NEMA
Setting Standards for Excellence

August 1, 2003

DOCKET # 03-AAER-1

California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, Mail Station 4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

NEMA Comments on Proposed Additions/Revisions to Title 20

NEMA is the leading trade association in the United States representing the interests of electroindustry manufacturers. Founded in 1926 and headquartered near Washington, D.C., its 400 member companies manufacture products used in the generation, transmission and distribution, control, and end-use of electricity. Domestic shipments of electrical products within the NEMA scope exceed $100 billion.

General Comments

NEMA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed list of products for standards. NEMA favors high efficiency products because they are good for the public and the economy. We note that many of the products under consideration are subject to current or future federal government actions on efficiency, testing, labeling and/or reporting requirements. As a policy matter, NEMA is opposed to state efforts to set mandatory standards that differ from federal standards, as such efforts save little or no energy and add costs to manufacturers and consumers. NEMA has made its views on this policy matter abundantly clear before the Commission and in court.

California has means other than product standards to improve efficiency. We understand that about $300 million per year is available in California "public benefits funds" for incenting high efficiency product purchases. A review of the rebates available on the CEC website reveals that some programs are out of funds, but that others are not. Perhaps funds could be shifted to programs that are more popular or cost effective. For example, replacement of existing T12 general service fluorescent lamps using magnetic ballasts with T8 lamps using electronic ballasts in commercial buildings could cost effectively save at least 1000 MWe of capacity for lighting energy savings, alone. Significant energy savings would also accrue because of reduced air conditioning load. These energy savings would occur at the annual and daily peak load, maximizing capacity reduction and cost savings. A tax deduction under consideration by the US Congress and supported by environmental and industry groups would provide an incentive to go beyond ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1 commercial building lighting efficiency requirements (similar or the same as the proposed 2005 Title 24 requirements), which would even further increase new buildings and building upgrade efficiency through more efficient lamps, ballasts, controls, and luminaires.

National Electrical
Manufacturers Association

1300 North 17th Street, Suite 1847
Rosslyn, VA 22209
(703) 841-3200
FAX (703) 841-5900

We would appreciate more coordination between the numerous CEC efforts underway to save energy. The AB 549 efforts to identify milestones in an existing building's lifetime where consideration of system upgrades to requirements for new buildings would appear, in concept, to offer the potential for large savings without distorting the product marketplace via Title 20. In another example, there is a defined power density for sign lighting in Title 24, so why should there also be Title 20 requirements for the component efficacy if the overall power density requirements are met? Also, we have not seen any assessment of the cost effectiveness of additional product coverage in Title 20.

Product Specific Comments

1. The US Department of Energy has designated general service incandescent lamps as "covered products" (see Federal Register notice dated September 28, 1994). Federal law preempts State energy efficiency requirements for "covered products". If the CEC has problems with products in the California market it can take advantage of remedies in federal law to get non-complying products off the market. NEMA believes that strong encouragement to replace general service incandescent lamps with Energy Star™ listed compact fluorescent lamps would save far more energy than state standards for general service incandescent lamps. NEMA opposes the CEC proposal on general service incandescent lamps.

2. As pointed out in the CEC materials, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 required DOE to evaluate the merit of regulation of HID lamps. DOE has published a comprehensive draft report for review on this subject; is in the process of determining whether standards are needed; and comments on this report are due to DOE on September 5, 2003. The DOE schedule calls for a determination whether or not to pursue standards by June 2004. The action under DOE consideration would be to establish HID lamp efficacy standards high enough that mercury vapor lamps would not qualify. Without commenting on the merits of the DOE potential standard, whatever the national standard turns out to be it would preempt a state efficiency standard. Also, the DOE report contains a detailed discussion regarding the applications for HID lamps of various types showing the pitfalls inherent in the CEC proposal to use only pulse start lamps. Pulse start lamps are not available in all wattages and in vertical and horizontal burning positions. Unfortunately, there is not a complete line of pulse start sources available today. For those types of lamps/burning positions where pulse start is not available an assessment would be needed to ensure that the efficacy values under consideration by CEC allow probe start technology. Also, proposed Title 24 for 2005 includes lighting power density values that must be met for new buildings and "alterations"; we do not see the need for product standards since the building standard must be met. NEMA opposes the CEC proposal on HID lamps.

3. We agree that LED channel letters are appropriate for sign lighting. Many internally illuminated signs use MH sources whereas the CEC materials indicate that internally illuminated signs only use fluorescent sources. The electronic ballast requirement should apply only to fluorescent sources. Electronic ballast technology is not commercially viable for electronic HID sign lighting. Requirements for signs should be divided by product category: channel letters; box signs; and video billboards are not similar at all. This measure does not mention standard billboards. Since standard billboards are typically illuminated with high efficacy sources, we presume that standard billboards are exempted from this proposed standard.

4. Standards for modular furniture task lighting could be handled in prescriptive requirements in Title 24. Requirements for high efficacy luminaries could be added in Section 146, for example.

5. I had requested an opportunity for hearing on the Title 20 illuminated exit signs requirements and it was agreed to by CEC. It is not clear where that matter stands with respect to this proceeding. Will exit signs be part of this proceeding or a separate one?

6. Energy legislation pending in the US Congress may require standby power rulemakings, which could set federal standards other than those contained in the CEC materials. We are working with members who manufacture these products and reserve the right to comment later on proposals for these products.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Kear

Director, Energy Policy

Dear Dockets Personnel;

Please docket the attached 3 documents into Docket #04-AAER-1.

These items were originally docketed in 03-AAER-1, but have been referenced by submittals in the new docket, requiring us to place them in the new docket.

Thanks,

Jim Holland