMA and its members generally agree with the proposals for Street and Roadway luminaires. Regarding luminaires associated with Buildings, these luminaires should be regulated by Title 24 through overall energy use requirements.
- 5) Regarding Lighting Accessories: We are against regulation of these very small loads. There is no evidence that their installed base is increasing significantly. Further, decorative light strings are used only for a small part of the year and the installed base of night lights is very small and the average wattage is small. The application of resources to this minimal-use sector will not yield a beneficial return on investment.
- 6) Regarding Lamps Exempt in EISA 2007: We must correct the inaccurate statement that all incandescent lamp designs can incorporate a halogen capsule, this is not true. For example, some smaller lamp types that cannot

safely incorporate a capsule due to heat considerations and some reflector lamp designs cannot incorporate a halogen capsule in the existing shape and achieve required light pattern or light distribution. Additionally, it is our position that sales volumes on these lamps are so low that the required investment by industry will not have a payback. In conclusion, regulation of these products might kill the market.

- 7) Regarding Linear Fluorescent fixtures. The requested information should be and in many cases is on specifications (“cut sheets”) – which is where designers need it. These products are not aimed at the average consumer.

In summary, NEMA and its members agree with the proposals which address large market share products for which energy savings are still feasible without burdensome redesign and testing. We disagree with the proposals that focus on lighting quality and consumer acceptance because these are not energy-related topics. Lastly, we disagree with any proposals that address products already highly regulated, or exempt, by the Federal government owing to the resulting disconnects between products and markets that must satisfy two different sets of requirements.

Comments on the Remarks from CLTC:

It is the position of NEMA and its members that health issues should not be addressed by the California Energy Commission. These issues are more properly addressed by medical and health authorities. Numerous studies have been done and are being done to address these issues in more appropriate offices. Also, we wish to correct a statement or inference that non-dimmable CFLs are not safe for use when operated on dimmers. An extensive destructive test performed by Underwriters Laboratories (UL) on hundreds of products determined that UL-listed products fail safely when put into worst-case conditions and driven to failure on purpose. A copy of the report is available from UL.

Moving Forward

NEMA looks forward to assisting in the proposal process, and hopes the Commission will agree with our suggestions of where to focus. We wish to echo our comments at the workshop that component level energy savings are reaching diminishing returns. At the same time, systems-based energy solutions are clearly showing a much higher potential for energy savings versus individual component discussions. The U.S. Department of Energy has recently opened discussions on the matter of a Lighting Systems Rule. We submit that the best opportunities for energy savings lay in properly designed, installed, commissioned and maintained lighting systems. How to address this at the high level is a significant challenge, but we believe that putting most of our commission, industry and stakeholder energies into further developments in Title 24 will yield better returns than focusing on Title 20. The Commission and the stakeholders represent a significant source of experience and talent. NEMA again asks you to join us in tackling the challenge of the systems solution.

The critical point is the arguable lack of resources, for all of us, to do both these numerous component codes and the systems solution at the same time. We ask for your help on the systems solution and the relief on component regulations so we may all more fully concentrate on the greater potential savings area.