PG&E

CODES AND STANDARDS ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE (CASE)

2008 CEC Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards Rulemaking Proceeding
February, 2007

Draft Report
Requirements for Signs

This report was prepared by Pacific Gas and Electric Company and funded by the California utility customers under the auspices of the California Public Utilities Commission.

Created on 2/13/2007 6:42:00 PM

Table of Contents

Document information

Category: Codes and Standards

Keywords: PG&E CASE, Codes and Standards Enhancements, Title 24, nonresidential, 2008, efficiency, illuminated signs

Overview

This CASE proposal addresses the energy savings opportunities available in outdoor signs. The key elements of the proposal are as follows:

- Turn off lights in signs when no one is present or when the light is imperceptible because there is vastly more daylight than the light produced by the sign. Require automatic time and daylight responsive lighting controls for all outdoor signs. Require switched receptacles for indoor plug-in signs.

- The amount of light needed to see an unfiltered sign during the day is substantially greater than that needed at night. Require automatic dimming controls for outdoor signs that are illuminated during daytime hours.

- Set minimum efficiency requirements for transformers or power supplies serving neon and cold cathode sources.

- Require demand responsive controls for large signs illuminated during the day. Dimming loads or turning off a fraction of the load for a few hours per year can help prevent loss of utility service and yield significant cost savings for the owner.

Description

In Section 132 add a new subsection (c) to require automatic time schedule lighting controls for all outdoor signs. The control strategy required will vary based on sign usage patterns. Photoelectric controls combined with time switches will be required for all signs not used in the daytime. Dimming controls will be required for signs that are illuminated during daytime hours, to enable a minimum of 65 percent reduction in lighting power at night.

In Section 132 add a new subsection (d) to require switched receptacles for plug-in indoor signs. The control strategy required will be a manual time schedule based on owner/operator preference.

Requirements for minimum efficiency transformers or power supplies in neon and cold cathode signs. When complying with the alternative to Section 148 (a) or (b), minimum efficiency transformers or power supplies are required to drive neon and cold cathode lamps for all signs. Minimum efficiency power supplies can reduce overall energy use by as much as approximately 25% for indoor applications and by as much as approximately 22% for outdoor applications.

Energy Benefits

The following table illustrates the energy savings per square or lineal foot of each major sign category for which we are proposing efficiency upgrades. The assumed load is 12 Watt per square foot for fluorescent signs, 68 to 75 Watt per square foot for LED signs and 8.5 Watt per lineal foot for neon and cold cathode signs.

Table 1: Unit energy savings per measure

Efficiency Upgrade	Energy Savings
Automatic Controls for Outdoor Signs	4 to 57 kWh/SF
Switched Receptacles for Plug-in Indoor Signs	8.8 kWh/SF
Dimming Controls for Outdoor Signs Operated during Daytime Hours	176 to 196 kWh/SF
Minimum efficiency Transformers or Power Supplies for Neon and Cold Cathode Sources	2.4 to 5.3 KWh/LF

Non-energy Benefits

The implementation of lighting controls will reduce operating time and/or lighting power, leading to longer lamp life and reduced maintenance. The implementation of high efficiency power supplies in neon and cold cathode signs can reduce the quantity of materials used in sign equipment. The use of dimming controls in LED message centers operated both in the day and at night will enable optimum control of sign conspicuity.

Statewide Energy Impacts

The statewide energy impacts will be estimated in the final CASE report when the estimates of energy savings are refined and applied to the statewide estimates of new signs added in the state. The statewide estimate of new sign construction is based on the PIER Outdoor Lighting survey.

Environmental Impact

No direct environmental impact is anticipated from implementation of these measures.

Primary environmental impacts are based upon air emissions reductions from power plants due to electricity savings... We will base these estimates of reduced emissions by multiplying the statewide energy savings by the emissions factor values generated by the California Energy Commission for evaluating the environmental impacts of the 2005 standards as shown in Table 2 below.[1]

Table 2: Emissions Factors used to calculate the air emissions reductions resulting from end-use reductions in electricity and natural gas consumption

Emissions factors	NOx	CO	CO2	PM10
Natural Gas, California (lbs/MMBtu)	0.094	0.03	115	0.01
Electricity, Western States (lbs/MWh)	0.383	0.23	1200	0.06

Statewide estimates of savings will be developed for the final report.

[1] Table 1, Appendix B page 2, Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration for the 2005 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings September 2003 P400-03-018. Values provided by the CEC System Assessment and Facilities Siting Division http://www.energy.ca.gov/reports/2003-09-12_400-03-018.PDF

Type of Change

All of the measures described here mandatory, they cannot be by-passed by saving more energy somewhere else in the permit application.

Proposed Measure	**Type of change**	**Impact on standards**	**Documents to be modified**
Require combination of time scheduling and daylight responsive lighting controls for all outdoor signs.	Mandatory measure	Expands the scope of the existing standards. There currently is no requirement for time scheduling lighting controls.	Standards, Manuals and Compliance Forms
Require switched receptacles for plug-in indoor signs.	Mandatory measure	Expands the scope of the existing standards. There currently is no requirement for switched receptacles for plug-in indoor signs.	Standards, Manuals and Compliance Forms
Require dimming controls for outdoor signs that are illuminated during daytime hours.	Mandatory measure	Expands the scope of the existing standards. There currently is no provision for lighting controls	Standards, Manuals and Compliance Forms
Require high efficiency transformers or power supplies for neon and cold cathode sources serving unfiltered signs or filtered signs exceeding 12 watts per square foot..	Mandatory measure	Expands the scope of the existing standards. Transformer type currently is not regulated.	Standards, Manuals and Compliance Forms
Require demand responsive lighting controls for large signs on during the day.	Mandatory measure	Expands the scope of the existing standards.	Standards, Manuals and Compliance Forms

Currently the performance approach calculations contained in the Alternative Compliance Method (ACM) Manual do not include outdoor lighting or sign lighting energy consumption. This proposal would not change this approach and thus this measure will not impact the ACM manual.

Technology Measures

The energy savings from this proposal are based on the added energy efficiency of the following technologies.

1. The use of time switches or photoelectric controls for the control of outdoor signs.

2. The use of dimming controls for the reduction of power in outdoor signs that are illuminated during daytime hours.

3. The use of switched receptacles for plug-in indoor signs.

4. The use of high efficiency power supplies for neon and cold cathode sources.

5. The use of demand responsive controls for larger signs illuminated during the day.

Information about the availability, cost, and performance of the technology is readily available and were compiled from the following sources:

- Sign product manufacturers' and sign industry association websites.
- Communication with sign manufacturers' associations.
- Communication with sign manufacturers and fabricators.
- Sign Industry Workshops facilitated by Southern California Edison (SCE) in December 2005 and February 2006.
- Attendance at the Western Sign Show in San Diego on February 10 and 11, 2006.
- Research institutions including the California Lighting Technology Center (CLTC) which is performing internally lit sign research for SCE

For the proposed use of automatic time schedule lighting controls with all signs the measure compares those cases where signs are controlled dusk on , dusk off to a dusk-on and time-off, time on, dawn-off control strategy. Astronomic time switches are readily available and currently are regulated by the standards for interior and exterior lighting. Dimming controls and time scheduling software are readily available for signs that are illuminated during the daylight hours (message centers) and can provide the capability to reduce the power input by as much as 90 % during nighttime use.

