

HJR 12  
Public Testimony Packet  
Received by the  
House Resources Committee  
After March 10<sup>th</sup> Hearing

Good afternoon members of of the House Resources Committee,

My name is Jamie Rodriguez and I'm writing from Anchorage to oppose HJR12. This Resolution is a waste of money and a lose-lose situation for Alaska.

Why didn't the major players show up to the Lease Sale? Because they knew this was a financial risk not worth taking.

AIDEA's bid on the majority of the lease tracts at a cost to our state of over \$9 mill in lease bids and almost \$4 mill in ANNUAL(!) rental fees is completely ridiculous! Additionally, the question has yet to be determined as to the legality of AIDEA's involvement in this purchase.

A reminder that Alaska is in the midst of a fiscal disaster. Budget cuts have gutted our schools, our ferries, and so much more. Little as been untouched and this resolution threatens to put us in even greater financial difficulty. What else is left to cut that will make up for lost revenue and savings?

With all of the above, plus the lack of industry interest, financial institutions having stated that they will no longer be involved in financing oil exploration/development projects, PLUS ongoing litigation due to problems with the federal Environmental Impact Statement process, Alaska simply cannot afford to pile on needless annual costs in the millions of dollars.

As a forty-seven year resident of Alaska, who witnessed the rise and fall of big oil, I urge this committee to vote NO on HJR12. Passing this resolution makes absolutely no sense. It's time to face reality. HJR12 is a financial black hole for Alaska.

Thank you.

---

Honorable members of the House Resources Committee,

I respectfully submit the following comments as written testimony on HJR 12. I also shared similar comments with Vice-Chair Hopkins yesterday for his role on the committee and as the representative from the district in which I reside.

We are adamantly opposed to HJR 12 and strongly urge you to oppose this resolution. Given the make-up of the committee and the Legislature, we understand that this will likely pass. We also understand that this is a highly contentious issue and has been for over 40 years. As you well know, the State of Alaska has been overly dependent on North Slope oil as our "cash cow" for that duration and many of our current fiscal issues result from that singular over-reliance. To continue to view drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as the silver bullet that will save our economy is a fantasy long past its time.

We have numerous issues with the bill -- from using it as a statement to indicate that this represents the sentiment of all Alaskans to the fallacies and mis-information held within the content of the full text and supporting documents. The following speaks to that:

- HJR 12 ignores the multitude of voices opposed to extraction on the Arctic Refuge coastal plain. Among those voices are Gwich'in and Inupiat land protectors. The Gwich'in have a sacred relationship with the Porcupine Caribou herd, who rely on the coastal plain for survival. Many Alaskans, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, oppose extraction in the Arctic Refuge, and all voices should be considered.
- No major oil companies participated in the January 6, 2021 lease sale in the Arctic Refuge. Every big oil corporation knew this was a fiscal and reputational risk, so they didn't show up and the state of Alaska, via AIDEA, stepped in. AIDEA bid on the majority of the lease tracts, costing the state over \$9.1 mill in lease bids plus \$3.7 mill in annual rental fees (50% will be returned to the state). With Presidential opposition to development, ongoing litigation due to problems with the federal Environmental Impact Statement process, limited to no industry interest, and annual costs to the state in the millions of dollars, passing HJR12 makes no sense. AIDEA's belief, despite Big Oil's lack of interest and all of the major banks in the US stating, if not codifying in policy, that they will not fund Arctic oil, including in the Refuge, that they can attract investors is absurd. The state, through AIDEA, spends millions it will not recoup.
- HJR 12 claims that the state will "ensure the health of the Central Arctic and Porcupine caribou herds," but science shows that migration would be hugely impacted by oil extraction on the Arctic Refuge coastal plain. The Central Arctic herd, which many people report seeing around industry infrastructure on the North Slope, has indeed changed its movements and behaviors to avoid roads and pipelines, especially during the calving season (Johnson, et al, 2019). The geography of the coastal plain in the Refuge, where the distance between the Brooks Range to the south and the coast to the north is relatively narrow, leaves fewer options for an adapted migration than elsewhere in the north, meaning pregnant Porcupine cows would be extra vulnerable. The Porcupine herd is the only Arctic Alaska herd that hasn't seen a decline in population in recent years--its calving and post-calving grounds must remain protected.
- Arctic oil extraction would contribute to the climate crisis by adding carbon pollution to the Earth's atmosphere. This is simply not a risk we can afford to take based on the existing climate crisis, which is affecting Alaska and the Arctic at disproportionate rates. This resolution comes at a time when Alaska should be focusing on clean energy solutions and economic diversification, not beginning new extraction projects.
- HJR 12 claims that development on the coastal plain would only affect 2,000 acres of the Arctic Refuge. This is a wholly misleading statement because the 2,000 acres referenced would be non-contiguous and could spread across the entire coastal plain, a point that has been well documented. According to the FEIS for the leasing program, while the 2,000 acres of surface development allowed at any one time is only 0.13% of the program area, it will be spread out and discontinuous. Over 170 miles

