DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	22-AAER-04
Project Title:	2022 Amendments to the Appliance Efficiency Regulations
TN #:	254709
Document Title:	Transcript for Jan 9 public hearing
Description:	This file is the transcript of the public hearing held on Tuesday, January 9, 2024 for the federal alignment rulemaking proceeding
Filer:	Peter Strait
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	2/27/2024 4:11:29 PM
Docketed Date:	2/27/2024

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
In the matter of:
Public Hearing - ) Federal and Administrative ) Docket No. 22-AAER-04 Updates to Title 20, CCR ) )
CEC PUBLIC HEARING ON
FEDERAL ALIGNMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES
TO TITLE 20, CCR SECTIONS 1601-1609
REMOTE ACCESS VIA ZOOM
TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2024
10:00 A.M.
Reported by:
Elise Hicks

## APPEARANCES

## STAFF

Peter Strait, Manager, Appliances Branch

Corrine Fishman, Regulations Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT

Laura Petrillo-Groh, Air-Condition, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute

Alex Baker, National Electrical Manufacturers Association

Jacob Cassady, Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers

INDEX	
	PAGE
1. Introduction	4
2. Public Comment	9
3. Adjournment	19

1 PROCEDINGS 2 10:00 a.m. 3 TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2023 4 MR. STRAIT: Good morning, everyone. I'm Peter 5 Strait, manager of the Appliances Branch of the California 6 Energy Commission. 7 Welcome to the public hearing for the federal and administrative updates to the Title 20 Appliance Efficiency 8 9 Regulations. 10 Next. There we go. 11 So the purpose of this public hearing is to 12 receive verbal comments on the proposed regulatory 13 language. All documents related to this rulemaking can be 14 found on the California Energy Commission's website in 15 docket number 22-AAER-02, and that will include a copy of 16 this presentation. No decisions will be made today at this 17 public hearing. 18 This public hearing is being recorded by a court 19 reporter as well as on Zoom, and all statements made today 20 will become part of the public record. 21 And finally, all comments that are received today 22 and previous comments received during the written comment 23 period will be reviewed by the California Commission. 24 Responses to all comments will be made available in the 25 public in the final rulemaking package.

Here are some general rules for this public
 hearing.

3 First, all of the attendee lines are muted. 4 Comments will be taken at the end of the presentation. For 5 general clarifying questions, please type your question into the Q&A section rather than making a verbal comment. 6 7 To comment verbally, please use the 'raise hand' function to speak. For those that are online, we will raise your 8 9 hand, and then I as the host can give you the ability to speak, and then you would then unmute yourself. So it's a 10 11 two-step process.

For those joining via phone, you can raise your hand by pushing star nine and the host will give you the ability to speak. Remembering that star six then will mute and unmute yourself. Please make sure to state your name and affiliation at the beginning of your comment.

So here's the short agenda for today's public hearing. First we'll start by providing a brief overview of the rulemaking, including the main components of the proposed changes. Next we'll discuss the ruling timeline and what comes after this public hearing. And then lastly we'll open it for public comments.

The goal of this rulemaking, the purpose of it, is to provide alignment with current federal appliance standards and to make other necessary administrative

1 updates to California's appliance efficiency standards.
2 These are as found in Title 20 of Section 1601 through 1609
3 of the California Code of Regulations.
4 This rulemaking is not proposing any new state5 level efficiency standards for appliances, nor is it
6 proposing any increase in the stringency of current state
7 efficiency standards.

8 The proposed changes fall into five general 9 categories.

First, the first and largest category is updates to align with current federal law, for example, to ensure that references to federal tech efficiency standards are current. The majority of proposed changes fall into this category.

15 The second category includes updates to our data 16 submittal requirements and processes. The proposed changes 17 to \$1606 and Table X largely fall into this category.

Third is the removal of a redundant specification in the marking requirements for commercial and industrial fans and blowers found in §1607(d)16. With the proposed change, models are required to be marked legibly but are not required to use a specific font size, ensuring that products of varying sizes can be marked appropriately.

Fourth are updates to our regulations governing administrative proceedings, including compliance review and

enforcement proceedings. The proposed changes to \$1608 and
 \$1609 largely fall into this category.

Lastly, we have taken the opportunity to make other administrative and non-substantive improvements to the text of the regulations to help ensure clarity and consistency. An example is a proposed renumbering of certain tables in \$1607(d)12(c).

