DOCKETED		
Docket Number:	20-AAER-01	
Project Title:	Amendments to the Title 20 Appliance Efficiency Regulations Rulemaking	
TN #:	237318	
Document Title:	Final Statement of Reasons (FSOR)	
Description:	Final Statement of Reasons, including responses to comments received, for the 2020 Repeal of Self-Contained Lighting Controls and Other Amendments Rulemaking	
Filer:	Carlos Baez	
Organization:	California Energy Commission	
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff	
Submission Date:	3/26/2021 11:47:15 AM	
Docketed Date:	3/26/2021	

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, California 95814

Main website: www.energy.ca.gov CEC-57 (Revised 1/19)



FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

2020 Repeal of Self-Contained Lighting Controls and Other Amendments Z # 2020-0929-03

UPDATE OF THE INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

There were no modifications to the regulation text following the close of the public comment period. No changes or updates to the ISOR are necessary.

LOCAL MANDATE DETERMINATION

The California Energy Commission has determined that this action will not result in a local mandate on local agencies or school districts.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS

The Energy Commission determined pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(4) that no alternative before it would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which this action is proposed, no alternative would be as effective as and less burdensome to affected persons than the adoption of the proposed regulation, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

Except as discussed in the summary and response to comments, no alternatives were recommended.

ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD LESSEN ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

The CEC considered impacts to small businesses and alternatives in the Notice of Proposed Action and the Initial Statement of Reasons, and hereby incorporates these discussions by reference. The CEC did not identify any small businesses that will be adversely impacted by the adopted regulations. The adopted regulations are not likely to have a significant adverse economic impact on small business and no alternatives were proposed that would lessen any adverse economic impact on small business. For the purposes of this analysis, the CEC used the consolidated definition of small business in Government Code section 11346.3(b)(4)(B).

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

No documents are proposed to be incorporated by reference.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

All responses to public comments, including acceptance of recommendations and justification when recommendations were not accepted, are hereby incorporated by reference to this Final Statement of Reasons, and included in the rulemaking file.

Written Comments Received 2020 Repeal of Self-Contained Lighting Controls and Other Amendments Title 20, Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 4 California Code of Regulations 45-Day Comment Period October 9, 2020 Through November 23, 2020

Commenter's Name	Comments/	Response
	Suggested Revisions	
Alex Boesenberg and Phil Squair, National Electrical Manufacturers Association	General Letter of Support	No response required
Stephen R. Irving, Lutron Electronics Co., Inc.	Lutron supports the proposed removal of Self-Contained Lighting Controls from Title 20 Appliance Efficiency Regulations as it eliminates redundant requirements and reduces confusion about certifications.	General comment of support. No Response required.
	1. Elimination of Redundant Requirements As stated in the Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR), requirements for Lighting Controls were transitioned to the Title 24 Building Energy Code during the 2019 revision, leaving duplicative requirements in Title 20. Elimination of these Title 20 requirements was anticipated during that development and continues to be appropriate today.	
Stephen R. Irving,	2. Eliminate Customer Confusion	Comment Acknowledged.
Lutron Electronics	regarding Certification Requirements	No changes required.
Co., Inc.	Lutron has received several questions about certifications in the MAEDbS for	Yes, if this rulemaking were to be approved and adopted, we would then archive all current listings of
	Systems-Based Lighting Controls from	self-contained lighting controls in MAEDbS and
	our customers in California. These	prevent the submission of new models of lighting
	customers were accustomed to	controls. The models will still be searchable for

Commenter's Name	Comments/	Response
	Suggested Revisions	
	certifications for our <i>Self-Contained</i> Lighting Controls and expected the same for our <i>Systems-Based</i> Lighting Controls. One can easily understand their confusion as the two types of controls are frequently used to fulfill the same customer need (use case).	historical purposes, but new certifications will no longer be required or permitted. We will post notifications within the MAEDbS system to inform users of the changes and also send out a list server email notice.
	Archiving existing certifications for Self- Contained Lighting Controls in the MAEDbS is the best fix. Customers looking for certifications simply wanted to ensure that they comply with CEC requirements. There is no need to maintain certifications for Lighting Controls.	
	To prevent further confusion during this transition, we recommend that all existing database entries be archived at the same time and that any MAEDbS searches for Lighting Controls return a simple explanation informing customers that certification is no longer required. This explanation will help prevent concern from customers and retailers who buy, use, and sell these energy-saving devices.	
Steve McCarthy Vice President, Public Policy California Retailers Association	Out of my own confusion I missed this morning's hearing and had intended to testify. I wonder if there is any remaining opportunity to have further conversation about portable luminaires, and specifically the requirement for prepackaged bulbs? We expressed our concern in last year's proceeding on specialty bulbs that	Comment Acknowledged No Change Thanks for reaching out to us. Yes, we recognize that the "bulb-in-the-box" requirement needs to be reassessed, mainly due to subsequent appliance rulemakings and LED market transformation, which has increased efficiency in lighting.

Commenter's Name	Comments/	Response
	Suggested Revisions efficiency bulbs, it would render obsolete the subsection (n)(4) that those bulbs be included pre-sale on portable luminaires. In fact, that requirement may now be a net contributor to the waste stream, in addition to making the products more expensive for consumers and limiting product options. We noted that this issue is not part of this particular update. Would it be possible to connect on this? My apologies for the lateness of this issue and thank you for any help you can provide.	Unfortunately, besides the proposed removal of the minimum light output requirement, no additional changes regarding portable luminaires can be made in this current rulemaking (docket 20-AAER-01) because it would be outside of the limited scope for this rulemaking. Staff considered additional changes to portable luminaires at the time the rulemaking was started, but realized that additional changes would involve other products covered and/or efficiency requirements, which would require significant research and staff report, an effort that could not be undertaken at the time. However, we anticipate a rulemaking in the future to fully address portable luminaire requirements in Title 20. When this happens, we would reach out to industry to gain further insights into this topic. If you haven't already, please subscribe to our "appliances" list server to receive email updates on all rulemaking activity for Title 20. You would receive an email when this new rulemaking is eventually initiated. You can sign up here: https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/listservers/index_cms.html

Public Hearing Comments Received 2020 Repeal of Self-Contained Lighting Controls and Other Amendments Title 20, Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 4 California Code of Regulations Public Hearing December 3, 2020

Commenter's Name	Comments/ Suggested Revisions	Response
	No Comments were received during the public hearing	