For the proposed use of switched receptacles for control of indoor signs, the measure compares those cases where signs are left on because there is no switch control to a time scheduled-on, time scheduled-off, control strategy. Sign mounted switches often are not readily accessible and operators leave signs on in unoccupied areas not visible to viewers outside the building. Switched receptacles are a readily available wiring method to provide a readily accessible manual controls.

For the proposed use of minimum efficiency transformers or power supplies with neon and cold cathode sources, the measure compares the commonly used ferromagnetic transformers from three manufacturers to establish minimum efficiency standards. The sign industry uses ferromagnetic transformers predominately because they are suitable for use in all applications, including high ambient temperature and for dimming and flashing. Although higher efficiency, high frequency electronic power supplies are readily available, these are not suited for high temperature applications above 100^{o} F ambient, dimming and flashing applications and applications requiring long lead lengths (due to issues with capacitive coupling that severely limit capacity).

Measure Availability and Cost

To develop the costs for this proposal we contacted these major manufacturers for electric sign components.

1. Automatic time schedule lighting controls: Intermatic, Tork and others.

2. Switched receptacles: Leviton.

3. Automatic dimming controls: Daktronics, Barco, Vantage and others.

4. High efficiency neon and cold cathode power supplies: Ventex, Transfotec, Philips, France, Allanson and Transco.

The costs of automatic time scheduling controls combined with daylight sensing (astronomic or photoelectric) add to the costs of sign installations as compared to the installation of photoelectric controls only. The analysis assumes a $500 cost. Since the cost of controls is fairly fixed regardless of size and number of loads, the cost per sign is inversely proportional to the number of signs on a single meter. The analysis assumes the smallest sign load which will be cost effective for implementation of this measure. This sign load is 180 Watt.

The requirement for switch receptacles adds to the cost of the plug-in signs. The analysis assumes a $200.00 cost. The analysis assumes the smallest sign load that will be cost effective for implementation of this measure. This sign load is 180 Watt. This load is so small that the requirement is for all signs.

The provision of automatic dimming controls adds to the cost of LED signs without dimming controls. For a basic outdoor LED message center with a monochromatic four-module display, these controls add approximately $1000 to the cost of the sign installation. This represents approximately 27% of the cost of the sign installation used in the analysis. For larger signs, the proportional cost of the dimming controls relative to the total cost of the sign will be less. The analysis assumes the smallest signs for a range of viewing distances from 110 to 500 feet. This sign load varies from 240 to 960 Watt.

The costs of minimum efficiency transformers and power supplies for neon and cold cathode compare favorably to the costs of low efficiency ferromagnetic transformers. For minimum efficiency transformers the evaluation shows a slight cost increase over their lower efficiency counterparts. The analysis found a cost of $1.53 per lineal foot.

Although the measure does not require the use of higher efficiency, high frequency power supplies, a previous evaluation showed that high power factor high efficiency power supplies are equivalent in price to normal power factor ferromagnetic transformers and are less costly than high power factor ferromagnetic transformers. The analysis found a savings of $0.64 per lineal foot. If a high efficiency power supply is misapplied in a high temperature application, then premature failure could occur, resulting in the cost of replacement of the failed power supply. For this reason it is anticipated that increased maintenance costs will result from the use of high efficiency neon power supplies. For the nighttime operation scenario, the analysis assumes replacing 25% of the high efficiency power supplies in years 5 and 10. For the 24 hour operation scenario, the analysis assumes replacing 25% of the high efficiency power supplies in years 5 and 10 and full replacement of standard transformers and high efficiency power supplies in year 15.The additional maintenance cost is $1.41 per lineal foot for the 24 hour scenario and $2.26 for the nighttime scenario. The results show that in spite of anticipated increased maintenance costs the measure is cost effective because of lower first costs and energy savings.

For demand response controls, the costs assume the addition of a control relay for switched loads and a control program for LED message centers per electric meter. For switched loads the analysis assumes a cost increase of $400. For programmed loads the analysis assumes a cost increase of $1,000.

Table 3: Summary of Unit Measure Costs

Measure Description	Cost ($)	Unit
Time scheduling controls	$500	Site
Automatic dimming controls	$1,000	Sign
Portable sign manual switch control	$200	Sign
Minimum efficiency transformers or power supplies - neon and cold cathode	$ 1.53	Lineal foot
Demand response controls	$400 – $1,000	Meter

Useful Life, Persistence and Maintenance

Sign Lighting Controls

A photoelectric switch control (dusk on / dusk off) is assumed to be the base case. It is assumed that 25% of the installation cost for the proposed automatic time schedule lighting controls will be incurred midway through the 15 year life of the system to maintain the lighting controls. For the base case photoelectric switch control, a maintenance cost of 100% of the installation cost is assumed midway through the 15 year life of the system. The energy savings will persist for the entire life of the measure provided it receives proper maintenance (replacement units must include all features of the measure) and the control schedule follows the model schedule.

Performance verification will be required during initial compliance and may be useful after installation to determine actual scheduling practice. Commissioning including programming of the time scheduling controls and required inspection by the authority having jurisdiction are necessary with this measure. Since the performance of the measure is dependent on properly installed and programmed applications, performance verification may affect persistence of savings. It is essential that the installations are inspected to meet the requirements of the Energy Standards and the California Electrical Code. Compliance verification at the time of building permit issuance and inspection are essential to the persistence of this measure.

Automatic dimming controls are part of time scheduling software available for LED message centers and displays. It is likely that dimming LED displays will increase the maintained life of the LED modules. For the purpose of analysis, the assumed life for the LEDs is 100,000 hours as stated in manufacturers' product literature. In service, this assumed life depends on electrical operating characteristics and temperature. By definition, at the end of rated life, the LEDs are operating at 50% of rated output. Therefore, for the purpose of analysis, it is assumed that 50% of the modules will be replaced at 70% of rated life (70,000 hours) for the base case and the remaining 50% of the modules will be replaced at 100% rated life (100,000 hours). Since the proposed case significantly reduces the average energy and operational temperatures during the measures' lifetime, it is assumed that 50% of the modules will be replaced at the end of rated life (100,000 hours) and the remaining 50% of the modules will be replaced at 120% rated life (120,000 hours)..

The energy savings will persist for the entire life of the measure provided it receives proper maintenance (replacement units must include all features of the measure) and the control schedule follows the model schedule. Performance verification will be required during initial compliance and may be useful after installation to determine actual dimming practice. Commissioning including programming of the dimming controls and required inspection by the authority having jurisdiction are necessary with this measure. Since the performance of the measure is dependent on properly installed and programmed applications, performance verification may affect persistence of savings. It is essential that the installations are inspected to meet the requirements of the Energy Standards and the California Electrical Code. Compliance verification at the time of building permit issuance and inspection are essential to the persistence of this measure.

