

Joe Hayes

From: Nathan Andrews <~~nathana@alaska.gov~~>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Opposition to SB 120

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Alaska State Senate State Affairs Committee,

I'm writing to voice my firm opposition to Senate Bill 120, which aims to create the Alaska Climate Change Emergency Response Commission. While I value protecting our environment, I have serious doubts about the reasoning and consequences of this proposal.

No Real Emergency

The bill paints climate change as an urgent crisis in Alaska, but that doesn't hold up. Yes, weather and climate shift over time, and we should keep an eye on it, but calling it an "emergency" suggests we're facing immediate disaster. I don't see the evidence for that. Natural climate patterns are largely beyond our control, and hyping it as a crisis could push us into panicked decisions instead of smart, fact-based ones.

Shaky Science

There's growing doubt about how much human activity really drives climate change. A study from March 21, 2025, in the *Science of Climate Change* journal used cutting-edge AI to argue that natural forces—like solar changes and Earth's own cycles—might matter more than human CO₂ emissions. This flies in the face of the usual story that we're the main culprits ([malone.news](#)). Science isn't about groupthink; it's about proof. History shows "consensus" can crumble when new facts emerge—think of past flops in fields like diet or astronomy. Policy this big needs cold, hard data, not just what's popular. So far, the testimony on SB 120 seems lopsided, leaning on mainstream views without room for debate. If you want a fair process, bring in groups like the CO₂ Coalition or the researchers behind that study. Diverse voices matter.

Economic and Social Risks

Rushing into policies built on shaky ground could hurt Alaskans. Look at Europe—climate rules there have swallowed up farmland, wrecked farmers' livelihoods, and jacked up food costs. In Alaska, that could hit our farmers, small businesses, and Native communities hardest, especially those tied to traditional ways of living.

Green Energy's Hidden Costs

Switching to alternatives like electric vehicles or wind power sounds noble, but it's not clean and simple. Lithium mining for batteries trashes ecosystems and exploits workers, sometimes kids. Wind turbines chop up birds and leave behind disposal headaches. We can't ignore those trade-offs.

My Recommendation

I urge you to rethink SB 120. Any move this big needs rock-solid science and a hard look at how it'll play out economically, socially, and environmentally. Pump the brakes, dig into the data, and avoid locking us into something that could backfire.

Thanks for hearing me out.

Sincerely,

Nate Andrews