Hello,

I have a work conflict during today's House Energy Committee meeting, so I am unable to call in and provide testimony. I would like to share my support for HB 153, the Renewable Portfolio Standard bill.

I was born and raised in Anchorage and I love living here now in my 30s, but I am extremely concerned about my ability to afford to do so in the future because of the lack of urgency from the state in addressing the natural gas crisis and current Railbelt energy needs.

I would encourage members of the committee to take a look at Erin McKittrick's recent blog post: A practical way forward in the new Renewable Portfolio Standard. I was heartened to see her analysis that the Railbelt can meet proposed RPS standards via already proposed projects, with little impact to consumer costs. These are not outlandish or pie in the sky ideas, they are projects with funding and support and are very much achievable.

Thank you for your consideration of this bill and my comments. Have a great day!

Sincerely,

Maddie Halloran

(Anchorage - District 19)

Request to kill HB 153. Our state is in a recession and with no end in sight, now is not the time to add additional costs or create energy instability. Alaskans deserve and demand stable power, oil, LNG, coal, nuclear, hydro.

If you are unable or unwilling to work for Alaskans and Americans, helping to provide stable energy you should resign.

Thank you

Rhonda

Dear House Energy Committee,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to House Bill 153, which proposes renewable energy mandates for Alaska. While the idea of transitioning to renewables may seem appealing at first glance, a closer look reveals significant drawbacks that could negatively impact our state.

Firstly, the economic implications are concerning. HB 153 requires utilities to achieve 40% renewable energy by 2030 and 55% by 2035. This means a massive investment in new wind farms and solar panels, and the costs will inevitably fall on us, the consumers. Electricity rates will rise, placing an additional burden on families already struggling to make ends meet and small businesses fighting to stay afloat. This could lead to job losses as costs increase. Given the economic challenges we already face, Alaska cannot afford this extra strain, especially when the benefits remain unclear.

Secondly, the reliability of our power supply is at stake. While wind and solar energy have their merits, they are inherently inconsistent. Wind can drop off unexpectedly, and during our harsh winters, sunlight is scarce. Over-relying on these sources risks blackouts—potentially during freezing temperatures when we need heat the most. Our grid must be dependable, not dependent on favorable weather conditions. HB 153 takes an unnecessary gamble with our energy security.

Lastly, the environmental argument for this bill doesn't fully hold up. The plan includes biomass and waste-to-energy as "renewable" sources, yet burning these can emit more CO2 than traditional fossil fuels. Furthermore, scaling up renewables requires mining rare earth minerals, which devastates land and ecosystems. Alaska has cleaner, more practical options like natural gas that avoid these hidden environmental costs.

In short, HB 153 feels like a costly and risky experiment imposed on us without our consent. It threatens our finances, our power reliability, and even the environment it claims to protect. I urge you to oppose this bill and support energy solutions that remain affordable and dependable, rather than a mandate that could leave us vulnerable. Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns.

Sincerely,
Keddie E. Johnson
Owner: Madly Krafty
10767 Kenai Spur Hwy
Suite:C
Kenai, AK 99611

Hello Legislators and staff of the Energy Committee-

My name is WAYNE WOODS, I live in the MAT-SU Borough, and I am a lifelong Alaskan. I tell people that I was conceived in the Territory, but born in the State.

I am a professional hunter by trade; and along with my wife & family have operated a tourism-related business in Alaska since 1986 until this day.

I would like to address you as to my perception of HB 153 regarding Renewable Portfolio Standard legislation.

hmy opinion- Instead of lower cost, stable electric energy for the people of Alaska- this does exactly the opposite-
By mandating use of technology that is neither cost-effective nor reliable.

This can only be achieved through the extortion of governmental mandates to producers, with increased rates and costs to the consumer, & subsidies with public funding or "grants" - and selling it as "investment".

This is a great deal- if you are in the "green energy" business- but this is an idea that has passed its sell-by date. This is evidenced by a new Administration in America, leading with overwhelming popular support- and giving clear resource development directives to lower costs to the consumer, and increase living standards.

Alaska is a resource Super Power,_jnd the people of Alaska should not be further hindered in our quality of life, by short-sightet'□?ndates that benefit the few, at the cost of clear violation of the public trust.

Thank you.

To the House Energy Committee,

I support the renewable portfolio standard legislation.

The Railbelt has enormous renewable potential.

The Railbelt's renewable energy resources can lead to the development of local industries, creating local jobs.

Thank you,
Doug Woodby

Good afternoon: Co-Chairs and Committee Members:
This is Santa Claus in North Pole, testifying as an Alaska voter in support of House Bill 153:

I agree with researcher Aurora Roth that:

A Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) is a policy that provides investment certainty that can attract more experienced independent power producers to compete with each other in the Railbelt, benefiting consumers.

An RPS would provide Railbelt utilities with regulatory certainty about their investments in renewable energy.

An RPS would catalyze more and necessary cooperation between the Railbelt utilities to meet the standard.

An RPS provides necessary sideboards to current LNG negotiations, and would give the electric utilities a modicum of negotiating leverage they currently do not have.

The Railbelt has enormous renewable energy resource potential.

The cost of renewable energy technologies like wind, solar and battery storage have all been declining rapidly.

There are several renewable projects that are already proposed that could raise the percentage of renewable electricity in the Railbelt to 40%, the amount required by 2032 in the standard.