For switched receptacles, sign-mounted controls for 50% of the signs is assumed to be the base case. It is assumed that 20% of the installation cost for the proposed manual switch controls will be incurred at the end of the 15-year life of the system to maintain the lighting controls and control wiring for a percentage of the installations. Also, for the base case local sign switch control, a maintenance cost of 20% of the local sign switch installation cost is assumed at the end of the 15 year life of the system. The difference in the cost of relamping is included in the analysis. The energy savings will persist for the entire life of the measure provided it receives proper maintenance (replacement units must include all features of the measure) and the control schedule follows the model schedule. Performance verification will be required during initial compliance and may be useful after installation to determine actual scheduling practice. Commissioning including required inspection by the authority having jurisdiction are necessary with this measure. Since the performance of the measure is dependent on properly installed applications, performance verification may affect persistence of savings. It is essential that the installations are inspected to meet the requirements of the Energy Standards and the California Electrical Code. Compliance verification at the time of building permit issuance and inspection are essential to the persistence of this measure

Minimum Efficiency Neon / Cold Cathode Transformers Power Supplies

From our experience with the relative failure rates between earlier versions of electronic ballasts and their magnetic counterparts, we expect that neon high efficiency power supplies will require more frequent replacement than their ferromagnetic counterparts. For the purpose of comparison, the analysis assumes 25% of the high efficiency neon power supplies would be replaced at a five year life and another 25% would be replaced at a 10 year life. At the end of the useful life (15 years), the analysis assumes 100% of both the ferromagnetic transformers and high efficiency neon power supplies would be replaced. The energy savings will persist for the entire life of the measure provided it receives proper maintenance (replacement units must be high efficiency). Verification that the correct equipment is installed is needed initially and this can be solved with a label that indicates compliance with either the W/sf requirements or the efficiency of the installed components. Commissioning other than required inspection by the authority having jurisdiction is unnecessary with this measure. Since the performance of the measure is inherent in properly installed applications, performance verification will not affect persistence of savings. It is essential however that the installations are inspected to meet the requirements of the Energy Standards and the California Electrical Code. Compliance verification at the time of building permit issuance and inspection is essential to the persistence of this measure.

Performance Verification

The performance of automatic time scheduling lighting controls, dimming controls (for signs on during the day) and manually switched receptacles are based on effective commissioning and in some cases, programming of the controls. Performance verification may include monitoring a representative sample of installations for actual operating schedules. The existing acceptance tests for time switches could be applied to this type of control.

The performance verification for minimum efficiency transformers and power supplies for neon and cold cathode lamps are based primarily on making sure they are installed. This activity is a function of the building permit compliance verification and installation inspection.

Cost Effectiveness

The cost-effectiveness of each measure is described in detail in the “Results” section of this report.

- The automatic time schedule lighting controls measure is demonstrated cost effective. The benefit/cost is 1.0 for a sign of 180 Watt. The measure is cost effective when the sign load controlled is greater than 180 Watt.

- The automatic dimming controls measure for LED signs operated during daytime hours is demonstrated cost effective. For the smallest physical size signs for a range of viewing distances from 110 feet to 500 feet, the range of benefit/cost ratios is between 1.1 and 4.1. The measure is cost effective when the sign load is greater than 240 watts.

- The switched receptacles manual control measure for indoor signs is demonstrated cost effective. The benefit/cost is 1.1 for a sign load of 180 Watt. The measure is cost effective when the sign load controlled is greater than 180 Watt.

- The minimum efficiency neon transformer or power supply mandatory measure is demonstrated cost effective for both nighttime operation. For nighttime operation, the benefit/cost ratio is 1.6. For 24-hour operation; the benefit/cost ratio is 5.0. The measure is cost effective for an aggregation of signs above 170 Watt.

- The demand response measures are assumed to be cost effective at a benefit/cost ratio of 1.5 for large signs. This measure would apply only to very large installations of signs on a single electric meter.

Analysis Tools

The analysis to quantify energy savings and peak electricity demand reductions uses a spreadsheet developed to compare alternative lighting technologies for use in sign illumination based on input power and time of day (TDV) cost values for each hour of the year. This spreadsheet kept track of the sunset times by day. We based this on a site in Fresno which is near the middle latitude of the population in California.

Relationship to Other Measures

No other measures are anticipated to be impacted by this change.

Methodology

The evaluation of proposed technologies and operating strategies included assumptions of number of operating hours for signs supported by studies conducted by Southern California Edison in 2005 and 2006. Sign manufacturers and sign component manufacturers provided information regarding the power characteristics, operational limitations and costs of proposed technologies. The results of SCE’s sign control survey are tabulated in Table 4. It should be noted that this survey did not differentiate between standard time only time switches and those that are astronomical based (i.e. turn lights on and off relative to sunrise and sunset times calculated based on date and latitude and longitude).

Table 4: Sign controls: Frequency of use and resulting hours of operation

Type of Control	Controlled			Uncontrolled	Total
	% of controls	Hours of operation	Weighted average hours of operation	Hours of operation	Weighted average hours of operation
Time Switch	78%	9.59	7.5		
Photocell	4%	13.81	0.6		
Manual	15%	11.62	1.77		
Other	2%	6.33	0.14		
Total	100%		10.01	24	
Percent Controlled / Uncontrolled			79%	21%	
Weighted Hours Controlled / Uncontrolled			7.91	5.04	12.9

Controls

Automatic time schedule lighting controls

The use of automatic time schedule lighting controls was investigated as a proposed mandatory measure. The proposed measure will require automatic time schedule controls with astronomic feature or used in conjunction with photoelectric controls to preclude daytime operation of signs intended to operate at night only. The proposed measure was compared to a base case with photoelectric controls. The information in the Table 3from the sign survey completed by Southern California Edison in November 2005 (Phase 1) and June 2006 (Phase 2) was used to establish the baseline for existing sign operation.

As a comparison to the base cases, an automatic time switch lighting control schedule was modeled. As compared to the base cases operating signs from approximately 6 to 14 hours per day on average, the proposed case simulated sign operation from dusk to midnight and from 4 am to dawn.

Automatic dimming controls

The use of automatic dimming controls for outdoor LED signs operated during the day was investigated. If an LED sign is operated during the day then the required sign luminance should be reduced at night to provide readability. The sign industry generally supplies dimming for these types of signs, however data obtained from surveys conducted by the city of Anchorage, Alaska in 2004 and the Heschong Mahone Group in 2006 indicate that not all LED signs operated during the day are dimmed at night. Sign manufacturers provide software with time scheduling and dimming capabilities. To model automatic dimming controls on LED signs, two 4-module signs rated 240 watts, designed for viewing distances from 110 to 235 feet and 245 to 350 feet respectively, and one 8-module sign rated 960 watts, designed for viewing distances up to 500 feet were selected. To simulate the effect of dimming on LED signs operated during the day the load was decreased to 35% of maximum rated load for the dusk to dawn period. These signs were selected as representative of small signs for outdoor applications.

Manually switched receptacle plug-in sign lighting controls

The use of manually switched receptacles to control plug-in signs was investigated as a proposed mandatory measure. The proposed measure will require switched receptacles for indoor plug-in signs. The proposed measure was compared to a base case with local sign switch or no controls. The information in the Table 3 from the sign survey completed by Southern California Edison in November 2005 (Phase 1) and June 2006 (Phase 2) was used to establish the baseline for existing sign operation.

As a comparison to the base cases, a manually switch receptacle schedule was modeled. As compared to the base cases operating signs from approximately 12 hours per day on average, the proposed case simulated sign operation for approximately 10 hours per day.