of roads and 200-240 miles of pipelines would traverse the coastal plain. The impact would be widespread and extensive.

- This resolution frames the hoped for development of the Arctic Refuge as nothing but a big positive for the people of Alaska and the nation, but this perspective ignores the elephant in the room – the climate is deteriorating at an alarming rate and immediate action must be taken at every level of society. Alaska cannot wish away its role and responsibility. Alaska's production and use of oil, gas and coal contribute to the climate crisis, and it's time for Alaska to contribute to climate solutions.
- It's time to get serious about our collective responsibilities to address the climate crisis. It makes little economic or environmental sense for the state to promote and invest public funds in the quest to find new sources of oil and gas, when it's obvious that a large percentage of existing oil and gas reserves should not be produced. It makes no economic sense for Alaska to bank its future on a declining and dirty industry that the rest of the world is rapidly moving away from. We need to phase out existing production and stop looking for new sources.

In response to specific points in Resolution language

- Re: "WHEREAS proponents of anthropogenically driven climate change point to the burning of oil and gas as causing increased greenhouse gas emissions; however, the exploration and extraction of oil and gas has not been shown to contribute significantly to increased greenhouse gas emissions; and" This statement is incorrect. Oil and gas industry operations account for more than half of Alaska's GHG emissions. (source: Alaska 2015 Greenhouse Gas Inventory by Sector, Exhibits 4 & 5, pages 13, 14, and Exhibit 28, page 37.)
- Re: "WHEREAS oil and gas exploration and development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and adjacent land could result in major discoveries that would reduce our nation's dependency on oil produced by hostile foreign nations, help balance the nation's trade deficit, and significantly increase the nation's security;" Failing to address the climate crisis by continuing to develop new fossil fuel sources from the Arctic Refuge would not increase the nation's security, but rather would make us more insecure as the nation is forced to address massive and expensive climate events and dislocations.
- Re: "WHEREAS additional natural gas production from the North Slope of Alaska, including the significant gas reserves expected to be found in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, would enhance the energy independence of the state and the nation in the future;" Almost all of the oil produced in Alaska is shipped out for processing and shipped back as high-cost products; more in-state production would not enhance the energy independence or lower prices for Alaskans. Energy independence for Alaskans would be enhanced by conversion to local renewable energy sources and increased energy efficiency.
- Re: "WHEREAS natural gas production from the North Slope of Alaska would enhance the economic viability of the proposed liquefied natural gas project;" Exporting North Slope gas as LNG via a pipeline to tidewater, long a pipe dream, is less feasible today than when it was first proposed decades ago. If it were economic, private industry would have built it long ago. Massive federal subsidies would be required, but are unlikely and unwarranted for a project that would harm the climate and lock in more fossil fuel infrastructure for decades.

