

KYLE PITSOR Vice President, Government Relations

March 23, 2009

Mr. Hampton Newsome Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room H-135 (Annex J), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580

SUBJECT: Lamp Labeling Study, Project No. P084206

Dear Mr. Newsome,

The National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) Lamp Labeling Study, Project No. P084206.

NEMA is the trade association of choice for the electrical manufacturing industry. Founded in 1926 and headquartered near Washington, D.C., its approximately 450 member companies manufacture products used in the generation, transmission and distribution, control and end-use of electricity, including the lamps included within this rulemaking.

We offer the following comments on the Federal Register Notice dated February 20, 2009.

<u>Section I. Background</u>. The statement that commenters provided no research is not accurate since NEMA, through several of its member companies, was a participant in the LRC research on color scale communications.

<u>Section II. FTC's Proposed Consumer Study</u>. Regarding *Yearly Energy Cost Information*, the use of 10.8 cents per kWh is accurate for a baseline, since it reflects the 2008 national average. However, the use of this value implies that the price per kWh would have to change every year to reflect the most recent average. For packaging purposes, that is impractical. We suggest using 10 cents per kWh, as this is a figure that is easy for consumers to translate to their own kWh rates.

National Electrical Manufacturers Association

1300 North 17th Street, Suite 1752 Rosslyn, VA 22209 (703) 841-3274 FAX (703) 841-3374 kyl_pitsor@nema.org Comments by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association March 23, 2009 Page 2

Table 1 shows examples of label variables. When one compares these variables to the three label format examples, some of these variables never appear. We would like clarification that the 3 formats (A, B, and C) will indeed have variations shown to the respondents. For example, A, B, and C all show "brightness" in lumens, but the table indicates that one variable will be "light output" in lumens. Please confirm that all variables will be shown. Also please confirm if there will be more than 3 label formats, or if the ones shown (A, B, and C) are the only ones to be tested.

We believe that the issue of prominence of these variables, which was discussed at length in the September 2008 FTC roundtable, has not been addressed at all for this study. A particular variable could be made more prominent than another by using bold type, making the font size larger, or placing it first rather than last. We believe that these variables should be tested using different prominences – in other words, some test labels could show lumens in larger or bolder type, while others could feature lifetime more prominently.

Table 2 shows examples of test models. The second model shows a lamp that achieves 124 lumens per watt, and it is the only 5-star rated lamp. This model should not be included as is. From life data, it is obvious this is an LED retrofit lamp, and the latest models on the market are at best 42 lumens per watt. Since this survey also purports to ascertain preferences, then this particular model, which does not in fact exist, will likely skew results, particularly regarding preference.

<u>All Label Examples</u>: On the front panel, change wording from "medium screw"to "medium base" or "medium screw base." Other variables besides the term"color temperature"should be tested, including "color appearance." Spell out 'hours' or at least 'hrs' instead of '3h'. Confirm if there will be other formats shown to respondents, or if A, B, and C are the only formats to be used. In our opinion, these three formats are not enough. For example, consider testing the label format that was developed for Solid State Light (SSL) products below.



<u>Label A:</u> Rear panel wording shows lumen comparisons to incandescent. Thinking ahead several years, this comparison will likely become invalid or even unclear as standard wattage incandescent lamps are removed from the market. This should be taken into consideration now.

Comments by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association March 23, 2009 Page 3

<u>Label B:</u> The check mark is likely inappropriate because a check can imply a best choice instead of the actual color of the bulb inside the box. Perhaps a small arrow pointing up or downward at the color box would be a better approach to test. The stars may also mislead, so care must be taken to show only the number of stars that represent the particular bulb's performance shown on the test label.

<u>Label C:</u> Color temperature does not have enough scale. In other words, lamp color temperature can be as high as 6500K so the full scale should be shown. Try both directions for the color, namely *warm to cool* left to right and *cool to warm* left to right to ascertain preference, if any. Also consider the variable wording of *warm appearance* and *cool appearance*.

Even in the proposed formats, space will be an issue on the smaller packages. Also note that manufacturers cannot have 2-sided printing (on the inside of the box) or inserts required as part of the format, as these will add considerable packaging costs.

It is unclear how products with less than one-year lifespan on the Yearly Energy Costs information will be treated - the statement is "Yearly Energy Costs." Additionally, life in years is only expressed as a decimal. Some studies have shown that consumers react best to years + months (e.g. in LABEL A instead of 1.4 years, this could be expressed as 1 yr 3 mos.)

Mercury Label

We also request that you include the NEMA nationwide mercury label on lamp packages. Several states have adopted legislation requiring such a label identifying the product as containing mercury and requiring information about recycling. NEMA has been able to adopt a nationwide label that has been approved by these states. With the limited space available on packages for labeling, the NEMA label identified the product as containing mercury, advised consumers to check state and local disposal requirements and refers consumers to the <u>www.lamprecycle.org</u> website, developed by NEMA with the assistance of lamp recyclers, to provide consumers with a one stop source of nationwide information about lamp recycling. The EPA Energy Star program requires reference to either the lamprecycle.org website of an EPA website.

Currently, however, any state could change the label requirements. This could affect the label information required by the FTC and possible could be make compliance with both requirements impossible. Since lamps move in interstate commerce, the FTC has authority to adopt such a label, and there is existing use of the label for most of this decade, we believe that adding this requirement to the FTC label will allow for a nationwide solution to the goals of both energy and environmental information within the constraints of the limited space available on a lamp package for such a label.

Sincerely,

n

Kyle Pitsor Vice President, Government Relations