

**From:** Susanne Garfield  
**To:** Docket Optical System  
**CC:** Adam Gottlieb; Harinder Singh; Ken Rider; Paula David; Peter Strait; ...  
**Date:** 9/15/2009 1:50 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Plasma Coalition asks CEC to correct errors in media materials (Docket #07-AAER-3C)  
**Attachments:** PDC Asks CEC To Correct Errors.pdf

Dockets,  
I received this via email addressed to Adam Gottlieb. This letter should be docketed under #07-AAER-3C. Thank you. Susanne

>>> "Dave Arland" <dave@arlandcom.com> 09/15/09 12:01 PM >>>  
Susanne -

I'd appreciate if you could make sure Adam Gottlieb gets this e-mail, since he is mentioned. I didn't find his email address readily available on the CEC web site.

Regards,

Dave Arland

On behalf of Jim Palumbo, President of the Plasma Display Coalition, please see the attached letter regarding errors in the media materials distributed by the California Energy Commission.

Text of the letter is also copied below.

-----

pdc

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>07-AAER-3</b>	
DATE	<u>9/15/2009</u>
RECD.	<u>9/15/2009</u>

382 LAWRENCE COURT  
WYCKOFF, NEW JERSEY 07481  
201 970-2222  
jimpalumbo@verizon.net

JAMES M. PALUMBO  
PRESIDENT

September 15, 2009

Mr. Adam Gottlieb  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

VIA E-MAIL

Re: Docket #07-AAER-3C

Dear Mr. Gottlieb:

On behalf of the Plasma Display Coalition, I am writing to ask the

California Energy Commission to review the blatantly inaccurate and often damaging information found on your web site regarding the proposed energy efficiency regulations for television sets. This misinformation is misleading to the media, to our valuable customers, and to California consumers in general.

Members of the Plasma Display Coalition have been among the HDTV leaders who have voluntarily introduced new TV technologies that conserve energy. We understand and share the Commission's objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but we part ways with regard to the tactical approach. As you know, our members believe that industry can and will voluntarily respond to consumer demand for more energy efficient displays. We believe a far more effective way to reduce power consumption in the State of California and meet Title 20 goals is for the Energy Commission to adopt a strategic approach that focuses, in part, on retiring older far less-efficient televisions rather than with restricting certain new TV technologies from the marketplace.

Recently, we learned that the CEC's updated "Frequently Asked Questions" and "Just the Facts, The Truth About Proposed TV Standards" ([http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/tv\\_faqs.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/tv_faqs.html)) contains outdated energy efficiency information and references products that have never existed in our industry. We ask that you immediately review these materials and make appropriate corrections.

Specifically, and with regard to Plasma TV technology, your "FAQ" document shows a chart that compares CRT, LCD, and Plasma technologies. However, you use three examples of products that have never been marketed in the United States. We know of no manufacturer who has ever made a 30-inch color TV picture tube set - the most common size classes were 31/32" and 35/36". (Retailers sold millions of these enormous picture tube products in the 1990's, and there are millions of them still in use in California. A 36-inch TV can easily consume TWICE the energy of a new 42-inch Plasma HDTV.) Further, to our knowledge, no manufacturer has ever produced a 36-inch LCD or a 48-inch Plasma set. These screen sizes are fabrications on your part, or on the part of whoever provided this information to the Commission. Further, the energy efficiency comparisons for these imaginary televisions are grossly exaggerated.

Another comparison chart stacks a 42-inch LCD against a 42-inch Plasma model. Current ENERGY STAR 42" Plasma models, which make up the bulk of Plasma sales, range from 155-195 watts. Yet your chart suggests that a more typical energy consumption figure is an inflated 271 watts -- a 40%+ discrepancy. We object to this inaccurate and misleading portrayal of our industry's finest products, especially given the enormous strides that our

members have made to increase relative energy efficiency over the past several years.

This inaccurate information is a tremendous disservice to our industry, to the media, and to consumers. We urge you to immediately remove the inaccurate information or replace it with more relevant, updated statistics. We would be happy to assist you in this effort.

Other "Questions & Answers" in your materials are equally misleading.

You suggest that the TV sets consume a tenth of a typical home's electricity. This figure is simply wrong! Common home energy statistics generally place TV use at 3-4% of household energy consumption.

Your materials also suggest that no televisions would be banned under the proposed CEC TV regulations. Again, this is simply wrong! Today's best performing and most fully-featured HDTVs in the most popular screen sizes, which will be marketed in nearby states, will most likely be banned for sale in California as the result of the proposed constrictive regulation. We again ask for a correction to this misleading information.

Lastly, it appears that your "facts" are only telling part of the story. In addition to listing those who support the proposed CEC regulation, it would be fair to California consumers to also list those who do NOT support the proposed regulation that will restrict models from California retail stores. While large retailers have recently asked that these documents be amended to remove their implied endorsement of your efforts, your so-called "facts" document makes no reference to the many hundreds of California retailers and independent installers who oppose the CEC efforts which will eliminate jobs, imperil tax revenue and place California business at risk. We believe it is in the best interest of California citizens that your government agency promote and deliver accurate information in all materials and web sites regarding this matter.