- Re: "WHEREAS, at Prudhoe Bay and other locations along the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the oil industry has demonstrated that it can conduct oil and gas activity without adversely affecting the environment or wildlife populations;" It is untrue that there have been no adverse effects to the environment and wildlife from oil operations. For example, the industry represents that it is doing great, but villagers in the North Slope village of Nuiqsut would disagree; they have expressed extensive concerns about current industry levels and industry expansion nearly surrounding their community and impeding access to subsistence resources. Effects on fisheries and wildlife continue to linger decades after the 1989 Exxon Valdez spill in Prince William Sound, a direct result of North Slope oil production. There are also numerous records and examples of smaller spills on the North Slope.
- Re: "WHEREAS the oil and gas industry is using innovative technology and environmental practices in new oilfield developments, and those techniques are directly applicable to operating on the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and would further enhance the already high standards for environmental protection in the industry;" While some technological innovations such as carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) exist those are not currently being used in North Slope oil and gas operations, and there is no reason to believe that industry would choose to use these expensive techniques if allowed to develop in the Refuge unless required to do so. Conoco's new "beast" (which slid off the road while being transported west of Prudhoe a year ago) with expanded extended-reach capabilities is touted as the solution for keeping footprints "small" while reaching 7 miles out from the pad (for a 154 sq mile reach). The Beast was never tested, with the shut downs due to Covid last year. It's efficacy and safety are unproven.
- Re: "WHEREAS the state promotes the development of renewable and alternative energy resources;" Over the past decades some progress has been made to convert Alaska communities to renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, hydro, biomass and tidal. But there's a long way yet to go and the state should do more to assist utilities, local communities and local businesses to accelerate this effort.
- Re: "WHEREAS the Arctic policy of the state, codified as AS 44.99.105, states "It is the policy of the state, as it relates to the Arctic, to uphold the state's commitment to economically vibrant communities sustained by development activities consistent with the state's responsibility for a healthy environment;" This statute incorporates the notion that the state must consider climate effects resulting from oil and gas exploration and production when determining what activities are consistent with a healthy environment. This resolution is silent on the negative climate effects and says inaccurately any such effects are insignificant.

I am sure you have also heard the 1.5 million acre coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge described as a tiny sliver of the 19 million acre Refuge. "It's only 8%. The other 92% will remain off limits." Similarly, the 2,000 acres of surface development has been compared to a dot of ink on Don Young's nose or, as in the Sponsor Statement, as a quarter on a football field. I hope that the above facts about the 2,000 acres dispels that myth and clarifies that fallacy. In response to the "it's only 8%" argument, it is critical to recognize that size does not necessarily equate to degree of significance. The coastal plain --the region of the Refuge that lies between the Brooks Range and the Beaufort Sea-- is unique geologically and ecologically. It is the heart of the Refuge. The average human heart is >0.5% of our body weight. Yet, we

know that if that relatively small part of the body is damaged or destroyed, the entire organism is impacted, potentially, fatally. Despite the "relatively" small size, the impact is significant. The same holds true for the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge.

I hope you will strongly consider the information included herein and oppose HJR12.

Respectfully yours,

Lisa Baraff

Program Director and

Climate Change & Energy Program Manager

---

State of Alaska Legislators:

I am writing to you today to strongly support HJR12 which will hopefully help to open ANWR to oil leasing, exploration and production.

My name is Robert Valantas and my family and I moved to Anchorage in Spring of 1982. I worked for BP for 16 years and then consulted for them for another 10. I am the President of the Northern Lights Retiree's Club. It has well over 100 members, which are retirees of Alaska's oil production companies. I'm sure I speak for essentially all of them in this E Mail.

My points of support for this bill are:

1. ANWR has high potential for containing major oil and gas deposits.
2. The US needs to be energy independent and ANWR will help ensure that. Green energy cannot possibly fulfill the US energy needs for many years to come. Oil and gas will be a necessity and we sure don't want to buy oil from the mid-East and fund their terrorist activities against us.
3. Alaska desperately needs more revenue to fund required State spending and, as we know, it comes from oil. At best ANWR will be years away, but we need to plan ahead and we certainly don't want state taxes.
4. The environment can be preserved with only minimal impact. Modern oil development encompasses a minimum footprint and the environmental record of oil producers in Alaska is exemplary. The ANWR leasing area is small and on its coastal plain, which is essentially an arctic dessert. ANWR is a very large area and environmental support ads convey that the drilling area is in the beautiful mountainous area – not so! I and many of our Club members have worked on the NS and witnessed the care with which the oil producers protect the environment. They are not perfect, but really close.

5. As far as caribou and wildlife being negatively impacted, first the leasing area is small. Second, and as an example, the caribou herd at Prudhoe Bay has increased dramatically since oil production began in 1977.

To summarize, we need to open ANWR to oil and gas leasing, exploration and production for all of the above reasons. I believe this is in the best interest of all Alaskans and Americans.

-Valantas

---

To Whom It May Concern,

As a lifelong Alaskan, I want it to be clear that I deeply oppose HJR12 and I believe you should too.

