

DOCKET**09-AAER-1C**

DATE SEP 18 2009

RECD SEP 21 2009

From: Mediaoffice
To: dpp@pacbell.net
CC: Docket Optical System
Date: 9/18/2009 5:59 PM
Subject: Response to: Complaint Form (docket 3 09-AEET-1C)

Mr. Provenghi,

Thank you for sending in a concerns about the Calif. Energy Commission proposed regulations on TVs.

We would like to direct you to the Energy Commission staff report on our website that will explain the reasoning behind the proposed regulations. A newspaper article cannot get into the depth of discussion that is needed to explain they whys behind our actions. The report can be found and downloaded from:

http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/2009_tvregs/documents/

We urge you to read the report to help you understand why such regulations are needed. Staff has been working with the TV industry and other interested groups for more than a year on these regulations. According to our analysis, there will be an negligible increase in the cost to make the HDTVs more energy efficient.

Almost all appliances sold in California, except for the newer flat screen TVs, have to meet strict energy efficiency standards already. The state has been requiring these standards since 1978. The standards have helped make all our appliances more energy efficient. For example, refrigerators sold today use about 1/4 the amount of electricity they did 30 years ago because of energy efficiency regulations. The manufacturers would not have done that had they not been required to. But we are not lacking for consumer choice. You have hundreds of models to chose from if you're buying a new "frig", with all the features you would desire. But the manufacturers were required to make their products more efficient, and they had to do so in a cost-effective manner.

California was the first state to require more efficient refrigerators, and so the manufacturers rather than making two models, one for California and one for the rest of the country, made all of their refrigerators (and freezer) more energy efficient. So, everyone was eventually buying the same models.

California's efficiency standards have helped keep our per-person electricity use flat, with very little increase, for the last 30 years, while the rest of the country's electricity use per person has increased very dramatically. California's efficiency standards for buildings and appliances have saved consumers than \$56 billion in electricity and natural gas costs since 1978. It is estimated the standards will save an additional \$23 billion by 2013.

The old TV standards are based on the old cathode ray tube TVs. The federal government has not moved forward in updating its testing methods. So the state, which can regulate appliances sold here, is proposing that new test methods are used and that the televisions meet a certain threshold of energy use. The Energy Commission is only adding TVs to the very long list of appliances whose energy use we already regulate.

TVs use about 10 percent of the electricity in most homes, and as the number of screens and peripheral equipment (satellite boxes, cable TV, BlueRay, VCRs, etc.) in a house increases, the amount of electricity used also increases. Our staff estimates that these new regulations will save Californians money and will reduce the need to build additional power plants.

The technology exists for flat screens (LCDs, plasmas, etc.) to meet the standards we are proposing. Many models (more than 600) already meet the proposed state standards, which if approved won't go into effect for two years.

No one will be deprived of the model they want to purchase, and no one will be taking anyone's TV away.

The manufacturers are the ones that have to meet the new standards. Already many TV makers have said that meeting these new standards can be done at little or no cost.

Concerns raised by small businesses that specialize in very large, home theater TV systems have been taken into consideration. So, the proposed regulations do not affect TVs that measure larger than 58-inches diagonally (1400 square inches). Those larger TVs may be considered in a future update to the regulations.

We hope that you would please read our staff report so you can better understand our reasoning about why such regulations are needed.

Thank you again for voicing your concerns. Your e-mail will be filed with the formal comments on this proceeding.

Bob Aldrich
Media & Public Communications Office
California Energy Commission

>>> <dpp@pacbell.net> 09/18/09 5:12 PM >>>

Last Name: Provenghi
First Name: David
Address: 3404 31st Street
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip Code: 92104
Country: USA
Daytime Phone Number:
Evening Phone Number:
Fax Number:

E-MAIL: dpp@pacbell.net

Complaint or Comment About the California Energy Commission

Description of complaint or comment (people involved, dates, time, etc).

Dear California Energy Commission:

I read a news article today that I hope isn't true. It claims that your agency is moving to require tougher new energy laws for HDTVs. The result will be higher TV costs to the consumers, and possibly save us \$30 per year in energy costs. I can already predict that TV costs will far surpass that small savings. If this is indeed correct, you are encouraging Californians to either move out of state, or buy from out of state where those stupid regulations don't exist. Either way, California eventually loses. Why must you have to make an expensive investment even more expensive? STOP RAISING THE COST OF LIVING IN CALIFORNIA. I've been a resident all my life (over 40 years), and I am really getting tired of the CA government finding new ways to make me pay more. Stop it.

Would you like to discuss this complaint in detail with a Commission representative?

NO

Further Action to Be Taken

Please specify what action you would like the Energy Commission to take?
Stop putting government's nose into everything. If people want to have TVs that cost more in energy, let them pay for it. Don't increase the cost of goods!

Give a brief summary of any action already taken in relation to this complaint.

Give the name(s) of any person in the Commission already contacted in relation to this matter.