



November 21, 2011

Mr. Harinder Singh
Mr. Michael Leanon
Dockets Office, MS-4
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
Via E-Mail: Docket@energy.state.ca.us

DOCKET	
11-AAER-2	
DATE	Nov. 21 2011
RECD.	Nov. 21 2011

RE: Docket No.11-AAER-2: Rulemaking Proceeding Phase II on Appliance Efficiency Regulations

Makita U.S.A., Inc., would like to provide the following comments on the California Energy Commission's Proposed Amendments to Appliance Efficiency Regulations which proposed amendments to Sections 1601 - 1608 of Title 20 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the Efficiency Standards for Battery Chargers and Lighting Controls, Staff Analysis of Battery Charger Standards (Staff Report), Docket No. 09-AAER-02; 2010 Rulemaking Proceeding Phase II on Appliance Efficiency Regulations (March 2011).

General Comments:

Makita has been a global power tool manufacturer and distributor and is known as a global leader in battery power tools. Makita has more than forty overseas subsidiaries in over thirty countries with factories in seven countries including the United States. Makita USA, Inc. is also head quartered in La Mirada California.

Makita has been at the forefront with innovative charger designs that enhance battery life while producing an efficient charging system. As stated in the past Makita was the first power tool company to have a battery charger approved by Energy Star. In fact at this time all of Makita's battery chargers are Energy Star approved showing our overall commitment to building more energy efficient products.

Concerns and Comments:

- Many of our other concerns have been addressed in the Power Tool Institutes (PTI) response so we do not want to repeat them here in this letter. We would just like to go on record that we are in full support of the PTI comments provided.
- The lack of response to the past letters that have been sent as a part of this process is a major concern. The points that have been made in our correspondence have not been addressed in the responses published to date. A response to the requested stake holder's comments would be a reasonable expectation when trying to address the issues raised. Therefore, the following issues are being raised again in an effort to obtain an expected response.
 - The proposal as currently written will result in almost all of our chargers being re-designed. This change over of our charger models along with the very short proposed effective date of January 2013 makes it impossible for us to bring all of our models into compliance. In order to re-design, have third party tested conducted for safety approval and manufacture the chargers we would need at least a 2 year time period.

There has been no rationale provided indicating why the CEC believes that such a large undertaking by the manufacturers can be completed within a 1 year period. This proposed compliance time period is very short and unrealistic.

During the last meeting almost every presenter made a point of how the 1 year time frame for compliance is not realistic. We would again ask the CEC to consider increasing the proposal for compliance to 2 years. If the effective date can not be increased to 2 years we would like to have a rationale provided from the CEC indicating how they came to the conclusion that such an undertaking can be completed in a 1 year time period for power tool charger manufacturers.

- The current proposal is allowing for the non compliant chargers to be sold as replacement parts up to 5 years after the effective date. We agree with the intention of this proposal however, we would like to recommend that this date be pushed out to 10 years for power tool chargers.

Our users tend to purchase a number of different types of power tools (drills, saws, reciprocating-saws, staplers, impact wrenches, flashlights, vacuums etc.) that run on the same platform battery/charger systems. These tools, if cared for, can last a long period of time. Many times this collection of tools can run into the thousands of dollars and it would most definitely be a hardship for many end-users/contractors who have made the investment but it becomes worthless without a replacement charger.

We feel that after a 10 year period the impact of not having a replacement charger would be minimized to the end-user. Again if this proposal can not be granted please provide a response indicating why it can not be granted for power tool battery charging systems.

- There will be minimal gains of energy savings from many of our chargers due to these proposed requirements. The Staff Report (Docket#11-AAER-2) indicates, in Table A7, (Costs and Savings) an energy savings of 14.95 Kwh/yr for power tool chargers. However, for many of our chargers we would not see this type of savings. In fact on one of our typical chargers we would see an annual savings of only 3.21 Kwh/yr. This minor energy savings would not be cost effective for the end-user due to the added expense that would be incurred as a result of the required redesign for compliance.

In addition the incremental cost associated with these types of changes is much higher than the \$0.55 currently indicated in the table. It is expected that the cost will range from 7 to 20 times this estimated cost depending on the charger design.

In Conclusion

For powered tool battery chargers in this proposal there are major concerns in the fact that the energy efficiency levels selected are unrealistic, preliminary testing is demonstrating that many chargers will not pass the proposed limits, the actual energy gains to the end-user are not cost effective and the proposed one year effective date is not reasonable and will not allow manufacturers to bring all their products into compliance by the effective date.

Due to all of the issues above it is recommended that the CEC consider breaking out the category for power tool battery chargers from this proposal and developing a separate category with efficiency limits that would more properly be representative of these type of products and their usages.

Another option would be to remove this product category from this proposal completely knowing that the DOE will be providing power tool battery chargers requirements in the very near future.

Your time and effort in considering our comments to the proposed battery charger is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stan Rodrigues
Manager, Regulatory & Compliance Dept.
Makita USA, Inc.