Demand response controls

The use of demand response controls for indoor cabinet signs and outdoor message centers was investigated. Under a demand response condition, sign owners could opt to receive an incentive from the electric utility. Two options would be available. The first option would allow the electric utility to control the sign for the hours from 1 pm to 5 pm, inclusive, 10 days per year. The present value of turning off 1 kW for 10 days for these four hours over the course of 15 years is $250/kW. The second option would allow the electric utility to control the sign for 2.4 hours during the most severe demand conditions annually. The present value of turning off 1 kW for 2.4 hours per year over the course of 15 years is $366/kW. The total societal value of demand response per kW of load is $616 present worth over 15 years. The analysis considers two measures. The first measure is the application of demand response controls to indoor cabinet signs. The measure assumes that the cabinet sign would be turned off in response to receipt of the utility's load shed signal. The second measure is the application of demand response controls to outdoor LED message centers.

Neon

The use of minimum efficiency transformers or neon power supplies as an alternative to lower efficiency ferromagnetic transformers was investigated. Based on the analysis the minimum efficiency was established at a value that could be satisfied by at least 50% of the standard manufactured analyzed for all of the voltages at both 30mA and 60 mA output currents.

This analysis is summarized in the following table

Table 5:Neon Transformer Efficiency Summary

			High Power factor				Normal Power Factor				Overall min
Input	Output	Tube	Manuf 1	Manuf 2	Manuf 3	2nd highest	Manuf 1	Manuf 2	Manuf 3	2nd lowest	2nd lowest by mA
Volts	Volts	mA	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %	Eff %
120	15000	30	94.7	90.9	88.9	90.9	90.9	96.0	88.9	90.9	
120	12000	30	95.0	90.3	88.4	90.3	90.3	95.3	88.4	90.3	
120	10500	30	92.9	92.9		92.9	93.8	95.2		93.8	
120	9000	30	88.7	85.8	83.7	85.8	81.5	90.5	83.7	83.7	
120	7500	30	84.2	80.8	78.7	80.8	76.8	85.3	78.7	78.7	
120	6000	30		85.9	84.1	84.1	81.6	90.7	84.1	84.1	
120	5000	30		78.6	83.0	78.6	79.1	84.0	84.0	84.0	
120	4000	30		75.8	83.1	79.4	77.1	77.1	83.1	77.1	
120	3000	30		78.1	83.3	78.1	81.6	81.6	83.3	81.6	77.1
120	15000	60	81.3	80.5		80.5	85.0	85.0	78.7	85.0	
120	12000	60	82.9	82.9		82.9	87.5	87.5	81.0	87.5	
120	9000	60	71.2	71.2	69.5	71.2	68.2	75.1	69.5	69.5	
120	7500	60	71.1	68.2	66.7	68.2	68.2	72.0	66.7	68.2	
120	6000	60	79.8	75.8	74.2	75.8	75.8	80.0	74.2	75.8	
120	5000	60	73.6	73.6	73.3	73.6	74.3	74.3	73.3	74.3	
120	4000	60	78.4	87.4	83.1	83.1	81.5	74.5	83.1	81.5	
120	3000	60		85.1	83.3	83.3	89.8	67.3	83.3	83.3	68.2

To simplify the analysis, it was assumed that the tubing use is 12 mm in diameter. To perform the analysis, the power capacity in watts was determined for both ferromagnetic transformers and high efficiency neon power supplies from information provide by the sign component manufacturers. The capability in linear feet of tubing driven was determined using industry standard performance tables for both ferromagnetic transformers and high efficiency neon power supplies. Costs of typical signs and components were obtained from sign manufacturers. Several measures are analyzed – indoor applications, outdoor applications and varying schedules depending on the application (i.e. filtered or unfiltered). To develop a representative measure four signs containing normal and high power factor transformers at 30mA and 60 mA respectively were aggregated into one measure. The total power input, cost and cost of maintenance of the measure were compared to the base case. Transformer efficiency at 60 mA was typically lower than transformer efficiency at 30 mA. This analysis assures that two out of three transformers considered can meet the requirements for the worst case output voltage, power factor or tube current.

Results

First and foremost, the study indicates that there is a significant opportunity to achieve energy savings through the use of controls on signs. Secondly, the study indicates the effectiveness of improving the efficiency of neon transformers and power supplies. The study found time scheduling and daylight responsive control measures to be cost effective, providing sign owners with greater operational control flexibility. The measures are intended to preserve the signs' messages while affording the benefits of energy savings resulting from operational control and equipment efficiency. In the case of nighttime dimming controls for signs normally operated in the daytime, the controls can provide the operators with the capability to achieve optimum sign conspicuity both during the day and at night.

The research demonstrated that available product operating and performance data is inconsistent. One overriding issue with respect to lighting products used in signs is the interdependency between electrical operating characteristics, performance and temperature. The products available to the sign industry vary widely in efficiency and performance. One significant barrier to the wide use of electronic ballasts is operating temperature.

Although not included in any of the measures presented, there appears to be a significant opportunity to improve the efficiency of fluorescent systems used in cabinet signs. The sign industry currently uses T12 high output fluorescent technology powered by ferro-magnetic ballasts as a fundamental technology. The current standards address measures which encourage the use of more efficient technology such as electronic ballasts and rare earth phosphor lamps. To improve further the efficiency of these systems will require the cooperation of the sign product manufacturers, sign manufacturers, electric utilities, end users and industry associations. Information, such as watts input, ballast factor, power factor and relative light output, needs to be reported by all parties in a consistent manner to enable performance evaluation. Typical cabinet signs utilize fluorescent lamps as a light source to illuminate a translucent image on the face(s) of the sign. In addition to the improvement of technology efficiencies, there appears to be an opportunity to develop new designs for cabinet signs that utilize alternative optical system design to the typical fluorescent array. For larger signs, there are alternative high intensity discharge systems available. For smaller signs, there are signs, edge-lit with T5 fluorescent lamps that are significantly more efficient than the typical back-lit signs.

The neon sign industry has an opportunity to solve the issue of incompatibility of high efficiency power supplies with standard applications due to temperature limitations and capacitive coupling issues. Potentially, medium frequency high-grade steel laminated core transformers with copper windings could provide enhanced efficiency without the limitations experienced with the current high frequency models. This study found the need for a consistent method for rating and labeling the efficiency of neon transformers and power supplies.

The LED industry is emerging as a dynamic element of the sign market. Message centers provide a significant opportunity to display multiple messages, graphics and video content on a 24 hour per day, 7 day per week basis. Currently these displays have average input power densities ranging from nearly 15-20 watts per square foot to over 85 watts per square foot. Maximum power densities can exceed 300 watts per square foot. The industry is progressively developing more efficient LEDs. As the technology improves, it is anticipated that LEDs will approach the efficacy of fluorescent systems. There is a particular need for standardization of LED products, as the current variability of products from manufacturer to manufacturer makes it difficult for the industry to adopt LED technology. As the technology improves, it will be increasingly important to have testing standards to evaluate system performance relative to other technologies.

