

April 8, 2022

BY EMAIL

Gary May, Chancellor
University of California, Davis
chancellor@ucdavis.edu

Re: The LED Fraud

Dear Gary May,

One of our members posted the following to our group this week. **“LED streetlights are dystopian, and depressingly soulless. It’s not natural to live under their migraine inducing glare. Look at candlelight for instance, it has an orange glow, just like the sun.”**

Figure 1 shows an example of the dystopian, soulless, harsh-white, toxic, hazardous, non-uniform energy, surface source LED lights alongside traditional point source lights.



Figure 1 - America's Best Value Inn – Sacramento, CA

Luminous Efficacy is a measure of the luminous efficiency of a light source. It is the ratio of the total luminous flux emitted to the total power input, expressed in lumens per watt. **Energy Efficiency** is providing the same quality of service using less energy. Luminous Efficacy and Energy Efficiency are not equivalent.

Michael Siminovitch is the Director of the UC Davis California Lighting Technology Center and the Rosenfeld Chair in Energy Efficiency.¹ It would seem reasonable that Mr. Siminovitch would understand the difference between luminous efficacy and energy efficiency. And yet, Mr. Siminovitch's bio page states, "*CLTC projects accelerate the development and commercialization of energy-efficient lighting technologies for both residential and commercial applications.*" From this statement, we infer that Mr. Siminovitch is referring to solid state lighting and is thus falsely claiming that luminous efficacy and energy efficiency are the same. Additional statements by Mr. Siminovitch are in the footnotes.²³

The California Energy Commission has relied heavily on Mr. Siminovitch's false claim to develop the Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The result of developing standards based on this false claim has led to a catastrophic switch to the dystopian and soulless LED lighting, such as shown in Figure 1.

We have attempted to engage with UC Davis' CLTC about this issue. We first contacted Keith Graeber, Director of Engineering on March 7, 2022, and again on March 25, 2022, but received no response. We also contacted Michael Siminovitch, again with no response. We then contacted Michael Sweeney, UC Davis Chief Campus Counsel, who did respond, but informed us that he declined to investigate. Therefore, we are now elevating this situation to the UC Davis Chancellor.

Mr. Siminovitch's false claim that luminous efficacy and energy efficiency are equivalent will have a major impact on the reputation of UC Davis for decades to come. Nearly the entire state of California is inundated with toxic, low-quality LED light, in whole or part, due to Mr. Siminovitch's false claim. LED lighting, due to its non-uniform energy, excessive blue wavelength light, and flicker characteristics, are causing numerous health problems such as epileptic seizures, migraines, panic attacks, anxiety, and a general decay of societal well being due to what we call the LED Fraud.

However, it's never too late to solve the LED crisis. Unlike cleaning up lead paint or asbestos, cleaning up toxic LED light is as easy as turning off the switch. The first step, though, is for UC Davis to publicly state the following:

"Luminous efficacy does not equal energy efficiency, surface sources do not provide the same quality of service as point sources, and LEDs are not energy efficient."

To preserve its reputation and limit its liability, UC Davis must investigate the LED Fraud and make a public statement declaring that the switch to LED was a mistake based on a false claim.

¹ <https://cltc.ucdavis.edu/michael-siminovitch>

² <https://www.energy.ca.gov/publications/2021/laboratory-california-marketplace-new-generation-led-lighting-solutions>

³ <https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=238658&DocumentContentId=72038>

Sincerely,

Mark Baker

Mark Baker
President

Soft Lights Foundation
mbaker@softlights.org

**YOU DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT
TO SHINE YOUR  LIGHT
IN MY **