We urge the Energy Commission to thoroughly review the biased and inaccurate materials it is distributing to the media and to the public, so that a fair evaluation of the benefits and disadvantages of the regulatory proposals can be conducted with the scrutiny of public review. In doing so, we encourage you to review and consider the testimony and written comments of the many retailers and manufactures that have summarized the damage the proposed regulation will have on their business and consumers.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely

James Palumbo

President

Plasma Display Coalition

[www.plasmadisplaycoalition.org](http://www.plasmadisplaycoalition.org)

cc: Ms. Karen Douglas, Chair, California Energy Commission

Mr. James D. Boyd, Vice Chair, California Energy Commission

Mr. Jeffrey D. Byron, Commissioner, California Energy Commission

Ms. Julia Levin, J.D., Commissioner, California Energy Commissioner

Dr. Arthur H. Rosenfeld, Commissioner, California Energy Commissioner

Mr. Daniel Pellissier, Office of California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

# PLASMA DISPLAY COALITION

382 LAWRENCE COURT  
WYCKOFF, NEW JERSEY 07481  
201 970-2222  
jimpalumbo@verizon.net

JAMES M. PALUMBO  
PRESIDENT

September 15, 2009

Mr. Adam Gottlieb  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

*VIA E-MAIL*

Re: Docket #07-AAER-3C

Dear Mr. Gottlieb:

On behalf of the Plasma Display Coalition, I am writing to ask the California Energy Commission to review the blatantly inaccurate and often damaging information found on your web site regarding the proposed energy efficiency regulations for television sets. This misinformation is misleading to the media, to our valuable customers, and to California consumers in general.

Members of the Plasma Display Coalition have been among the HDTV leaders who have voluntarily introduced new TV technologies that conserve energy. We understand and share the Commission's objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but we part ways with regard to the tactical approach. As you know, our members believe that industry can and will voluntarily respond to consumer demand for more energy efficient displays. We believe a far more effective way to reduce power consumption in the State of California and meet Title 20 goals is for the Energy Commission to adopt a strategic approach that focuses, in part, on retiring older far less-efficient televisions rather than with restricting certain new TV technologies from the marketplace.

Recently, we learned that the CEC's updated "Frequently Asked Questions" and "Just the Facts, The Truth About Proposed TV Standards" ([http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/tv\\_faqs.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/tv_faqs.html)) contains outdated energy efficiency information and references products that have never existed in our industry. We ask that you immediately review these materials and make appropriate corrections.

Specifically, and with regard to Plasma TV technology, your “FAQ” document shows a chart that compares CRT, LCD, and Plasma technologies. However, you use three examples of products that have never been marketed in the United States. We know of no manufacturer who has ever made a 30-inch color TV picture tube set – the most common size classes were 31/32” and 35/36”. (Retailers sold millions of these enormous picture tube products in the 1990’s, and there are millions of them still in use in California. A 36-inch TV can easily consume TWICE the energy of a new 42-inch Plasma HDTV.) Further, to our knowledge, no manufacturer has ever produced a 36-inch LCD or a 48-inch Plasma set. These screen sizes are fabrications on your part, or on the part of whoever provided this information to the Commission. Further, the energy efficiency comparisons for these imaginary televisions are grossly exaggerated.

Another comparison chart stacks a 42-inch LCD against a 42-inch Plasma model. Current ENERGY STAR 42” Plasma models, which make up the bulk of Plasma sales, range from 155-195 watts. Yet your chart suggests that a more typical energy consumption figure is an inflated 271 watts -- a 40%+ discrepancy. We object to this inaccurate and misleading portrayal of our industry’s finest products, especially given the enormous strides that our members have made to increase relative energy efficiency over the past several years.

This inaccurate information is a tremendous disservice to our industry, to the media, and to consumers. We urge you to immediately remove the inaccurate information or replace it with more relevant, updated statistics. We would be happy to assist you in this effort.

Other “Questions & Answers” in your materials are equally misleading.

You suggest that the TV sets consume a tenth of a typical home’s electricity. This figure is simply wrong! Common home energy statistics generally place TV use at 3-4% of household energy consumption.

Your materials also suggest that no televisions would be banned under the proposed CEC TV regulations. Again, this is simply wrong! Today’s best performing and most fully-featured HDTVs in the most popular screen sizes, which will be marketed in nearby states, will most likely be banned for sale in California as the result of the proposed constrictive regulation. We again ask for a correction to this misleading information.

Lastly, it appears that your “facts” are only telling part of the story. In addition to listing those who support the proposed CEC regulation, it would be fair to California consumers to also list those who do NOT support the proposed regulation that will restrict models from California retail stores. While large retailers have recently asked that these documents be amended to remove their implied endorsement of your efforts, your so-called “facts” document makes no reference to the many hundreds of California retailers and independent installers who oppose the CEC efforts which will eliminate jobs, imperil tax revenue and place California business at risk. We believe it is in the best interest of California citizens that your government agency promote and deliver accurate information in all materials and web sites regarding this matter.

We urge the Energy Commission to thoroughly review the biased and inaccurate materials it is distributing to the media and to the public, so that a fair evaluation of the benefits and

disadvantages of the regulatory proposals can be conducted with the scrutiny of public review. In doing so, we encourage you to review and consider the testimony and written comments of the many retailers and manufactures that have summarized the damage the proposed regulation will have on their business and consumers.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely

James Palumbo  
President  
Plasma Display Coalition

[www.plasmadisplaycoalition.org](http://www.plasmadisplaycoalition.org)

cc: Ms. Karen Douglas, Chair, California Energy Commission  
Mr. James D. Boyd, Vice Chair, California Energy Commission  
Mr. Jeffrey D. Byron, Commissioner, California Energy Commission  
Ms. Julia Levin, J.D., Commissioner, California Energy Commissioner  
Dr. Arthur H. Rosenfeld, Commissioner, California Energy Commissioner  
Mr. Daniel Pellissier, Office of California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger