

## DOCKETED

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Docket Number:</b>   | 15-AAER-06   |
| <b>Project Title:</b>   | Small Diameter Directional LED Lamps and General Purpose LED Lamps |
| <b>TN #:</b>            | 208957   |
| <b>Document Title:</b>  | Ann Sparks Comments: Docket Number 15-AAER-06                      |
| <b>Description:</b>     | N/A  |
| <b>Filer:</b>           | System   |
| <b>Organization:</b>    | Ann Sparks   |
| <b>Submitter Role:</b>  | Public   |
| <b>Submission Date:</b> | 1/25/2016 8:56:25 AM   |
| <b>Docketed Date:</b>   | 1/19/2016  |

*Comment Received From: Ann Sparks*

*Submitted On: 1/25/2016*

*Docket Number: 15-AAER-06*

## **Docket Number 15-AAER-06**

Dear California Energy Commission,

Dear Commissioner McAllister:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised 15-day proposal for small diameter directional LED lamps and General Purpose LED Lamps published on January 7, 2016.

The California Energy Commission (CEC) has proposed that general service LED lamps manufactured on or after January 1, 2018 shall have a CRI of 82 or greater and individual color scores (R) of 72 or greater. These new regulations provide an optimal combination of key performance attributes, luminous efficacy, color rendering and longevity.

The proposed standards provide an opportunity for Californians to save \$4 billion over the next 13 years. By 2029, the standards will be saving about 3,000 Gwh per year, which is equivalent to about 400,000 average homes indefinitely or avoiding the construction of one 500 MW power plant. That means 10.3 million metric tons of CO2 avoided between 2017 and 2029, which is equivalent to the emissions of about 168,000 cars.

However, opponents of the proposal want to weaken the standards, which will harm the reputation of LED lighting, thereby chipping away at potential monetary and energy savings, thwarting efforts to fight climate change and making them less enjoyable.

As a consumer, I don't want to see the standards weakened because it means I save less money, the planet suffers and I don't get to enjoy quality lighting at a price I can afford. I support the CEC's proposal and reject the opposition's efforts to weaken the standards.

Sincerely,

Ann Sparks