This study investigated using electronic high efficiency power supplies (drivers) for LED signs. The study found that high efficiency power supplies can be15 to 35% more efficient than their low efficiency counterparts are. For the proposed use of high efficiency power supplies with LED sources the evaluated measure compared low efficiency ac input / dc output power supplies to high efficiency switching mode power supplies. High efficiency switching mode power supplies are readily available and provide increased efficiency. Typical efficiency for a high efficiency switching mode power supply is 80% or greater. Although it is apparent that many manufacturers are producing high efficiency power supplies, they do not publish technical data consistently. Basic quantities such as input/output watts, efficiency and power factor are not readily available to specifiers and consumers. There also is a lack of available testing standards. For these reasons, no efficiency standards are proposed as a result of this study. It is recommended that efficiency standards for LED power supplies be developed as part of the Title 20 Standards revision process. The development of LED driver operating, performance and testing standards must occur first to enable the inclusion of efficiency requirements in the California Energy Standards and harvest persistent energy savings.

Energy, Cost Savings and Cost-effectiveness

The energy cost savings was calculated via a spreadsheet that had statewide average costs per hour for all hours of the year. These were then aggregated into weekday daytime values for each hour of the day, weekend daytime values, weeknight values and weekend night values. By entering the schedule that signs are on during days and nights one can compare the kWh and time-of-day value (TDV) costs over the course of a year. The TDV energy cost savings are then compared to the incremental costs of each measure. Cost-effectiveness is calculated by the following relation:

Cost-effectiveness = Life cycle O&M cost savings / Incremental cost

Often life cycle savings is merely the energy savings multiplied by the present value of the energy cost over 15 years at a 3% discount rate. In other cases where the maintenance or replacement costs or periods change then these costs are also considered as part of the life cycle savings. When the maintenance occurs, impacts its present valued cost as the maintenance cost is derated by a future worth factor.

Following is a series of tables showing an example savings calculation for the measure of using an astronomic time switch (or combination of photoelectric switch in conjunction with a time switch so that both scheduling and presence of sunlight is the function of the control) to replace a photoelectric switch (presence of sunlight only function of control). Table 6 shows the assumed schedule of operation for the photoelectric cell control, the “base case,” as derived from SCE study data, the installed cost and the load in kilowatts and then that of the “proposed case” control, the astronomic time switch. Note that or the “daytime base” column the kWh and TDV kBtus are calculated the day time hours during this schedule. Similarly, for the “nighttime base” column only night time hours during this schedule are kWh or TDV calculated. The proposed case table shows the assumed schedule of operation for the proposed case (i.e. lights can be turned off later at night) and the installed cost. The schedule indicates that the load will be on from dusk to midnight, off at midnight and then back on from 4 am to dawn.

Base case Description:	PE Cell Controlled Sign
Installed cost:	$200.00

Enter kW schedule for base case

Hour	Daytime base M-F	Daytime base Sat	Daytime base Sun	Night time base M-F	Night time base Sat	Night time base Sun
1				0.18	0.18	0.18
2				0.18	0.18	0.18
3				0.18	0.18	0.18
4				0.18	0.18	0.18
5				0.18	0.18	0.18
6				0.18	0.18	0.18
7				0.18	0.18	0.18
8				0.18	0.18	0.18
9				0.18	0.18	0.18
10				0.18	0.18	0.18
11				0.18	0.18	0.18
12				0.18	0.18	0.18
13				0.18	0.18	0.18
14				0.18	0.18	0.18
15				0.18	0.18	0.18
16				0.18	0.18	0.18
17				0.18	0.18	0.18
18				0.18	0.18	0.18
19				0.18	0.18	0.18
20				0.18	0.18	0.18
21				0.18	0.18	0.18
22				0.18	0.18	0.18
23				0.18	0.18	0.18
24				0.18	0.18	0.18
	Only day time hours during this schedule are kWh or TDV calculated			Only night time hours during this schedule are kWh or TDV calculated		

Proposed case description:	Astronomic Time Switch Control / PE
Installed cost:	$500.00

Enter kW schedule for proposed case

Hour	Daytime proposed M-F	Daytime proposed Sat	Daytime proposed Sun	Night time proposed M-F	Night time proposed Sat	Night time proposed Sun
1						
2						
3						
4						
5				0.18	0.18	0.18
6				0.18	0.18	0.18
7				0.18	0.18	0.18
8				0.18	0.18	0.18
9				0.18	0.18	0.18
10				0.18	0.18	0.18
11				0.18	0.18	0.18
12				0.18	0.18	0.18
13				0.18	0.18	0.18
14				0.18	0.18	0.18
15				0.18	0.18	0.18
16				0.18	0.18	0.18
17				0.18	0.18	0.18
18				0.18	0.18	0.18
19				0.18	0.18	0.18
20				0.18	0.18	0.18
21				0.18	0.18	0.18
22				0.18	0.18	0.18
23				0.18	0.18	0.18
24				0.18	0.18	0.18
	Only day time hours during this schedule are kWh or TDV calculated			Only night time hours during this schedule are kWh or TDV calculated		

Table 6: Day and night schedules for Astronomical Time Switch measure

Table 7: Maintenance cost calculation including 3% real discount rate

	Maintenance Costs		Maint Savings	Future Value
Year	Base case	Proposed case	PV $	Multiplier
1			$0.00	97%
2			$0.00	94%
3			$0.00	92%
4			$0.00	89%
5			$0.00	86%
6			$0.00	84%
7			$0.00	81%
8	$ 200.00	$ 250.00	-$39.47	79%
9			$0.00	77%
10			$0.00	74%
11			$0.00	72%
12			$0.00	70%
13			$0.00	68%
14			$0.00	66%
15			$0.00	64%
Total			-$39.47	

Table 7 shows the assumed maintenance costs for the base and proposed cases. In the base case, the photocell is replaced and it is assumed that the entire of the cost of the initial installation will be spent. In the proposed case, it is assumed that either a photoelectric cell is replaced or that the astronomic time switch has to be reprogrammed and that this will cost slightly more. For the purpose of the analysis, it is assumed in both cases that the maintenance will occur at the halfway point of the system's life. Since the maintenance cost is higher for the proposed system, it is represented as a negative maintenance cost savings for this measure

Table 8 summarizes the energy and cost savings. For each hour of the day, the table shows the savings for total kWh, TDV kBtu, energy cost PV $, maintenance PV $ and total PV $. It also shows the incremental cost for the measure and the benefit / cost (B/C) ratio. The objective is to select measures which have positive PV $ savings and a B/C ratio greater than 1.0, which indicates that the measure has life cycle savings greater than its cost and therefore is cost effective.

Table 8: Hourly energy and cost savings and B/C ratio summary

Energy and Cost Savings Summary: Astronomic Time Switch Control / PE

	Savings	Savings	Savings	PV Savings	Cost Savings
Hour	**Total kWh**	**TDV kBtu**	**Energy Cost PV $**	**Maint. PV $**	**Total PV $**
1	66	1,022	$ 86		
2	66	981	$ 83		
3	66	952	$ 80		
4	66	949	$ 80		
5	0	0	$ -		
6	0	0	$ -		
7	0	0	$ -		
8	0	0	$ -		
9	0	0	$ -		
10	0	0	$ -		
11	0	0	$ -		
12	0	0	$ -		
13	0	0	$ -		
14	0	0	$ -		
15	0	0	$ -		
16	0	0	$ -		
17	0	0	$ -		
18	0	0	$ -		
19	0	0	$ -		
20	0	0	$ -		
21	0	0	$ -		
22	0	0	$ -		
23	0	0	$ -	**PV Savings**	**Cost Savings**
24	0	0	$ -	**Maint. PV $**	**Total PV $**
Total	**263**	**3,905**	**$ 329**	**-39**	**$290**
				Incremental Cost	**$300**
				B/C ratio	**1.0**

Table 9 below summarizes all of the proposed measures for signs. As shown, all of the measures have a B/C ratio greater than 1.0 or are "immediate." If the B/C ratio is immediate, then the measure costs less than the base case.