8 All of these proposed changes are described in 9 the initial statement of reasons and are shown in the 10 proposed regulatory language, both of which are available 11 on our website via our docket.

12 On-screen is a very simple rulemaking timeline. 13 Since this rulemaking does not propose any new performance 14 standards, the timeline is a little shorter than 15 traditional appliance rulemakings. This rulemaking 16 eventually began with publishing the Notice of Proposed 17 Action, Initial Statement of Reasons, and the Proposed 18 Regulatory Language, also referred to sometimes as the 19 "Express Terms." The publishing of these documents 20 initiated the 45-day written public comment period. This 21 comment period ended yesterday on January 8th.

Next is this public hearing, which is the event today. This is another opportunity for CEC staff to receive comments on this rule. Following this public hearing, the rulemaking will be presented at an Energy

Commission business meeting for adoption. It's anticipated
 that this item will be presented at the March business
 meeting.

If adopted, the rulemaking package will be sent 4 5 to the Office of Administrative Law for review. Ιf approved by OAL, the rulemaking will take effect and the 6 7 proposed changes will be incorporated into Title 20. OAL's review is primarily to ensure that we followed process, so 8 9 they're not reviewing the substance of the rulemaking so much as ensuring we actually undertook all of the steps 10 11 required to ensure the public was provided the opportunity 12 to participate.

The 45-day comment period, public hearing, and business meetings are all opportunities for the public to comment. For more information or questions, please feel free to contact me or to contact Corinne Fishman, who is our Regulations Manager.

Thank you for your time today. We do hope that this presentation was helpful and, again, this slide deck will be added to the docket if you would like to review it later, and a transcript of today's hearing will be posted once one is available.

This concludes the presentation, so we will nowopen up the platform for formal comments.

25

As stated earlier, to comment verbally, please

1 use the raised hand function to speak. That'll identify 2 you so that we can then find you and allow you to speak. 3 And then remember, also, once we have given you permission 4 to speak, that you might also have to unmute yourself. 5 So I see we have 35 attendees online. Hopefully 6 we won't need to impose any timing requirements for 7 comments, but if we do receive a large volume of comments, 8 if it looks like we won't be able to hear everyone, we may 9 impose a three-minute or potentially a two-minute limit to 10 comments, but for now we're going to avoid doing so to the 11 amount that we can. 12 I'm seeing one raised hand from Laura Petrillo-13 Groh so, Laura, I'm going to allow you to talk. You may 14 now unmute yourself. 15 MS. PETRILLO-GROH: Hi, Peter. This is Laura 16 Petrillo-Groh with AHRI. 17 Can you hear me okay? 18 MR. STRAIT: Yes. Welcome to the call. 19 MS. PETRILLO-GROH: Thank you. 20 AHRI represents over 300 manufacturers of air 21 conditioning, heating, and refrigeration equipment, and we 22 very much appreciate the careful review that you and your 23 team have put into this proposal. It is -- we appreciate, 24 with respect to fans, the current scope is maintained and 25 the speed at which you put out these changes is

1 appreciated.

2 I will say that AHRI written comments highlight a 3 few questions or considerations that we might have on some 4 of the proposed changes, particularly with respect to 5 commercial and industrial fans. The adopted definition, or proposed adopted definition, for AEDM under the air 6 7 conditioners, air filters, and heat pump water heating packages is specific to residential central air 8 9 conditioners and heat pumps, but there is a new definition 10 for AEDM under fans, and we want to make sure that the AEDM 11 provisions are preserved for the stand-alone fans. It's 12 very important that this federal test procedure permits the 13 use of AEDMs for fans.

And also that -- the definition that's currently proposed, there's a little conflict there. The definition that's currently proposed is site-specific residential, air conditioner, and heat-pump metrics, and there are many other products under a federal efficiency standard that do permit the use of AEDMs.

So we have proposed two ways to rectify this in our comments. Either adopt a broader definition of AEDM that does not reference specific metric, but really just the portions of the federal code that outline which products are permitted in the AEDM provisions in federal law. Alternatively, to add AEDM definitions that are

specific to all the products that are federally regulated
 that permit the use of AEDMs.

3 So those were just -- I just wanted to highlight 4 there that we support the use of AEDMs for commercial and 5 industrial fans and for all federally regulated products 6 that currently use AEDMs.

