

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	16-BSTD-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	2013 Compliance Option for Nonresidential Lighting Alterations
<b>TN #:</b>	210864
<b>Document Title:</b>	Stan Walerczyk Comments: Should Title 24 Be An Obstacle For Lighting Retrofits?
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Stan Walerczyk
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	3/25/2016 1:47:02 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	3/25/2016

*Comment Received From: Stan Walerczyk*

*Submitted On: 3/25/2016*

*Docket Number: 16-BSTD-01*

## **Should Title 24 Be An Obstacle For Lighting Retrofits?**

Dear Sirs and Madams

Should Title 24 Be An Obstacle For Lighting Retrofits?

CEC, please respond, because this is very important.

The CEC should take credit that before July 1, 2014, Title 24 was not an obstacle for lighting retrofits.

Does the CEC accept that the 2013 Title 24 has been a major obstacle for lighting retrofits and admit there is no realistic justification for what it did?

Does the CEC really think that even modified 15 day language is the best way to remove obstacles for lighting retrofit? If so, what is the rationale, compared to other options?

Does the CEC think that the potential 35%/50% rule is fair to end-customers, who have done previous retrofits and want to do re-retrofits, even though they may not be able to save 35% or 50%?

Does the CEC think that planning time and 3 year cycles still work, when lighting and controls are evolving so quickly?

Does the CEC think it can do better than the free market with lighting retrofits?

CEC, please let everybody know why you do not think that going back to before July 1, 2014 or having no Title 24 for lighting retrofits would be much better than anything you have proposed.

Stan

P.S. In a previous letter, I mentioned Prop 38, which should have been Prop 39. Without Prop 39 funds, there would be less lighting retrofits.

Stan Walerczyk, CLEP, HCLS

Principal of lighting Wizards

808-344-9685

stan@lightingwizards.com