

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	16-BSTD-02
<b>Project Title:</b>	2016 Nonresidential Lighting Alteration Enforcement
<b>TN #:</b>	210740
<b>Document Title:</b>	Mike Stone Comments: Enforcement of 2016 Nonresidential Lighting Alterations
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Mike Stone
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	3/15/2016 3:04:25 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	3/15/2016

*Comment Received From: Mike Stone*

*Submitted On: 3/15/2016*

*Docket Number: 16-BSTD-02*

## **Enforcement of 2016 Nonresidential Lighting Alterations**

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

March 15, 2016

California Energy Commission  
Dockets Office, MS-4  
Re: Docket No. 16-BSTD-02  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
[docket@energy.ca.gov](mailto:docket@energy.ca.gov)

RE: 2016 Nonresidential Lighting Alterations Enforcement

My name is Mike Stone, I am the West Coast Field Representative for the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA). I am also the Secretary for the Northern California Chapter of the International Association of Electrical Inspectors (IAEI). I am writing to express concern over how the new requirements for nonresidential lighting alterations will be enforced.

The new 2016 standards allow an exemption for advanced lighting controls in an alteration if the installation is 30-50% more efficient than the existing. However, to verify the baseline of 30-50% efficiency, some type of pre-inspection will need to be done. This requirement for verifying the existing baseline does not exist in the current 2013 standards. Without verification of this existing baseline, this exception is ripe for abuse by owners and contractors who are mainly looking at the bottom line cost of an installation.

Requiring Building Departments to perform this pre-inspection would be a burden on them as it would entail an extra trip to document existing conditions. They typically inspect projects after work is done to verify compliance, not before. Most Building Departments would be hard pressed to have to conduct yet more inspections.

Given that the 2016 standards are already adopted, I suggest that the best alternative to ensure compliance is to use third party verification through the Commission's certified acceptance tester process. Certified acceptance testers are trained to identify the efficiency of existing luminaires and can accurately document the existing baseline.

Historically, enforcement of the California Energy Code has been robust and generally taken seriously by Building Departments. This new requirement that uses an existing baseline that is not verifiable is unprecedented in the history of Title 24 Part 6 as well as the other codes. The success that California has had in saving energy should not be watered down by allowing self-inspection or self-certification. This is bad policy and California should not go down that path.

Sincerely,

Mike Stone  
NEMA West Coast Field Representative  
IAEI Northern California Chapter, Secretary  
(707) 495-8424 cell  
[Mike.stone@nema.org](mailto:Mike.stone@nema.org)