

## LARL (Lawrence Association for Responsible Lighting)

In February, having considered testimony from Audubon Society, as well as all the medical and ecological aspects of this issue, the Commission directed staff to present an ordinance for 3,000 K streetlighting as standard for Lawrence.

(Note: LARL disagrees with staff's memo that the lights could be charged extra under the tariff. Other experts say differently.)

## Indemnity Agreement

Westar agrees to 3,000 K as the new standard for Lawrence streetlights, and asks for an indemnity contract. Such a contract (narrowly drafted) seems acceptable. Cities often accept very remote risk when they implement very worthwhile policies.

The actual likelihood of liability based on a city's choice of using the AMA (American Medical Association) recommended streetlight color temperature of 3,000K (which itself is backed by many studies) and when Chicago, Phoenix, and dozens more have implemented this standard and recognized it as the best standard... seems remote.

The city is simply following best evidence (and overwhelming evidence) for its citizens in moving to 3,000K.

## Delay

If a new standard is implemented...

Since an indemnity agreement could take time to draft... *we encourage the City to reach an understanding, involving Westar and the City Manager, that the new standard be implemented immediately.*

Mayor Boley accurately observed three months ago, "to delay is to decide." This Commission's goal on this issue is continually eroded through delay.

This standard for streetlights has been actively sought by LARL since last August. There was a three-month delay after Commissioner Amyx moved for consideration of this, until it was on the agenda. Then three more months passed after the Commission unanimously voiced approval, until now.

New development is occurring with 4,000K lamps, and burned out HPS lamps are presumably being replaced with 4,000K, which will be in place for 15 to 20 years. (We understand retrofitting is not occurring en masse).

If a 3,000 K lamp inventory is not immediately available, both the Manager and Westar could propose alternate solutions to reach the goal of quickly halting the 4,000K retrofits. For example, delaying any replacement until the new standard is available, or replacement of a burned out HPS with another HPS.

## Buying the Streetlights

Westar indicated it may be open to selling the city the streetlights.

This should be considered in the future when this current issue is resolved. For cost savings it is highly recommended. In 2009, the city auditor's report, which is on-line, estimated our city would save at least \$150,000 per year by owning the streetlights.

Additionally, LEDs can now save about 50% in energy costs. Overworked staff can be saved from working on this issue, as free audits are apparently available for obtaining a loan for efficiency upgrades. Once bought, the maintenance - simplified with LEDs- can be contracted out.

Cities have been buying their streetlights in Johnson County from KCPL for this reason.

\*\*\*

(Finally, in the proposed ordinance filed with this document, LARL recommends beam angles be included in any agreement... to help further reduce light pollution.)

## **Proposed Streetlight Ordinance**

“Henceforth, all streetlighting installed in, at the direction of, or owned by, the City of Lawrence, shall have light sources with a correlated color temperature preferably at or below 2700 K, but in no case greater than 3,000 K. This ordinance does not affect streetlights already retrofitted with light sources above 3,000 K, but is prospective, applying to future streetlight fixtures and lamps, including lamp installations, retrofits, and replacements.”

(While not commented on by the Commission, LARL has also recommended that beam angle limits be included. These help keep lighting directed down, to reduce glare and light pollution: “Maximum beam angles should be 120 degrees for streetlights, but 90 degrees for streetlights within 500 feet of Baker Wetlands.”)

Submitted by LARL