Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: I look forward to the day we can wean ourselves off a dependence on fossil fuels. I do support incentives and policies putting Alaska’s feet to the fire by adopting an RPS. I would look to energy experts to recommend a realistic date by which to be attaining the 50% goal. I am not convinced the year 2030 is realistic, but do agree that we need to be moving in that direction and to identify an attainable year for realizing the goal. If it is possible to realize 100% by 2045, I would embrace that goal as well.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Notwithstanding my service as staff in the Legislature for the past 21 years, this issue has not been something I have been assigned, nor been given just attention. Sadly, too many public resources and utilities seem to be profit- or politically driven. I very much
support the idea of opening access to the power grid and improving non-discriminatory policies for what is an essential community resource, distributed fairly among users both urban and rural.

**Q3:** Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

*Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?*

**A:** I understand this to be similar in principle to our state commercial fisheries loan fund, which is a policy area I worked on directly, and with success, for the past few years in the Legislature. Notwithstanding the political resistance from the private banking sector, I very much understand how this can help the “little guy,” using public funds to help leverage what is arguably inflated risk assigned by the private sector, and in the big picture improve Alaska’s energy policy portfolio. I therefore support this program in concept and would take great interest in seeing it move forward.

**Q4:** As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. *Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?*
A: Building codes are tricky. And Alaska is huge and diverse in its environmental conditions. A one-size-fits-all approach will not work. If we are to adopt a statewide code, it would first have to convince me that it is relevant to Alaska’s geographic and environmental diversity. I would also like to give local community governing bodies some flexibility in opting out of provisions that may not be relevant or attainable for their respective environment. I like the idea of a uniform code for new construction, for the supposed improvement of energy efficiency and maximizing market value. But at least currently, I’m skeptical it would work very well, and I have not seen or heard in recent years of such a code being offered and on the table. This again, is not a policy area I have been assigned legislatively, but am poised to take much greater interest in it given the opportunity.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I am inclined to believe the earth’s climate is changing. It is unclear whether or not humans have directly contributed to that change. Our planet Earth has evolved for billions of years and will continue to do so with or without us Humans. So regardless of the cause, what is important to recognize is how humans should choose to respond to climate change. It is every human’s responsibility to contribute to that discovery. State leaders can act accordingly. Rather than fix the blame, or spin our wheels denying the existence of climate change, let’s sort out how to fix our future, for the sake of Humans having a future.

That being said, I would like to acknowledge the work that experts and advocates have put forward via the CAALT’s recommendations. Setting up green banks to help spur investment and innovation in renewable energy technology, collaborating with federal efforts that are relevant and attainable in Alaska, and exploring carbon fees and dividends are all examples of programs and activities that should be on the table, vetted, and pursued at all levels in our State.

Adam Wool
State House District 5

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable
energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: No, although I support the concept I think binding to 50% might be a bit tough. We aren’t CA or HI with an abundance of sunshine and have such a spread out small population that it might be difficult. We’d likely need a major hydro project or some other large scale project so as to make up for other communities that don’t have such resources.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. I sponsored such legislation.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that
are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes, I think it might be difficult due to the number of rate payers in AK and also due to the already high cost of energy, but I do support the concept.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes, it makes sense

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.” [http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/].

What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: haven’t done a lot of research on the topic of cap and trade or such programs but it likely would have to fall on the producers and not on the consumers.
Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes. But, with the vast amount of oil money powering our political engines here in this state, we will need to bring a more liberal state government in into power or it will never that place here.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean
energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: No. I think in rural Alaska it might be too much of a burden to comply, but in urban bank financed housing it might be worth looking into.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: Cap and trade seems the most sensible to me.
Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes. We need to break our dependence on oil.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. All utilities should be transparent.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.
Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

*Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?*

A: Yes. Green energy needs economic support.

**Q4:** As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. *Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?*

A: No, if I build a place off grid & 30 miles upriver I shouldn’t be restrained by state codes.

**Q5:** Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


*What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?*

A: Carbon tax.
Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.
Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees).

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: Continue Gov. Walker’s program. Work with the Feds to set standards that other countries must adhere to. Take trade action if they do not.
Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes. Because we need to deliver more than lip service on this matter. We need to transition now to community scale renewable energy generation.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes, AND we need to encourage small scale generation from renewable sources the excess which should be able to be sold back to traditional suppliers

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every
year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: No, I have found that energy efficiency is code for let’s not really do anything to move forward. We need to put subsidies forward for both public and private transition to renewable energy now.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: No. I want to say yes to this- but the devil is in the detail and wide array of climate and geography we endure.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.” http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?
A: I do not yet have a comprehensive answer to this and rather than go off half informed I would need to study it more. I realize you are used to people agreeing with you but I choose to be honest and continue the conversation if we do not now 100% agree thank you.

