

MEMORANDUM

RE: Ex Parte Communication In Connection with  
Docket No. EERE-2010-BT-STD-0027  
Energy Efficiency Program for Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Public Meeting and  
Availability of the Framework Document for Commercial and Industrial Electric Motors,  
75 Fed.Reg. 59657 (September 28, 2010).

To: [expartecommunications@hq.doe.gov](mailto:expartecommunications@hq.doe.gov)

From: Clark R. Silcox, General Counsel  
National Electrical Manufacturers Association

Date: May 21, 2012

cc: Bill Hoyt, Alex Boesenberg, Rob Boeteler, John Malinowski, Andrew DeLaski, Neil Elliott, Dan  
Delaney, Michael Bruin, Tim Schumann

This memorandum memorializes another communication involving a follow-up to the Motor Coalition's previous communications in connection with this proceeding and documented in a memorandum dated April 18, 2012. In response to our prior correspondence, Navigant Consulting made technical inquiries about certain aspects of the Motor Coalition's proposal to expand the coverage of electric motors regulated under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act; for example how certain configurations of electric motors would be tested. On May 16, 2012, a teleconference was held to follow-up on Navigant's technical inquiries.

In attendance on the call were, DOE: Jim Raba, DOE Appliance Standards; John Cymbalsky, DOE Appliance Standards; Ami Grace-Tardi, DOE General Counsel's office; Michael Kido, DOE General Counsel's office; Lawrence Berkley National Laboratory: Sanaee Iyama; Navigant Consulting: William Kohse, Hisham Araji, Matthew Nardotti; Motor Coalition: Rob Boteler, Nidec Motors; John Malinowski, Baldor Electric; Dan Trombley, ACEEE; Andrew deLaski, ASAP; Alex Boesenberg, NEMA; Clark Silcox, NEMA (part-time); William Hoyt, NEMA.

While the purpose of the conference call was not to discuss the scope of the Motor Coalition's proposal, parts of the discussion went beyond technical discussions about testing and touched on what motors were covered or not covered by the Motor Coalition's proposal, and we submit this ex-parte memorandum to describe those coverage discussions.

The Motor Coalition was asked: "What does '56T frame enclosed and ODP not covered' mean? Where in NEMA Standards Publication MG1, 'Motors and Generators' is the 56T frame motor covered? What are the performance characteristics of such a 56T frame motor, for example, horsepower?"

RESPONSE: It was clarified that 56T frame could be 56 frame and could be the size and performance of a 140T frame motor. It was noted that the Motor Coalition is proposing coverage of 56

frame motors not covered in the Small Motor Rule. Discussion included what tables they would be included in in NEMA MG1. The Motor Coalition would consult with NEMA's Motor and Generator Section Technical Committee to provide a list of those tables. It was noted that tables in NEMA MG-1 had previously been expanded (Table 12-12, 8 pole motors was used as an example) in recent MG1 revisions.

The Motor Coalition was asked with respect to Encapsulation, could they clarify what was meant by submersible and immersible, and which were proposed for exclusion from coverage by the Motor Coalition?

RESPONSE: Immersible is to be covered; submersible is not to be covered (excluded from standards). The Motor Coalition would ask the NEMA Motor and Generator Section Technical Committee to provide definitions on both types that will clarify and differentiate between the two.

The Motor Coalition was asked with respect to Frequency: "Where it reads, 'Frequency -V 60 Hz is covered for US,' is that to say 60 Hz only and not 50 Hz or variable frequency motors?"

RESPONSE: 50Hz is not covered (US grid is 60Hz only). A 50/60Hz convertible (dual frequency) is covered product. The NEMA Motor and Generator Section is to provide clarifying language on dual frequency.