For the neon high efficiency power supply measure, a group of neon signs of varying tube lengths was compared. In the base case, the signs were supplied by standard neon transformers. In the proposed case, the signs were supplied by high efficiency power supplies. Power values were obtained from manufacturers' literature. Two scenarios were considered for energy savings. In one scenario, 24 hour operation was evaluated. In the second scenario, nighttime operation was evaluated. As shown in the table, the savings are positive and the incremental cost is negative which results in an immediate benefit.

For the astronomic time switch measure the base case schedule was derived from SCE data as described in the example for the Astronomic Time Switch Control / PE measure above. For all of the proposed measures, the load schedule was assumed on from dusk to midnight, off at midnight and then back on from 4 am to dawn. The load was varied in the various measures to determine a threshold value for application into the Standards. As shown in the table, the savings are positive and the B/C ratios are greater than 1.0 which results in cost effective measures.

Table 9:Sign efficiency measure summary - energy savings and B/C ratios

Energy and Cost Savings Summary: Signs

	Size	Energy Savings					Incremental Cost	Benefit / Cost Ratio
Sign Measure Description	**kW**	**Total kWh**	**TDV kBtu**	**Energy Cost PV $**	**Maint. PV $**	**Total PV $**	**PV $**	
Neon Minimum Efficiency Transformer or Power Supply - 24 Hr	0.68	420	8,129	$ 686	-$78	$ 608	$123	5.0
Neon Minimum Efficiency Transformer or Power Supply - Night	0.68	192	3,243	$274	-$78	$196	$123	1.6
Astronomic Time Switch Control / PE	.18	263	3,90 5	$329	-$39	$290	$300	1.0
Portable sign - manual switch	0.18 kW	131	2,594	$219	-$2	$217	$175	1.2
1 x 4 LED Monochromatic Short Range Dimming	0.24	625	10,539	$889	$172	$1,029	$1,000	1.0
1 x 4 LED Monochromatic Medium Range Dimming	0.24	625	10,539	$889	$367	$1,187	$1,000	1.2
2 x 4 LED Monochromatic Long Range Dimming	0.96	2,501	42,156	$3,556	$498	$3,959	$1,000	4.0

For the LED dimming measures, the use of automatic dimming controls was evaluated for three cases as shown in the table above. Small monochromatic outdoor message centers for short, medium and long range viewing were chosen for the analysis. In the base cases, it was assumed that the signs would operate at 100% output 24 hours per day. In the proposed cases it was assumed that the signs would operate at 100% output during daytime hours and at 35% output during nighttime hours. The loads were obtained from manufacturer's literature. As shown in the table, the savings are positive and the B/C ratios are greater than 1.0 which results in cost effective measures.

Demand response results

The California investor owned utilities are installing an automated meter infrastructure (AMI) that includes the capability of signaling customers when electricity process are exceptionally high and also when there is a system reliability emergency. The societal value of controls that can respond to this demand response signal is given in Table 10.

This value is made up of two components:

1) the economic value of the capacity offered by customers who participate in demand response programs or rates and

2) the value of responding to system emergencies to prevent blackouts. This value is based on the economic distress that results from a loss of service (blackout).

Table 10: Value of economic and emergency demand response

Value of Economic DR Resource	
Economic program top 10 days 1 -5 pm	
Resource value PV$/kW	$409.67
Productivity loss	20%
Net resource value PV$/kW	$327.74
Adjustment factors	
Participation rate	70%
Signal received	97%
Signal not over ridden	90%
Fraction ON during DR event	100%
Combined economic adjustment Factor	61%
Adjusted Net Resource Value PV$/kW	**$250**
Value of emergency DR	
Value of loss of service per kWh	$42.00
Negative impact on productivity	$2.50
Average outage time per year (h/yr)	2.4
annual net impact $/kW	$94.80
15 year present worth multiplier	$11.94
15 year discounted net impact PV $/kW	$1,132
Adjustment factors	
Fraction not participating in economic program	30%
Fraction in economic program normally overriding	7%
Total impacted by mandatory control	37%
Fraction of emergency signal not over ridden	90%
Fraction receiving the DR signal	97%
Fraction ON during DR event	100%
Combined emergency adjustment factors	32%
Adjusted net impact PV$/kW controlled	**$366**
Emergency and Economic Value PV$/kW	**$616**

The analysis in Table 10 assumes a participation rate of 70% in a program that gives incentives within the customer rate to curtail loads during the most expensive hours of the year. This assumption is based on a scenario that when the sign starts operating, the default utility rate is either real time based or a critical peak pricing type rate that passes through most of the costs on an hour by hour basis. In addition, this scenario assumes that regardless of participation in a rate or other program to voluntarily shed loads, that the utility can invoke an emergency load shed of lighting during the few hours per year that electrical system reliability is in peril. On average this occurs only 2.4 hours per year. Avoiding blackouts has a societal benefit of $42/kWh. When discounted over 15 years and accounting for productivity losses during this time period, this has a net value of $1,132/kW. When all of the derating factors are included, the overall direct economic benefit to the overage customer is PV$250/kW controlled and another PV$366/kW due to avoiding losses associated with blackouts for a total societal (economic + emergency) value of PV$616/kW.

The measure is based on reducing the power consumption of signs by 30% during the demand response period in response to receipt of the utility's load shed signal. Since this demand response period is typically during the summer between the hours of noon and 6pm, this measure applies to signs that are normally on during the day. We considered two sign types: cabinet signs and message centers. Some cabinet signs are illuminated during the day in indoor locations. Message centers could be either indoor or outdoors.

To identify the sign size at which a demand responsive control would be required, the fixed costs of installing a demand responsive control was compared to the life cycle savings of the control. To assure the outcome was conservative (i.e. the life cycle cost savings was greater than the initial cost) the threshold value of minimum sign size was calculated based on a Benefit/Cost ratio of 1.5.

Table 11 below shows the results of the analysis. For each scenario and demand response option there is a corresponding load in kW and size of sign. For cabinet signs, the analysis assumes a load of 12 W/sf. For LED message centers, the analysis assumes a load of 50 W/sf. If the full societal benefits are calculated, the minimum total sing power rating that could be cost-justify demand responsive controls with a 1.5 B/C ratio is 3.2 kW for cabinet signs and 8.1 kW for message centers. That is to say that the life cycle energy cost savings and value of blackouts avoided is worth $600 for a 3.2 kW cabinet sign, while the incremental implementation cost is only $400.

If one considers only the economic value of the energy displaced by reducing sign power consumption by 30% for the 10 days with the highest electricity costs for four hours per day, a minimum cabinet sign size of 8 kW and a minimum LED message center size of 20 kW would be required to justify the expense of the controls while maintaining a 1.5 Benefit /Cost ratio.