**Stephany Jeffers**
State House District 12

**Q1:** In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. **Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?**

A: Yes, we need to move towards renewable energy and diversifying Alaskan energy resources. Not only does it make environmental sense, it makes economic sense. Simply saying it’s a good idea isn’t enough, we need commitment and action.

**Q2:** The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

**Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?**

A: This is an area that I need to spend more time researching. While it sounds like a reasonable move, I am not willing to commit to anything without having a better understanding of the issue.
Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. We need to put our money where our mouth is when it comes to investing in renewable energy. There is no place in the nation where I think investing in renewables is more important than the State of Alaska.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: This is another area where I don’t feel comfortable committing to a simple "yes" or "no". I would highly support upgrading local codes to require greater energy efficiency in new builds. However, I also recognize that the needs of citizens in Anchorage vary greatly from the needs of citizens in Noatak. While I would like to see higher standards for energy efficiency for builders, I want to make sure whatever legislation is made considers the needs of our rural residents.
Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I think it is essential that we monitor and regulate the amount of carbon that is being pumped into our atmosphere. I am willing to support a carbon tax or other steps to help regulate greenhouse emissions. However, I think the most important step we can take is making sure that when we are investing in new energy projects, we focus those investments in renewable energy. Simply turning down the flow is not enough, we need to be changing the source.

Joe Hackenmueller
State House District 14 (Eagle River)

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes. We simply cannot afford to continue ignoring the social, political and environmental costs of a hydro-carbon based economy. Alaska is on the leading edge of environmental impacts as the effects of global warming are amplified in the arctic. We are a resource rich state, and that includes phenomenal opportunities to capitalize on renewable resources such as wind, solar, tidal, hydro, and geothermal.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to
say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.”

Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. There was a time when it may have made sense to have six separate power utilities along the Railbelt to serve widely separated communities. However, improvements in generation and transmission technologies make such an arrangement increasingly inefficient and imposes unnecessary costs on the consumers. While there have been recent efforts to consolidate some of these services, the establishment of an independent Railbelt authority will kickstart these efforts.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. We need to leverage every bit of federal funding available for clean energy
development, and we need to make a concerted effort to incentivize both businesses and individuals to transition to clean energy options.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes. Statewide building codes are "low hanging fruit" that can be easily implemented and would be in the best long-term interest of everyone.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.” http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I support a revenue positive carbon tax as outlined in the Climate Change Action Plan Recommendation to the Governor.

Lyn Franks
State House District 15

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?
A: Yes. In my campaign, I have championed sustainable industry. We can increase solar and wind production, explore geothermal, and begin to harness the bore tide to harness hydroelectric energy.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. I am behind this plan as a step or as a bridge in supporting clean energy.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?
A: Yes. We are currently in a global climate crisis. Any and all steps must be implemented as quickly as possible to circumvent catastrophic consequences to our state as well as to our world.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes. Furthermore, these codes and regulations must be developed in a way that allows for smooth and easy transitions with an emphasis on cost savings.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: Carbon taxes will help to reduce carbon emissions and help fund state services. Necessity is the mother of invention. Therefore, this is a good way for less sustainable industries to look for cost cutting ways that will boost sustainable energy and at the same time boost their revenues.

Andrew Josephson
State House District 17

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California
now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes, but. If achieving this goal requires turning a great wild river like the Susitna River, into a tamed, flooded, temperature-controlled river, then I’d rather not meet the goal. Put differently, I would be ecstatic about meeting the goal (or even exceeding it), but not at the expense of wild salmon and wild places.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. I have had repeated meetings with Chugach Electric, for example, of the benefits of economic dispatch. As I understand it, the Railbelt utilities are instead holding onto their fiefdoms and not seeing the bigger picture. They need nudging.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private
sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

*Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?*

A: Yes. Just, yes. This is a big topic at meetings of the National Caucus of Environmental Legislators.

**Q4:** As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. *Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?*

A: Yes. Chairman Sam Kito, House Labor & Commerce Committee, was looking into this and may have filed legislation. It was a topic of at least one hearing in 2018. While there may need to be exceptions for some rural communities, I absolutely support the concept.

**Q5:** Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.” [http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/](http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/).