As you know, there is a great amount of opposition to HJR12. This includes from Alaskans in the region of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that subsist from the caribou that calve in the sensitive coastal plain. But it also includes Alaskans like me, who've been to the Refuge multiple times and have seen firsthand the value of this intact ecosystem. Why not keep one portion of the coastal plain free from oil extraction?

We also saw all major oil companies staying away from bidding for leases on the coastal plain because of the financial riskiness in such an endeavor.

This place is important. I deeply feel this way and firmly oppose this resolution.

thank you,

Nathaniel Wilder

Anchorage, AK

---

To the House Natural Resources committee,

I'm writing in response to HJR 12. I am a resident of Denali Park, Alaska, District 6, and I'm writing on behalf of myself.

I am truly dismayed at the lack of vision and leadership exhibited by committee members and our legislature in general when it comes to the tired and outdated repetition of the misguided assumptions justifying this resolution. At a time when proactive climate policy and economic diversification is more urgent and vital than ever, and the Arctic is already warming faster than the rest of the planet, it is irresponsible and shameful that our elected leaders continue to push misleading promises on Alaskans. We deserve better. We need leadership that recognizes the human rights of its own people. We need economic security that does not put our children's health at risk. We need a state legislature that does not insist on throwing good money after bad to prove a long-dead point.

Please vote no on HJR12.

Erica Watson

---

From Rio Alberto:

The state of the Alaska has the opportunity to lead the nation in renewable energy sources while honoring and protecting the agreements we have to the Indigenous Communities who've stewarded this land since time immemorial.

To continue down the road of resource extraction is farcical, and parallels can be drawn between those who advocate for oil and those who denounced electricity, television, and the internet as being "unreliable" "unrealistic" or "not the way of the future."

There are federal funds waiting to be delegated to States that will put their citizens to work building a new, green infrastructure, if only the State is willing to try.

What better way to honor those that settled here before us in search of the "last frontier" by leading the way in this new frontier of green solutions.

---

Member of the House Resources Committee,

I am writing today to express my objections to oil and gas leasing, exploration, and eventual development of the Coastal Plain of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. The time has come to decrease the dependence of the United States on fossil fuels and limiting additional drilling and production will benefit our state much more than continuing down the path of further destruction and degradation of our public lands. I think that use of public money by AIDEA to purchase leases is an unacceptable use of my tax dollars and I would urge this committee to pursue renewable sources of energy to help preserve the beauty and sustainability of our environment and enable residents to continue our traditional subsistence lifestyles for generations to come.

Keils Kitchen PA-C



---

Dear House Resources Committee, I am writing to you today to participate in the public testimony on HJR 12. As a 3-decades resident of Fairbanks, I am very opposed to HJR 12 because I am opposed to oil development on the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge. I believe that the 1002 Area should become a declared Wilderness Area and protected as the only permanently protected Arctic tundra in the United States. There are National Parks in the Brooks Range, but none on the North Slope tundra. Most of the North Slope of Alaska is open to oil exploration and it is important to retain some wild land as a baseline to show future generations what natural tundra is like, with unimpacted natural processes. I also think that it is a big waste of Alaska State funds to have allowed AIDEA to bid on the oil leases in the 1002 area, when none of the large oil companies thought it was a good investment. Thank you for taking testimony on this important subject. Sincerely, Janet Jorgenson, Fairbanks, Alaska

---

Hello,

I am writing to oppose the use of State funds for ANWR leases. This is no time to waste public money. Over and over, Americans have rejected opening ANWR to drilling, including many, many lifelong Alaskans like myself. It simply is not in the State's longterm best interest to drill there, and squandering public money to prop up a faltering lease sale is a terrible idea.

Rosemary McGuire

Fairbanks, AK. 99709

---

Two or three years ago I testified before the Alaska Permanent Fund Trustees warning about its exposure the economic headwinds facing the fossil fuel industry. Now that the state House is considering spending public money, let me make sure you are also aware of these facts.

At the time I testified before the AKPF Trustees, the Permanent Fund's fossil fuel holdings had lost \$1 billion over 12 years, while the same amount of money invested in an S&P500 fund would have earned \$2 billion. Even during that time of enormous and nonstop market gains, fossil fuels lost money.

As I warned the Trustees at that time, so I warn you now. It is not a short-term problem that the fossil fuel industry is facing.

The fossil fuel industry is facing:

- a global switch to electric vehicles, which are already cheaper over the life of the vehicle due to less maintenance and cheaper fuel,
- a global switch to renewable electricity,
- cities, states, and countries determined to reach net zero emissions by 2050,
- banks refusing to lend to Arctic oil projects because of risk,
- insurance companies warning that climate risks are their #1 concern,
- oil companies own scientists agreeing that their product poses a climate problem,
- BP statement that Peak Oil may have occurred in 2019,

- conscientious investors divesting their funds from the industry and PROFITING FROM DIVESTMENT, and
- large oil companies downsizing, both in Alaska and abroad.

There is growing realization both within the fossil fuel industry and outside of it, that the industry already holds billions of dollars of assets that may very soon be impossible to sell.

Using public funds to prop up this industry just because "we're an oil state" is exactly the wrong thinking now. It is akin to spending public funds to support the tobacco industry in the 1990s or the leaded gasoline industry in the 1980s.

I urge a NO vote on HJR12.

---

**Scott Gruhn**

Dear members of the House Resources Committee,

I am writing regarding HJR 12, which you discussed today in committee.

Specifically, several of the resolution statements are at odds with reality:

(p.2, line 29) *WHEREAS proponents of anthropogenically driven climate change point to the burning of oil and gas as causing increased greenhouse gas emissions; however, the exploration and extraction of oil and gas has not been shown to contribute significantly to increased greenhouse gas emissions;*

This statement belies the simple fact that the purpose of extracting the oil is to provide, for the most part, fuel that will be burned and contribute to global climate change. The science is clear: the majority of known fossil fuel reserves must remain in the ground if we are to avoid the worst of the projected climate catastrophes. That means further exploration and development of new reserves should be off the table.

Besides, it is untrue to state that the "*extraction of oil and gas has not been shown to contribute significantly to increased greenhouse gas emissions.*" Some of Alaska's most significant emissions are from North Slope oil fields.

(p.4 line 25) *WHEREAS the legislative findings and intent in sec. 1, ch. 10, SLA 2015, which declares the Arctic policy of the state, states that "the continuing development of the state's natural resources in an environmentally and socially responsible manner is essential to the development of the state's economy and to the well-being of the residents of the state;"*

It is not environmentally responsible to further explore and develop fossil fuel resources. As per my comment above, the science is clear, the earth's living systems are at extreme risk due to the climate crisis and the majority of known reserves should be left in the ground

I believe that this resolution is a mistake. Please put your energies towards the development of renewable energy resources.

Thank you,

Doug Woodby

Juneau, Alaska

---

Testimony on HJR12

I am opposed to this resolution which claims that Alaskans are united in favor of the coastal plain lease sale. I am among the thousands of Alaskans standing with the Gwich'in people who oppose drilling in the Refuge on moral and spiritual grounds. Our voices are not included in HJR12.

A second reason for my opposition to HJR12 is on economic grounds. When no major oil companies showed up to bid on the lease tracts in January, AIDEA bid on the majority of them, which cost the state over \$9.1 million. It looks to me like that's a lot more money going out than expected to come in. Otherwise the major oil companies would have bid.

My third reason for opposition is that drilling for oil on the coastal plain will contribute to the looming climate crisis. The climate in the Arctic is changing twice as fast as elsewhere on the planet—from glacial melt in Greenland and loss of sea ice in the Beaufort Sea to land erosion on the Western Coast of Alaska. Climate change is real and affects all of us, especially people living along the coast where villages are threatened by rising sea levels.

Alaska must transition from an economy based on oil extraction to one more diversified, focusing on clean energy solutions.

Thank you.

Charlotte Basham  
Fairbanks AK 99709

---

Good afternoon members of the House Resources Committee,

My name is Jamie Rodriguez and I'm writing from Anchorage to oppose HJR12. This Resolution is a waste of money and a lose-lose situation for Alaska.

Why didn't the major players show up to the Lease Sale? Because they knew this was a financial risk not worth taking.

AIDEA's bid on the majority of the lease tracts at a cost to our state of over \$9 mill in lease bids and almost \$4 mill in ANNUAL(!) rental fees is completely ridiculous! Additionally, the question has yet to be determined as to the legality of AIDEA's involvement in this purchase.

A reminder that Alaska is in the midst of a fiscal disaster. Budget cuts have gutted our schools, our ferries, and so much more. Little as been untouched and this resolution threatens to put us in even greater financial difficulty. What else is left to cut that will make up for lost revenue and savings?

