

ENERGY FACTS



New high-efficiency incandescent bulbs, as on the right, have the same shape and lighting quality as the 125 year-old incandescent design on the left.

© Anthony Clark, NRDC

Better Light Bulbs Equal Consumer Savings in Every State

In 2007, Congress enacted new lighting efficiency standards. As long as Congress does not repeal the standards before they begin to take effect in January, they will save the average American household \$85 each year and more than \$12.5 billion nationally each year when fully implemented.

The new standards will not ban the incandescent bulbs that are familiar to consumers today; they will make the bulbs 25 to 30 percent more efficient. Switching to compact florescent bulbs (CFLs) or light-emitting diode (LED) bulbs will bring consumers even greater savings.

Researchers with the Appliance Standards Awareness Project (ASAP) and the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) recently calculated the potential savings (see chart on next page), considering average statewide electricity prices, the typical energy savings from more efficient bulbs, and state-level data on household energy usage. All states will see significant savings from the phase-in of more efficient bulbs, with some states, such as New York and Texas, saving more than \$1 billion every year—simply from consumers using better bulbs. Also, the new standards will eliminate the need for more than 30 new large power plants.

Some in Congress are considering repealing the new efficiency standards before they even take effect. That would take away \$12.5 billion in consumer savings—something none of us can afford.



For more
information,
please
contact:

Bob Keefe
202-289-2373
or bkeefe@nrdc.org
S [switchboard.nrdc.org/
blogs/bkeefe/](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/bkeefe/)

www.nrdc.org/policy
www.facebook.com/nrdc.org
www.twitter.com/nrdc

Projected Annual Electricity Savings From New Energy Efficient Light Bulb Standards

	Statewide Electricity Savings (billion kWh)	500 MW Power Plant Generation Equivalence (number of power plants)	Household Electricity Use Equivalence (number of households)	Per Household Electricity Savings (kWh)	Savings as a Percentage of Household Electricity Use	Per Household Bill Savings	Statewide Bill Savings
Alabama	1.43	0.5	100,000	700	5%	\$76	\$155,000,000
Alaska	0.25	0.1	30,000	795	10%	\$131	\$41,000,000
Arizona	2.91	0.9	230,000	779	6%	\$85	\$320,000,000
Arkansas	0.93	0.3	70,000	700	5%	\$61	\$81,000,000
California	12.82	4.2	1,840,000	821	12%	\$124	\$1,944,000,000
Colorado	1.70	0.6	210,000	714	9%	\$79	\$188,000,000
Connecticut	1.04	0.3	120,000	719	8%	\$139	\$201,000,000
Delaware	0.29	0.1	30,000	728	7%	\$101	\$40,000,000
District of Columbia	0.14	0.0	20,000	623	7%	\$86	\$19,000,000
Florida	7.90	2.6	580,000	711	5%	\$82	\$910,000,000
Georgia	3.42	1.1	250,000	762	6%	\$77	\$348,000,000
Hawaii	0.42	0.1	60,000	801	11%	\$225	\$118,000,000
Idaho	0.57	0.2	40,000	745	6%	\$59	\$46,000,000
Illinois	3.76	1.2	430,000	739	8%	\$85	\$433,000,000
Indiana	1.95	0.6	160,000	702	6%	\$67	\$187,000,000
Iowa	0.84	0.3	80,000	666	6%	\$69	\$88,000,000
Kansas	0.84	0.3	80,000	694	6%	\$69	\$84,000,000
Kentucky	1.31	0.4	90,000	697	5%	\$60	\$112,000,000
Louisiana	1.33	0.4	90,000	736	5%	\$66	\$119,000,000
Maine	0.39	0.1	60,000	666	11%	\$105	\$61,000,000
Maryland	1.94	0.6	160,000	742	6%	\$107	\$279,000,000
Massachusetts	1.95	0.6	270,000	717	10%	\$109	\$295,000,000
Michigan	2.86	0.9	370,000	714	9%	\$89	\$357,000,000
Minnesota	1.74	0.6	180,000	691	7%	\$72	\$182,000,000
Mississippi	0.87	0.3	60,000	733	5%	\$73	\$87,000,000
Missouri	1.83	0.6	140,000	697	5%	\$63	\$167,000,000
Montana	0.30	0.1	30,000	702	7%	\$64	\$28,000,000
Nebraska	0.53	0.2	40,000	691	6%	\$62	\$47,000,000
Nevada	1.21	0.4	110,000	750	7%	\$93	\$150,000,000
New Hampshire	0.44	0.1	60,000	717	10%	\$117	\$72,000,000
New Jersey	2.70	0.9	330,000	756	9%	\$125	\$447,000,000
New Mexico	0.62	0.2	80,000	736	10%	\$78	\$65,000,000
New York	5.48	1.8	790,000	745	11%	\$138	\$1,016,000,000
North Carolina	3.52	1.1	260,000	697	5%	\$71	\$359,000,000
North Dakota	0.18	0.1	10,000	632	5%	\$51	\$15,000,000
Ohio	3.25	1.1	310,000	697	7%	\$79	\$366,000,000
Oklahoma	1.15	0.4	90,000	702	5%	\$64	\$105,000,000
Oregon	1.38	0.4	110,000	702	6%	\$62	\$122,000,000
Pennsylvania	3.64	1.2	360,000	694	7%	\$89	\$465,000,000
Rhode Island	0.31	0.1	50,000	711	10%	\$113	\$49,000,000
South Carolina	1.51	0.5	110,000	711	5%	\$75	\$159,000,000
South Dakota	0.23	0.1	20,000	685	6%	\$61	\$21,000,000
Tennessee	2.12	0.7	140,000	702	5%	\$65	\$198,000,000
Texas	9.59	3.1	700,000	793	6%	\$92	\$1,110,000,000
Utah	1.05	0.3	110,000	886	9%	\$77	\$91,000,000
Vermont	0.19	0.1	30,000	674	10%	\$105	\$30,000,000
Virginia	2.77	0.9	200,000	717	5%	\$75	\$290,000,000
Washington	2.50	0.8	190,000	711	5%	\$57	\$200,000,000
West Virginia	0.49	0.2	40,000	669	5%	\$59	\$43,000,000
Wisconsin	1.72	0.6	210,000	683	8%	\$86	\$216,000,000
Wyoming	0.16	0.1	20,000	691	6%	\$60	\$14,000,000
United States	102.48	33.4	10,150,000	737	7%	\$85	\$12,540,000,000

SOURCE: American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy and Appliance Standards Awareness Project, July 2011