*What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?*

A: I am the only legislator carrying legislation to create a grant-seeking agency within the Governor’s Office, to work on both adaptation and mitigation efforts. The bill in one form, required an additional 1 cent per barrel be charged for TAPS throughput. The State of Alaska needs to do more.
Zack Fields
State House District 20

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.
Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I would support putting a price on carbon pollution and using proceeds to 1) grow the PFD and 2) invest in more clean, affordable energy and efficiency.
Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes. We bought solar panels for our home in Anchorage. I fully support renewable energy.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. I would like to learn more about this.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback
periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. I would support this program as we need to develop renewable resources, especially for village communities dependent upon diesel generators.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes. Absolutely. It would save money in the long run.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I support the carbon fee and dividend program.
Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: No. Projects like this happen at the pace regulated according to the specific area and it need. Sometimes bigger or biggest project first, sometimes smaller projects first. That need may not fall within these goals or guidelines, but the sooner the better.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.
Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: No

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: No. I respect people right to privacy and personal choice

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: Need more information
Chris Dimond  
State House District 33  

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: I would like to click "Yes" on this question. However, before I would commit to that "yes" I would want to know why we are not keeping on pace to reach that 50% now. Alaska is a big state. I want to make sure that there are no unknown reasons to myself, that make this an unattainable goal for Alaska and our remote regions, then figure out what is necessary to make that goal possible and move forward with binding legislation. I absolutely think we need to be making bigger strides towards all renewable energy, but I don’t want to see us locked into anything binding that will not be achievable.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. This seems pretty straightforward. I have a question for you; do you know why the legislature has not acted on this?

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more
than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. Investing in these types of programs create long term savings, as well as offering lower future energy costs to rate payers. These programs also create jobs.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes. As a builder myself, I understand and appreciate the need for uniform codes. This ensures a home buyer/lending institute are protected in their investment of a home. It ensures safety for the homeowner and neighbors etc.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”
What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: We should be making every effort possible to address and achieve the committees recommendations. Let’s bring industry and environmental groups to the table and start finding the solutions necessary to make sure we are protecting our state.

Sara Hannan
State House District 33

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: I need to learn more about the ability to meet the standard of 50% renewable and the impacts of making it binding. I am not sure what the hurdles are to meeting the goal so the nature of an incentive or a punishment is unclear to me. I support incentives and efforts to expand renewable energy for both private and public needs.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.”

Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?
A: Yes

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: Yes

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop
and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: We must expand our clean energy investments and talk about the full costs of our carbon emissions and we must address climate change impacts.

Patrick Savok
State House District 40

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Yes. Harnessing other means of energy is a must. We should have a standard in place to show we are moving toward that diligently. We have wind studies that show great potential for rural communities to be provided with renewable energy. This will drastically cut down the need for heating fuel and save on their pocketbooks.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.”

Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-
discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. First off, PCE is a huge help to the rural communities in district 40, if inefficiencies raise electric rates and negatively impact the consumers in rural Alaska utilizing this subsidy, then I will support legislation for an independent entity to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid. We need transparent pricing for all in Alaska.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. Anything we can do to attract more money for renewable energy projects will be beneficial for everyone in Alaska. Having an energy development bank would provide substantial leverage to meet a Renewable Portfolio Standard.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?
A: Yes. In District 40 we have a lack of housing and some of the coldest temps. in the State. I agree that a statewide residential building code for new home construction would help, as patchwork of current regulations makes it difficult for a home buyer, to not only navigate, but understand.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/. What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: As a former board member of my local co-op, the understanding I have of rural energy will help with the creation and implementation of a carbon fee and dividend program.

Susan Kay
Senate District E

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: No. We are still active in diverse rich resources we are only now understanding how to store and distribute power from renewable sources. I do not believe our State is off course or lagging in the resources or knowledge, nor capitol to invest. Why push 2025 goal to 2030? Human behavior proves our best work is completed as the deadline approaches! I will support renewable 100% for a return of 50% by 2025!

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who
will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: No. I will not support a law, which is the definition of legislation, to create and independent entity. What I will so is de regulate or rather review the statues in place to determine if there is any reason these pieces of "legislation" is acting as a barrier to the private sector in preventing independent entities from developing open access to the grid, or proposing another option that could deliver power in what you describe as "The Railbelt". The State does not create jobs. As a Senator my neighbors in District E want jobs, education, health care access, public safety and so on. I believe in Co-Ops and local business. I will support private or local co-op members in creating such an entity.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?
A: No., again a question in response. Why give money to the State, then have the State pay employees to manage and distribute the money, to those who may sign up for the loan? Cut out the State entirely! My answer to this I support a “State owned bank”. One reason why these conversations are evolving is because of the legalization of marijuana and the generation of money collected in taxes. I would certainly support green money loans via such path roads of investment into the State Bank. California is moving towards this direction, although I would urge the Legislature to keep focused on values and needs of Alaska. We have a couple State entities "The Mental Health Trust Authority" and PFD "Board of Trustees" who manage large budgets directly relating to Alaskans. A State bank isn’t a large step away.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: No. Spend a couple winters in less then standard condition. