

From: [Joe Hayes](#)
To: [Sorcha Hazelton](#)
Cc: [Sen. Scott Kawasaki](#)
Subject: FW: In favor of SB 102, AND OPPOSE SB 26
Date: Friday, March 7, 2025 2:59:53 PM

From: Lisa Alexia [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, March 7, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Joe Hayes <Joe.Hayes@akleg.gov>; Sen. Scott Kawasaki <Sen.Scott.Kawasaki@akleg.gov>
Subject: In favor of SB 102, AND OPPOSE SB 26

Chair Merrick & members of the Community and Regional Affairs Committee,

My name is Lisa Alexia, and I wish to discuss why I am in favor of SB 102 and oppose SB 26. My authority on this issue comes from nearly 25 years of living and working in Alaska, first as a Community Health Practitioner in remote villages, and later as a PA working in psychiatry and rural primary care. First, however, I would like to say that I am pleased that so many of you are working towards an end to Daylight Saving Time.

Senators, the bulk of Alaskans live in Anchorage and Fairbanks which is 2.5-3.5 hours displaced from true solar noon during Daylight Saving Time, due to the loss of time zones in 1983. Ending DST would provide a great public health benefit in terms of reducing the burden of chronic physical and mental health diseases as well as improving educational outcomes. However, *how* we eliminate DST, matters a great deal for two reasons:

1) SB 102 is the only bill that would actually help public health and safety because it restores an hour of morning light, which is crucial for alertness. A growing body of evidence suggests that disrupting circadian rhythms by getting up long before sunrise contributes to many general public health and safety risks as well as mental health and educational problems, as detailed in the documents filed with SB 102. It is the harms associated with losing morning light, even more than the actual changing of clocks, which causes the public health burden. This is especially important in the fall and early spring months with shorter days, when many Alaskans struggle with getting up long before sunrise to go to work and school.

2) SB 102, if passed, would end DST **this year** because eliminating DST and reverting to Standard Time is a state-level decision. SB 102 puts us in the category of Hawaii and Arizona—we simply no longer honor DST.

On the other hand, SB 26 would kick the can down the road and would depend on federal action, which is unlikely to occur. Additionally, if SB 26 were actually enacted, it would functionally convert Alaska to permanent Daylight Saving Time, which would *worsen our morning darkness in the winter by an hour*. For Anchorage, SB 26 would put sunrise after 11:00 a.m. for a full 5 weeks in December and January. For Southwest Alaska, two full months of winter would occur after 11:00 a.m.

In short, eliminating DST in favor of a return to Standard Time is like vaccines and seat belts—understanding the benefit requires looking at complex data on a population level and legislating changes which individuals do not always perceive as their preferred option. Legislators like yourselves are entrusted with weighing these pros and cons and relative risks and making decisions which benefit the greater good. My recommendation and hope is that the sponsors of these two bills can merge in favor of SB 102 to truly end DST this year, and withdraw SB 26 completely.

It's important to note that SB 102 would simply mean aligning Alaska's civil clock a little bit better with true solar time, but does not fix it completely. However, it seems the best and most achievable compromise to benefit Alaskans for the long-term.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify,

Lisa Alexia, PA-C, CAQ-Psych, PMH-C
Anchorage, Alaska