7

MR. STRAIT: Uh-huh.

8 MS. PETRILLO-GROH: So thanks, if you would 9 consider that comment.

10 And then the other, I think, pressing issue that 11 we wanted to note today has to do with several -- has to do 12 with a federal rule that is currently being conducted right 13 now, which is the DOE had sought feedback on a notice of 14 proposed rulemaking on certification requirements, labor 15 requirements, and enforcement provisions for consumer and 16 commercial equipment, and AHRI provided incident feedback 17 to the Department of Energy on that proposal. And we would -- those comments were attached with our CEC comments 18 19 because we want to make you and your team aware of those 20 changes that may -- in federal law -- that may also need to 21 be reflected in Title 20, and then onto the made submission 22 forms.

23 So we're hoping that you all will be able to work 24 with DOE and ensure that there's consistent and harmonized 25 reporting requirements for federally regulated products

1 without the need to --2 MR. STRAIT: Yeah. 3 MS. PETRILLO-GROH: -- go through multiple 4 rulemaking cycles. 5 So I just wanted to call your attention to that, and I'm happy to go over any feedback with CEC on this and 6 7 with our data services team if that's helpful in the future. 8 9 So thank you again for your attention to these comments and we appreciate it. Thanks. 10 11 MR. STRAIT: Absolutely. 12 I can say that our intent is not to make this a 13 regular occurrence, that we'll conduct one of these 14 rulemakings possibly every other year or every third year. 15 Our goal is not to have to do this every couple of months. 16 So certainly we'll take a look at what you've 17 pointed out for the DOE proceeding, and our technical staff 18 will follow up with you if we have any questions about the 19 technical substance of the comments, but thank you for 20 submitting the written material. 21 MS. PETRILLO-GROH: Thank you, Peter. 22 MR. STRAIT: You're welcome. 23 I see that Alex Baker, you've raised your hand. 24 I'm going to allow you to talk, so please go ahead and 25 unmuted yourself.

MR. BAKER: Good morning, Peter. Thank you.
 Alex Baker with the National Electrical Manufacturers
 Association.

I just wanted to thank you and the Commission for your efforts on this rulemaking. I've got a few other NEMA members on the line.

Following along today, we entered a letter with our commentary on the proposed amendments. We have one question: the ordering of the process here. We're sort of accustomed to having the public hearing precede the end of the comment period. And we're just wondering, is this a change that we should expect to see in future rulemakings as well?

MR. STRAIT: This is a change you should expect to see in future rulemakings. It comes from some of the particulars of the Administrative Procedures Act.

17 So previously we would have a hearing at the 18 start of the public comment period that would basically not 19 count toward that APA requirement, and then we would need 20 to have one after the public comment period. We would 21 normally use the business meeting for that purpose. But we 22 found that that created some procedural issues. So now we 23 are holding one public hearing after the close of the 24 comment period to satisfy that Administrative Procedures 25 Act requirement.

1 We may in the future also have a hearing that is 2 earlier on, and for our non-formal rulemaking portions of 3 what we do, we tend to have it early in the public comment 4 period. So we'll have a hearing that helps to explain to 5 the public, "here is what this document contains," or "here are the questions we're interested in knowing about". 6 7 But for rulemakings, yes, this is going to be the 8 pattern going forward. 9 MR. BAKER: Okay. I would just say that we've found it helpful in 10 11 the past to be part of the public hearing in advance, 12 because it often aids our understanding in what the 13 commission's intent is, and then it informs our comments 14 that we submit later. 15 MR. STRAIT: Uh-huh. 16 MR. BAKER: So there has been value in that order 17 of things in the past, but thanks for clarifying. 18 MR. STRAIT: Certainly. 19 Do you have any other public comments on the 20 materials? 21 MR. BAKER: That's it for today, Peter. 22 Thank you. 23 MR. STRAIT: Thank you. 24 I see that Jacob Cassady has raised their hand. 25 Jacob, I'm allowing you to talk. Please go ahead

1 and unmute yourself.

