

February 25, 2026

Senate Committee on Energy & Environment
Oregon State Capitol
900 Court St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

RE: HB 4060 and -2 amendments - OPPOSE

Chair Sollman, Vice Chair Brock Smith, and Members of the Committee,

Electrify Now is a volunteer organization working to educate the public on the benefits of adopting high efficiency electric solutions in their homes and workplaces. We submit this testimony to oppose to HB 4060 and amendments which will unnecessarily delay and impede state efforts to increase energy efficiency in our buildings for the following reasons.

1. Drop-in LED Replacement Bulbs are readily available which are compatible with existing fluorescent fixtures and require no wiring or fixture modification.

It is claimed by some proponents of HB 4060 that this bill would require the complete replacement of fluorescent fixtures. This is not the case and there is no evidence to support the claim that LED replacements for fluorescent tubes flicker or fail prematurely if a high quality tube of the correct type is installed. There are readily available LED bulbs that can be used in existing fixtures simply by installing the new bulb when a fluorescent tube burns out. A very quick visit to lighting sales sites will demonstrate the vast array of LED replacement options for fluorescent tubes.

[ULINE](#) , [1000BULBS](#), [LIGHTBULBS.COM](#)

2. LED Bulbs in commercial buildings will produce energy cost savings in one year that far exceed the additional cost of the bulb.

While LED replacement bulbs for fluorescent fixtures cost more than standard fluorescent bulbs, the energy savings for one year of operation exceeds the additional cost. A study by [ACEEE](#) found that LED replacements for fluorescents use 25-50% less energy and last 2 – 3 times longer. Because lights in commercial buildings are on a significant portion of the year, one T8 fluorescent tube (the most common in commercial buildings) which requires 32 W of power will cost roughly \$15 per year in electricity if the light is on 50% of the time. An LED replacement for that bulb will only need \$8.50 of electricity per year, a savings of nearly \$7 per bulb per year. The additional cost for an LED replacement bulb is under \$4. Therefore, a large building owner that is using thousands of these bulbs will be saving thousands of dollars per year in energy costs by replacing inefficient fluorescents with LEDs.

3. Fluorescent tubes are hazardous waste and large buildings have thousands of them.

Fluorescent tubes contain mercury – [a potent neurotoxin](#) that is considered among the top 10 chemicals of major public health concern and are especially dangerous to infants, pregnant women and unborn babies.

Broken fluorescent tubes release mercury vapor that can be inhaled or absorbed through the skin. [OHSA sets strict limits on permissible exposure to mercury](#) for workers handling fluorescent tube waste.

The Oregon DEQ states that [spent fluorescent tubes are hazardous waste](#) and disposed of with specific hazardous waste protocols.

A large commercial building of 1 Million square feet, such as the ones seeking exemption from the ban on fluorescent tube sales in Oregon, will have 10,000 to 20,000 of these hazardous fluorescent tubes which must be disposed of extremely carefully at end of life. Prolonging the use of these unnecessary, inefficient and hazardous products makes no sense when replacements are readily available.

4. Large buildings are not special cases.

Commercial buildings have maintenance staff as part of operating expenses. Larger buildings have larger staffs and larger operating budgets. These crews already replace fluorescent tubes when they burn out. The only change to their work would be that they would be screwing in an LED instead of a fluorescent tube. There is no logic to exempting large buildings from making this common sense upgrade, while making somewhat smaller properties comply. On the contrary, *larger buildings are exactly the building that should be doing this work as the energy savings and hazardous waste reduction are more significant for those properties.* It is no accident that Building Performance Standards (BPS) are focusing on large properties first. This bill is exactly opposed to what BPS has been created to accomplish – energy efficiency in large commercial properties.

5. Energy efficiency is more urgent now than ever.

It is more imperative now than ever before to reduce peak electricity demand as data centers and other additional electric loads put strain on our electric grid and add upward pressure to the cost of energy for households across the state. HB 4060 works against the public interest by failing to reduce electric loads that are low hanging fruit to reduce burdens on the grid and lower energy costs.

6. Fluorescent bulbs are illegal to sell into Oregon.

HB 2531 (2023) prohibits the sale of fluorescent bulbs in the state of Oregon, and HB 4060 does not change that basic underpinning of this bill which passed with widespread support. Retailers which sell fluorescent bulbs online clearly state that they cannot be shipped to Oregon. There is no practical way to exempt customers based on their size for the purposes of sales of a product that is illegal to sell or distribute into the state.

This bill creates a broad and unnecessary exemption to a fundamentally sound prohibition on inefficient and toxic fluorescent bulbs in Oregon. It cannot be justified based on burdensome costs to large building owners since LED replacements will reduce operating costs in excess of the additional bulb costs.

Please reject this bill which would appear to reward delay of common-sense policy and cater to those large entities who have the resources to fight laws they find inconvenient even when those laws are clearly in the public interest.

Thank you,

Brian Stewart
Co-Founder
Electrify Now