Table 11:Demand response – threshold sign size to assure a 1.5 B/C ratio

			Cost-effective Threshold @1.5 B/C ratio		Sign Size	
			Economic Value @ PV$250/kW	Economic + Emergency @PV$616/kW	Economic Value	Emergency Response
Sign Type	**Fraction Controlled**	**Implementation Cost**	**kW**	**kW**	**SF**	**SF**
Cabinet Sign	30%	400	8.0	3.2	666	271
LED Message Center	30%	1000	20.0	8.1	399	162

Statewide Energy Savings

Statewide energy savings estimates are based on unit energy savings multiplied by estimates of statewide quantities of signs. This statewide analysis will be included in the final Signs CASE report.

Recommendations

The following revisions to the Standards are recommended:

Proposed Mandatory Requirements

1. Require time schedule lighting controls for all outdoor signs.

2. Require automatic dimming controls for outdoor signs that are illuminated during daytime hours. Exemption for non-mercury containing discharge lamps as these sources are difficult to dim.

3. Require manual switch controls for portable electric sign receptacles and show window receptacles.

4. Require demand responsive controls for larger signs that are illuminated during daytime hours.

Proposed Prescriptive Requirements

1. High efficiency power supplies for neon sources in accordance with temperature limitations of the technology. Either high efficiency magnetic or non-linear power supplies can meet the proposed efficiencies

2. Optional high efficiency metal halide ballasts reflecting the requirements of Title-20 in lieu of meeting the existing lighting power density requirements.

Proposed Standards Language

Original standards language is in black font, the proposed deleted text is ~~in red text with hard strikeouts~~ and added language contained is in blue font and underlined

SECTION 101 – DEFINITIONS AND RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

DEMAND RESPONSE PERIOD is a period of time during which the local utility is curtailing electricity loads by sending out a demand response signal.

DEMAND RESPONSE SIGNAL is an electronic signal sent out by the local utility indicating a request to their customers to curtail electricity consumption.

SECTION 132 – OUTDOOR LIGHTING CONTROLS AND EQUIPMENT

(a) **Outdoor Lighting.** All permanently installed outdoor luminaires employing lamps rated over 100 watts shall either: have a lamp efficacy of at least 60 lumens per watt; or be controlled by a motion sensor.

EXCEPTIONS to Section 132 (a):

1. Lighting required by a health or life safety statute, ordinance, or regulation, including but not limited to, emergency lighting.
2. Lighting used in or around swimming pools, water features, or other locations subject to Article 680 of the California Electrical Code.
3. Searchlights.
4. Theme lighting for use in theme parks.
5. Lighting for film or live performances.
6. Temporary outdoor lighting.
7. Light emitting diode, neon and cold cathode lighting.

(b) **Luminaire Cutoff Requirements.** All outdoor luminaires that use lamps rated greater than 175 watts in hardscape areas including parking lots, building entrances, sales and non-sales canopies, and all outdoor sales areas shall be designated Cutoff for light distribution. To comply with this requirement the luminaire shall be rated Cutoff in a photometric test report that includes any tilt or other non-level mounting condition of the installed luminaire. Cutoff is a luminaire light distribution classification where the candela per 1000 lamp lumens does not numerically exceed 25 at or above a vertical angle of ninety degrees above nadir, and 100 at or above a vertical angle of eighty degrees above nadir. Nadir is in the direction of straight down, as would be indicated by a plumb line. Ninety degrees above nadir is horizontal. Eighty degrees above nadir is 10 degrees below horizontal.

EXCEPTIONS to Section 132 (b):

1. Internally illuminated, externally illuminated, and unfiltered signs.
2. Lighting for building facades, public monuments, statues, and vertical surfaces of bridges.
3. Lighting required by a health or life safety statute, ordinance, or regulation, including but not limited to, emergency lighting.
4. Temporary outdoor lighting.
5. Lighting used in or around swimming pools, water features, or other locations subject to Article 680 of the California Electrical Code.

(c) **Controls for Outdoor Lighting**

1. All permanently installed outdoor lighting shall be controlled by a photocontrol or astronomical time switch that automatically turns off the outdoor lighting when daylight is available.

EXCEPTION to Section 132 (c) 1.:

1. Lighting in parking garages, tunnels, and large covered areas that require illumination during daylight hours.
2. Sign lighting as covered by Section 133.

2. For lighting of building facades, parking lots, garages, sales and non-sales canopies, and all outdoor sales areas, where two or more luminaires are used, an automatic time switch shall be installed that (1) turns off the lighting when not needed and (2) reduces the lighting power (in watts) by at least 50% but not exceeding 80% or provides continuous dimming through a range that includes 50% through 80% reduction. This control shall meet the requirements of Section 119 (c).

EXCEPTIONS to Section 132 (c) 2:

1. Lighting required by a health or life safety statute, ordinance, or regulation, including but not limited to, emergency lighting.
2. Lighting for steps or stairs that require illumination during daylight hours.
3. Lighting that is controlled by a motion sensor and photocontrol.
4. Lighting for facilities that have equal lighting requirements at all hours and are designed to operate continuously.
5. Temporary outdoor lighting.
6. ~~Internally illuminated, externally illuminated, and unfiltered signs~~.

SECTION 133 – SIGN LIGHTING CONTROLS

(a) **Designation of Daytime Use**. If an outdoor sign is planned to be illuminated by electric lighting for more than 1 hour per day while the sun is above the horizon, the sign shall be designated as "Normally On during Daytime." Any outdoor sign that is not designated as "Normally On during Daytime," shall be designated as "Normally Off during Daytime."

(b)**Controls for Outdoor Signs Normally Off during Daytime**. All permanently installed outdoor signs that are designated normally off during daytime shall be controlled by a photocontrol and an automatic-time switch complying with Section 119(c) or an outdoor astronomical time switch complying with Section 119(j), that automatically turns off the outdoor signs when daylight is available.

EXCEPTIONS to Section 133 (b):
1. Signs required by a health or life safety statute, ordinance, or regulation, including but not limited to, exit and egress signs.
2. Outdoor signs in parking garages, tunnels, and large covered areas that require illumination during daylight hours.

(c) **Controls for Outdoor Signs Normally On during Daytime**. All permanently installed outdoor signs that are designated Normally On during Daytime shall be controlled by a photocontrol and an automatic-time switch complying with Section 119(c) or an outdoor astronomical time switch complying with Section 119(j), that automatically dims and reduces sign power draw by a minimum of 65% between the times of 30 minutes after sunset and 30 minutes before sunrise.

EXCEPTION 1 to Section 133 (c): Outdoor signs in parking garages, tunnels, and large covered areas that require illumination during daylight hours.

EXCEPTION 2 to Section 133 (c): : Signs illuminated by gas discharge lamps not containing mercury gas

(d)**Controls for Indoor Signs.**

1. All portable indoor signs shall be connected to an electrical receptacle controlled by a readily accessible manual switch.

