



PILKINGTON

March 28, 2003

The Honorable David Garman
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency
and Renewable Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 6C-016
Washington, DC 20585
VIA FACSIMILE: 202.586.9260

Dear Assistant Secretary Garman:

Pilkington North America, Inc. (PNA) *supports the Department of Energy's (DOE) adoption of the criteria set out in connection with the four-zone map* proposed in Richard Karney's 11 February 2003 letter (its "Letter"), and opposes DOE's adoption of the criteria related to the three-zone map. PNA's rationale for its support of the four-zone map and opposition to the three-zone map is set forth below and in the more detailed comments attached to this letter.

The fundamental objectives of the Energy Star Program are (1) to conserve all non-renewable energy sources used by our Nation according to sound scientific principles, (2) to maximize our Nation's use of renewable sources of energy, and (3) to serve the best interests of consumers selecting products on the basis of the Energy Star label. If these objectives are met, the Program's stakeholders and the marketplace will do the rest to ensure that the Program is a success.

In its Letter, the DOE concedes what is irrefutable from the relevant scientific and environmental evidence --- to wit, that the four-zone map is superior to the three-zone map in terms of satisfying these fundamental objectives of the Energy Star Program. First, DOE concedes that the four-zone map will save more energy than the three-zone map. Second, DOE acknowledges that this greater energy savings results from the fact that the four-zone map makes better use of the renewable energy of the sun than the three-zone map. Finally, in conceding that the four-zone map saves more energy than the three-zone map, DOE necessarily concedes that if the three-zone map is adopted, consumers in some climate regions would unwittingly end-up using more energy than necessary for no other reason than the fact that they selected windows in reliance on the Energy Star label.

PNA submits that if the marketplace learns (1) that Energy Star labeled windows in some climate regions *actually use more energy* than other products with no label (2) that DOE deliberately excluded those higher efficiency products from the Program; and (3) that, as a result, consumers in some climate regions are being misled concerning the performance of Energy Star labeled products, the credibility of this Program will quickly, and deservedly, deteriorate.

PNA supports the adoption of the four-zone map because:

- * It best serves all *objectives* of the Energy Star Program.
- * It will *save* more energy than the three-zone map because it makes better use of *solar energy, an abundant, renewable* energy source.
- * It will label the most *energy efficient products* with the Energy Star label.
- * It fairly represents actual differences in the climate make-up of the United States.
- * It corresponds directly with the energy zone changes that DOE has proposed in the *2003-2004 IECC development cycle*.

Likewise, *PNA opposes the adoption of the three-zone map* because:

- * It has been *proposed twice and withdrawn twice* by DOE. *The three-zone map is no longer a credible alternative*.
- * It will consume *more* energy than the four-zone map and *actually mislead* consumers concerning product performance.
- * Its adoption would rest on the *unsupportable and unproven assumption* that the environment will benefit from a peak electrical-energy load savings that would result from its adoption, all with no corresponding environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.
- * Its adoption would *destroy* the market for pyrolytical low-e products, making it *uneconomic* to produce pyrolytic low-e products for consumers in the United States or Canada.
- * Its adoption would bestow a monopoly in the low-e marketplace favoring a select group of glass manufacturers without any supportable scientific basis for doing so.
- * It *fails to coordinate any of its climate regions* with the energy zone changes that DOE has proposed in the 2003-2004 IECC development cycle.
- * It *does not represent* actual differences that exist in the climate make-up of the United States.

The four-zone map relies on sound scientific principles and will well serve the objectives and credibility of the Energy Star window program in the marketplace. The three-zone proposal on the other hand will deceive some consumers and destroy the market for pyrolytic low-e products. It is hard to see how either of those consequences flowing from the adoption of three-zone map could conceivably serve a credible objective of the Energy Star Windows Program.

PNA's detailed comments follow.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. D. J. G.", written in a cursive style.

Alan Graham, Esq.
Country Manager, North America
General Counsel & Secretary

cc: Honorable Kyle McSarrow,
Deputy Secretary,
United States Department of Energy
VIA FACSIMILE: 202.586.7210

Richard H. Karney, P.E., Manager
Energy Star Program
Building Technologies Program
United States Department of Energy
VIA FACSIMILE: 202.586.4617, and
Email: richard.karney@ee.doe.gov.

52898_1