2 MR. CASSADY: Thank you, Peter. Jacob Cassady 3 with the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers. 4 I want to just start out by echoing NEMA's 5 comments. I completely have everything ready to submit, and I will admit on the record I didn't. I thought this 6 7 workshop would help just kind of guide -- just making sure we have what the commission is looking for. If there is 8 9 any way for an extension, I humbly request it. As I said, 10 things are ready to go. 11 There's really only two things that I want to 12 point out. One is, it appears that for commercial cooking, 13 the -- now I'm trying to find where I have it, sorry -that the cooking section appears to reference an outdated 14 15 test procedure for commercial cooktop efficiency. 16 MR. STRAIT: Hmm. 17 MR. CASSADY: The latest version is ASTM F1521-12R18. 18 19 MR. STRAIT: Uh-huh. 20 MR. CASSADY: And then I just want -- with the 21 clothes washers under \$1604(1)(j), my understanding is it's 22 not used by manufacturers until the 2028 DOE compliance 23 date. 24 So it wasn't much. We appreciate the efforts to 25 continue to harmonize with federal regulations, and again

1 just humbly request a bit of an extension since this is a
2 change.
3 So thank you for listening to my comments.
4 MR. STRAIT: Sure.
5 I would direct you to go ahead and submit
6 whatever written material you have to the docket.

7 Materials that are received outside of the public comment 8 period we are not obligated under law to respond to in 9 writing, but having that supporting material for the 10 comments that you've made at this hearing would be on the 11 record.

12 So, I can direct staff to consider those 13 materials so that there's more specificity in tracking down 14 that test procedure, for example, and ensuring we have the 15 correct reference.

MR. CASSADY: Thank you.

16

MS. FISHMAN: Peter, may I weigh in for a moment?MR. STRAIT: Sure.

MS. FISHMAN: Hi, everyone. This is Corinne
Fishman. I'm the regulations manager here at California
Energy Commission.

And I just want to make a distinction between what a pre-rulemaking workshop is to discuss underlying actions and an APA hearing, which is to provide a forum for verbal comments once the 45-day has begun. So this is not

1 a workshop.

2	A workshop is done in pre-rulemaking. And then
3	we are required by the Administrative Procedures Act to
4	offer a public comment period once the rulemaking opens,
5	but we cannot offer that sooner than the last day of the
6	45-day comment period. So we typically do it the day
7	following the end of the 45-day comment period. So this is
8	an APA public hearing where we are looking for oral comment
9	following our written comment period, which is very
10	different from the pre-rulemaking workshop, so I hope that
11	kind of clarifies what this is versus what a workshop is.
12	Generally, because this was an update, there may
13	not have been as many workshops pre-rulemaking as we
14	normally would in a regular rulemaking, and maybe that's
15	where the confusion came in. But I did want to clarify
16	between those two things.
17	Thanks.
18	MR. STRAIT: I would add that, in part because
19	this is a cleanup rulemaking, we didn't have a staff report
20	document like we would if we were proposing standards that
21	has a lot of analysis in it.
22	So those documents also will typically have a
23	like a pre-rulemaking publication have a workshop or a
24	public process on that document. But since we don't have
25	one of those documents for here, that's also a way in which

1 this was all a bit of a faster process. 2 MS. FISHMAN: And this was not a current change. 3 This is a procedural change that we made several years ago 4 to hold an APA public hearing. 5 So thanks everybody. We appreciate your 6 comments. 7 MR. STRAIT: Alright. So I'm not seeing any other raised hands, so I 8 9 just want to do a quick check. Does anyone else want to 10 make any public comment as a part of this public hearing? 11 Alright. 12 Since I'm not seeing any additional hands raised, 13 I'll go ahead and conclude this public hearing. 14 I do want to thank everyone who reviewed the 15 material and participated by submitting comments either 16 orally today or written comments to the record. 17 As mentioned, if folks do have additional written 18 materials to submit, I would recommend submitting them. Whether or not we are able to issue a formal extension of 19 20 the period, it is better to have them in rather than to 21 leave them out. 22 Otherwise, again, we're very grateful for 23 everyone's efforts to help us in maintaining the currency 24 of our code, ensuring correct references to federal law, 25 and making general administrative improvements wherever we

can. So thank you very much everyone. Oh, I will -- let me check chat and Q&A. Okay. So the chat just echoes someone else's comment, and then the Q&A is just echoing someone else's comment. So I think we are in good shape to conclude the hearing. Thank you everyone and I hope you have a great rest of your day. (The public hearing adjourned at 10:21 a.m.) 

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 30th day of January, 2024.

ELISE HICKS, IAPRT CERT\*\*2176

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Martha L. Nelson

January 30, 2024

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT\*\*367