With all of the above, plus the lack of industry interest, financial institutions having stated that they will no longer be involved in financing oil exploration/development projects, PLUS ongoing litigation due to problems with the federal Environmental Impact Statement process, Alaska simply cannot afford to pile on needless annual costs in the millions of dollars.

As a forty-seven year resident of Alaska, who witnessed the rise and fall of big oil, I urge this committee to vote NO on HJR12. Passing this resolution makes absolutely no sense. It's time to face reality. HJR12 is a financial black hole for Alaska.

Thank you.

---

I do not approve of Alaska spending public money on ANWR leases. It's time to invest in a new energy future. I am not in favor of HJR 12.

[Mim McConnell Sitka, AK 99835](#)

---

Hello,

I am sorry I could not call in and speak to this matter in person. I was born and have lived in Alaska since the mid 60's and have long awaited for the Alaska renaissance to re-occur utilizing the ANWAR 1002 section.

Not only was this area set aside for oil and gas use, but we desperately need to keep moving forward with oil and gas exploration and production for the foreseeable future, regardless of the opinion of any sitting presidents stance on the matter. Renewables are reliant upon, and America is reliant on these resources and Alaska desperately needs them to move us forward as a state until we can further diversify our economic portfolio.

As you know, we have the best environmental standards in the industry and a legacy for being able to drill and transport our resources without environmental impact. If we do not work to obtain these resources the production will go to countries who will certainly do more harm than good to the environment. Our pipeline also needs the oil to continue to be an asset and not a liability to the state as pump motors become overtaxed by the lack of oil throughput – they need volume to remain viable.

Keep ANWA open and fight for Alaska! The 1002 area is in our state's constitution as a designated to utilize and develop! It will help the villages and people who live and work in the area, it will help Alaska, it will help the USA, and can help to keep the world a cleaner place!

Thank you for your consideration, and keep fighting for these things that will bring us all together.

Regards,

Jim Hill

All Pro Alaska

Anchorage, AK 99518

---

Dear Representatives,

I hope this email finds you and your families well.

I write to you in opposition to HJR 12. The science, economics and on-going public commentary around this issue speak to the need for us to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from development. When we look at the issue of climate change, the shift towards renewables, and the need to uphold the rights of Indigenous Peoples in this country and mostly certainly in this state, then we must move beyond pushing for the opening of the Arctic Refuge to oil development in the Coastal Plain which is also the birthing grounds of the Porcupine Caribou Herd which sustains the Gwich'in way of life. This state has wasted millions of dollars in the pursuit of oil in the Arctic Refuge and it has never been nor can it be now - justified.

Mahsi' choo! Thank you for hearing the voices of Alaskans on this issue.

Princess Lucaj

Fairbanks Resident

---

Dear Committee Members,

I urge you to vote against bill HJR12. As a citizen born in Alaska and one who worked for oil development in Prudhoe and Kuparuk, I am strongly against oil leasing and development in ANWR. I cherish Alaska's wild places and the protection of large intact ecosystems. The oil industry already has plenty of undeveloped oil resources and tract leases in the central and western Beaufort Coastal Plain to pursue. The State of Alaska is wasting our money on ANWR leasing and should not pursue it any longer.

Thanks for your consideration

Mark Jorgenson

Fairbanks, AK 99709

---

Dear House Resources Committee Members,

I am writing as an citizen of the State of Alaska, and as the parent of two wonderful young men. I am asking you NOT to endorse this resolution endorsing oil and gas leasing, exploration and development in the Coastal Plain of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge.

We are rapidly nearing the end of carbon based fuels. We already have more known reserves than we can afford to burn without causing climate disaster. The refuge is a refuge. Leave it for our children, leave it for the wildlife, leave it as a carbon sink and not a source of further carbon pollution.

Thank you for working for the good of all people and not just a monied few.

Respectfully,

Suzanne Cohen

Juneau, AK 99801

If you agree Alaska has no business spending public \$ on ANWR leases and that it's time to invest in a new energy future, call today!

House Resources Committee will hear public testimony on HJR12, a resolution endorsing oil and gas leasing, exploration, and eventual development in the Coastal Plain of Alaska National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) today (Wed March 10, 2021)

---

Alaska has no business spending public \$ on ANWR leases and that it's time to invest in a new energy future.