The Railbelt's renewable energy resources can lead to the development of local industries, creating local jobs.

More renewable electricity keeps Alaskans precious energy dollars in the state, rather than those dollars being exported to out of state (or out-of-country) providers.

I support House Bill 153 and encourage you to do the same.

Thank you. (Santa Claus, PO Box 55122, North Pole, AK 99705)

I understand that public testimony was taken yesterday 10 April in Juneau regarding HB 153, which concerns the Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS). I am writing as a 36-year-long Anchorage resident and a Chugach Electric Association (CEA) ratepayer to discourage passing of an RPS. I am an engineer and small-business owner in the state, and I have ran for a seat on the CEA Board of Directors twice (2020, and 2023). We have a property in Durango CO where we have two large solar arrays, so I am aware of the benefits and limitations of renewable power.

The AK Center (for the environment) and REAP, I expect, are strongly promoting the passage of the RPS that are before the Alaska Legislature now as House Bill 153. It is my opinion that enforcing these standards on utilities in Alaska, at this time in their current form, is absolutely not the right approach to integrating renewable energy into the Railbelt grid for the following reasons:

- The standards force the Railbelt utilities to meet unreasonable RPS milestones. The RPS sets a 55% renewables generation by 2035, which is not reasonable or realistic – here in Alaska – considering many factors.
- As written, the RPS fails to recognize technical challenges to integration of intermittent solar and wind farms, which will likely comprise most of the renewable generation.
- The RPS fail to recognize the transmission system upgrades that will be required to fully utilize the produced power from these intermittent, renewable power sources. These upgrades are complex and could require in excess of $2 billion to implement.
- When these intermittent, weather/wind dependent and seasonal power sources are integrated into the transmission system, spinning reserve (thermal generation) will still be required, which will duplicate and add costs. Those costs will pass to rate payers.
- As written, the RPS are punitive in nature; if minimum renewable generation thresholds are not met by the time deadlines, steep penalties will be imposed on the utilities ($45,000 for every GWh that the utility is below the RPS). Such penalties will seriously impact the Railbelt utilities' credit rating and financial viability. Further, the RPS legislation as written does not allow the utility to recover these fines through member rates – though Shaina Kilcoyne admitted ultimately the ratepayer would pay. That threatens the entire sustainability of the utility itself.
- The standards fail to recognize alternative carbon reduction measures and other clean energy solutions such as microreactors (nuclear), carbon sequestration, carbon capture, emissions reductions, and potentially other alternatives.

These standards will force capital investments that may be unwise, ill-timed or inefficient, raising members' rates unnecessarily. Existing assets that are still well within their useful life may be stranded, requiring early depreciation losses that will also raise rates. Finally, the RPS will

increase risk to reliability of our power along the Railbelt – and members have come to expect their power to be reliable.

Passing an RPS in some states may makes sense. For instance, in South Dakota where I grew up, the state has achieved nearly 80 percent renewables: 35% from hydroelectric dams along the Missouri River, and 55% from mostly wind. Growing up there, I know the state has incessant, never-ending wind on the plains of South Dakota, so it can make sense. South Dakota achieved this without a state-mandated RPS. It was driven by technology, physical features and economics. The same forces should drive conversion to renewables here in Alaska, not a state-mandated standard that will cost rate payers – possibly substantially – and it will provide less (to much less in time of need during the cold winter months) reliable power.

The last two years, solving climate change was a key driver for passing an RPS in the Alaska legislature. This year the RPS advocates (such as the Alaska Center and REAP, who endorsed Shaina Kilcoyne) are warning that the looming gas shortage in Cook Inlet demands an RPS. The RPS is in no way a solution to the gas shortage; natural gas and LNG are the solutions for that shortage. Particularly since achieving the 55% threshold by 2035 is absolutely out of reach – that is only 10 years! Conceivable in 20 years perhaps, depending again on economics and technological advancements and build out of the Railbelt's transmission system.

Thank you for consideration of my comments and concerns.

Brad Authier
10960 Glazanof Drive
Anchorage, AK. 99507
907-229-1570 (cell)

Hello House Energy Committee,

Please vote NO on HB 153.
The reasons are many, and I'm certain you know them already.

Carol Carman
D29 Secretary
d29@mtaonline.net
907-355-5915 (cell)

Hello Legislators and staff of the Energy Committee-

My name is WAYNE WOODS, I live in the MAT-SU Borough, and I am a lifelong Alaskan. I tell people that I was conceived in the Territory, but born in the State.

I am a professional hunter by trade; and along with my wife & family have operated a tourism-related business in Alaska since 1986 until this day.

I would like to address you as to my perception of HB 153 regarding Renewable Portfolio Standard legislation.

hmy opinion- Instead of lower cost, stable electric energy for the people of Alaska- this does exactly the opposite-

By mandating use of technology that is neither cost-effective nor reliable.

This can only be achieved through the extortion of governmental mandates to producers, with increased rates and costs to the consumer, & subsidies with public funding or "grants" - and selling it as "investment".

This is a great deal- if you are in the "green energy" business- but this is an idea that has passed its sell-by date. This is evidenced by a new Administration in America, leading with overwhelming popular support- and giving clear resource development directives to lower costs to the consumer, and increase living standards.

Alaska is a resource Super Power,_jnd the people of Alaska should not be further hindered in our

quality of life, by short-sightecfD□1ndates that benefit the few, at the cost of clear violation of the public trust.

Thank you.