

Submitter: Kyle Huth
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4060

I'm opposed to HB4060. As an engineer I have worked on many fluorescent to LED lighting upgrade projects. The vast majority of these fixtures are compatible with a drop-in equivalent LED lamp that does not require a fixture or ballast replacement. The LED equivalent might have a \$3-5 premium per lamp, but will save \$5-10 in energy cost in just the first year of replacement. It takes the exact same amount of time to replace when the fluorescent lamp burns out. It is true that the fluorescent fixture ballast, which is designed to provide a specific voltage and current to fluorescent lamps, might have a reduced lifespan from about 10 years to about 5 years with a LED bulb. But that still gives the facility years to come up with a more permanent solution, and when the ballast does fail it can be replaced or removed to be used with ballast-free LED lamps if the facility is not prepared for a full fixture replacement. In summary, there are cost effective short-term and long-term solutions, and there isn't a compelling reason to grant a carve-out exception to a few of the largest facilities in the state.