2. All show window receptacles shall be controlled by a readily accessible manual switch.

e) **Controls for All Signs**:

1. All permanently connected signs shall have an automatic time switch control that complies with Section 119(c).

2. Demand Responsive Sign Controls. If the electrical service to a sign is provided with a demand response signal by the local utility, demand responsive sign controls shall be installed under following conditions

i. Unfiltered signs illuminated during the day and having a connected load greater than 20 kW, shall have controls installed capable of receiving a demand response signal to reduce the sign load by a minimum of 30%.

ii. Filtered signs illuminated during the day and having a connected load greater than 8 kW, shall have controls installed capable of receiving a demand response signal to reduce the sign load by a minimum of 30%.

EXCEPTION to Section 133 (e)2: : Signs illuminated by gas discharge lamps not containing mercury gas are not required to have demand response controls

SECTION 148 – REQUIREMENTS FOR SIGNS

This section applies to all internally illuminated, ~~and~~ externally illuminated and unfiltered signs, both indoor and outdoor. Each sign shall comply with either subsection (a) **or** (b), as applicable~~, or with one of the alternatives that immediately follow subsection (b).~~

(a) For internally illuminated signs, the maximum allowed lighting power shall not exceed the product of the illuminated sign area and 12 watts per square foot. For double-faced signs, only the area of a single face shall be used to determine the allowed lighting power.

~~(b)~~ For externally illuminated signs, the maximum allowed lighting power shall not exceed the product of the illuminated sign area and 2.3 watts per square foot.-Only areas of an externally lighted sign that are illuminated without obstruction or interference, by one or more luminaires, shall be used.

~~ALTERNATIVE to 148(a) and (b):~~

(b) The sign complies with this Section if it is: ~~1. Equipped~~ equipped only with one or more of the following light sources:

1. ~~high pressure sodium, pulse start and ceramic metal halide, neon, cold cathode, light emitting diodes, barrier coat rare earth phosphor fluorescent lamps, or compact fluorescent lamps that do not contain a medium base socket (E24/E26), or~~
2. ~~Equipped only with electronic ballasts with a fundamental output frequency not less than 20 kHz.~~

1. high pressure sodium lamps,

2. pulse start metal halide lamps served by a ballast with a minimum efficiency of 88%, where ballast efficiency is the measured output wattage to the lamp divided by the measured operating input wattage when tested according to ANSI C82.6-2005.

3. neon, with transformer or power supply efficiency, the ratio of the output wattage to the input wattage at 100% tubing load, greater than or equal to following minimum efficiencies:

(a) a minimum efficiency of 77% when the transformer or power supply rated output current is less than 50 mA, otherwise

(b) a minimum efficiency of 68% when the transformer or power supply rated output current is 50 mA or greater

4. cold cathode or fluorescent lamps with barrier coat rare earth phosphors and equipped only with electronic ballasts having a fundamental output frequency not less than 20 kHz,

5. compact fluorescent lamps that do not contain a medium base socket (E24/E26)

6. light emitting diodes

EXCEPTION 1 to Section 148: ~~Unfiltered signs and~~ traffic signs.
EXCEPTION 2 to Section 148: Exit signs shall meet the requirements of the Appliance Efficiency Regulations.

SECTION 149 – ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS, AND REPAIRS TO EXISTING BUILDINGS THAT WILL BE NONRESIDENTIAL, HIGH-RISE RESIDENTIAL, AND HOTEL/MOTEL OCCUPANCIES AND TO EXISTING OUTDOOR LIGHTING FOR THESE OCCUPANCIES AND TO INTERNALLY AND EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGNS

…

(b) **Alterations.** Alterations to existing nonresidential, high-rise residential, or hotel/motel buildings or alterations in conjunction with a change in building occupancy to a nonresidential, high-rise residential, or hotel/motel occupancy not subject to Subsection (a) shall meet either Item 1 or 2 below.

1. **Prescriptive approach.** The altered envelope, space conditioning, lighting and water heating components, and any newly installed equipment serving the alteration, shall meet the applicable requirements of Sections 110 through 139; and

   G. New internally and externally illuminated signs shall meet the requirements of Sections 133, and 148.

   H. Alterations to existing indoor lighting systems that increase the connected lighting load or replace more than 50 percent of the luminaires shall meet the requirements of Sections 119, 130, 131, 132, and 146; and

   I Alterations to existing outdoor lighting systems that for any lighting application increase the connected lighting load or replace more than 50 percent of the luminaires shall meet the requirements of Section 147; and

   J Alterations to existing internally and externally illuminated signs that increase the connected lighting load, replace and rewire more than 50 percent of the ballasts, or relocate the sign to a different location on the same site or on a different site shall meet the requirements of Sections 133, and 148; and

   NOTE: Replacement of parts of an existing sign, including replacing lamps, the sign face or ballasts, that do not require rewiring or that are done at a time other than when the sign is relocated, is not an alteration subject to the requirements of Section 149 (b) 1 J.

Alternate Calculation Manual

Outdoor lighting is not included in the ACM manual, thus there are not changes proposed.

Bibliography and Other Research

Advance Transformer, 2002 *Case Study – Advance Renovates Own Headquarters Sign with Impressive Results*. Advance Transformer Co., Rosemount, IL.

Architectural Energy Corporation, *Life Cycle Cost Methodology 2008 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards* October 21, 2005 Prepared for California Energy Commission http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/documents/2005-10-24+25_workshop/2005-10-21_LCC_METHODOLOGY_2008_STANDARDS.PDF

IESNA 2000. IESNA Lighting Handbook Ninth Edition, Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, New York.

LRC, 2004. *Evaluation of Light-emitting Diodes for Signage Applications,* J.P. Freyssinier, Y. Zhou, V. Ramamurthy, A. Bierman, J.D. Bullough, and N. Narendran. Third International Conference on Solid State Lighting Lighting Proceedings of SPIE 5187: 309-317 Lighting Research Center, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY.

Navigant Consulting, Inc., September 2002, *U.S. Lighting Market Characterization Volume I: National Lighting Inventory and Energy Consumption Estimate Final Report,*for U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Building Technologies Program, Navigant Consulting Inc., Washington DC with XENERGY, Inc., Burlington, MA

Penn State, February 24, 2004. *Relative Visibility of Internally and Externally Illuminated On-Premise Signs.* Pennsylvania Transportation Institute, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

RLW Analytics, Inc., 2003*, California Outdoor Lighting Baseline*

Assessment, under subcontract to New Buildings Institute, California Energy Commission, Contract No. 400-99-013. Available at http://www.newbuildings.org/lighting.htm#research

Southern California Edison Design and Engineering Services Customer Service Business Unit, December 2005*, Commercial Signage Lighting and Controls,* Statewide Codes & Standards Program, Final Report

Acknowledgments

The Pacific Gas and Electric Company sponsored this report as part of its CASE (Codes and Standards Enhancement) project. Steve Blanc of PG&E is the project manager for this nonresidential CASE project. Pat Eilert of PG&E is the program manager for the CASE program. The HESCHONG MAHONE GROUP is the prime contractor and provided coordination of the nonresidential CASE reports.

Doug Avery of Southern California Edison hosted several industry workshops, which provided a forum for sign industry representatives and equipment manufacturers who provided valuable input to this report.

Michael F. Neils, Principal Investigator, of M. Neils Engineering, Inc. performed most of the analysis and reporting presented here. Juan José Villatoro and Danielle Neils, Lighting Analysts of M. Neils Engineering, Inc. provided technical support. Jon McHugh of the Heschong Mahone Group provided technical and editorial review.