New taxes on all of resource extraction to match market conditions.

Thank you

Raymond Cammisa

99577

---

Representatives on the House Resources Committee:

I oppose HJR 12. I am a 55-year resident of Alaska. As you consider this bill, I urge you to acknowledge that our economic dependence on fossil fuel extraction is a debilitating burden we must work our way out of. We share that burden with other petro-states in the US and around the world, and as we confront increasing pressures to sequester a large portion of reserves, our dependence puts us all in competition to be the last to do so. As we respond to these regulatory, shrinking demand, and risk-averse investment pressures, we need to weigh which of our reserves should be sequestered first. Consider: does it make sense for the State of

Alaska to promote oil development on federal lands and offshore, potentially introducing more oil into a weakening market, in competition with State-owned oil?

Thank you for your consideration.

John Dunker

Juneau

---

Dear House Resources Standing Committee:

I am a long time Alaska resident (1983) and am **strongly opposed to HJR 12**. I have watched our nation and state ignore global warming since the 70s when I became acutely aware of the scientifically documented effects that fossil fuel burning had on our environment. I was heavily involved in field work and saw firsthand the devastating effects of melting permafrost and coastal erosion. Yet, you seem to want to continue despoliation of the last pristine places ON EARTH to keep extracting fossil fuels! We have viable energy alternatives now, and should not so carelessly despoil our last islands of undeveloped wilderness. Remember how long (many decades) the tobacco industry held back the science on the harmful effects of smoking, something we all except as true now. How many people dies because of the priority placed on capital gains? Look to the future.

I agree with the following statements:

- HJR12 ignores the multitude of voices opposed to extraction on the Arctic Refuge coastal plain. Among those voices are Gwich'in and Iñupiat land protectors. The Gwich'in have a sacred relationship with the Porcupine Caribou herd, who rely on the coastal plain for survival. Many Alaskans, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, oppose extraction in the Arctic Refuge, and all voices should be considered.
- No major oil companies participated in the January 6, 2021 lease sale in the Arctic Refuge. Every big oil corporation knew this was a fiscal and reputational risk, so they didn't show up and the state of Alaska, via AIDEA, stepped in. AIDEA bid on the majority of the lease tracts, costing the state over \$9.1 mill in lease bids plus \$3.7 mill in annual rental fees (50% will be returned to the state). With Presidential opposition to development, ongoing litigation due to problems with the federal Environmental Impact Statement process, limited to no industry interest, and annual costs to the state in the millions of dollars, passing HJR12 makes no sense.
- Arctic oil extraction would contribute to the climate crisis by adding carbon pollution to the Earth's atmosphere. This is simply not a risk we can afford to take based on the existing climate crisis, which is affecting Alaska and the Arctic at disproportionate rates. This resolution comes at a time when Alaska should be focusing on clean energy solutions and economic diversification, not beginning new extraction projects. It's time to get serious about our collective responsibilities to address the climate crisis. It makes little economic or environmental sense for the state to promote and invest public funds in the quest to find new sources of oil and gas, when it's obvious that a large percentage of existing oil and gas reserves should not be produced.

Thank you, Jeanne Schaaf. Anchorage, AK. 99516

---

To The House Resources Committee-

I am writing to protest the proposed House Joint Resolution listed in my subject line.

HJR12 utterly dismisses the views of those opposed to oil extraction activity on the Arctic Refuge's coastal plain. I am one such person, and while I am not Gwich'in, nor am I Iñupiat, I *am* an Alaskan who cares about the well-being of my fellow Alaskans- fellow Alaskans who have spent decades asking politely for their concerns to get a bit of respect for their traditional subsistence lifestyle. HJR12 grants none of that respect, choosing instead to pursue the same unsustainable boom/bust resource extraction approach which has bedeviled Alaska's relationship with the wider world since the Russians were here.

Moreover, the State of Alaska couldn't find any serious buyers when, on January 6 of 2021, leases went on sale. The state foolishly spent money on a proposition no one in private industry deemed worthwhile- money that we will not see coming back.

Therefore, adoption of HJR12 is not merely impolite and dismissive of the concerns of Alaskans, it is also fiscally idiotic.

Don't do it.

Regards.

Henry Eshleman

---

Bad investment!  
-Mike Wilson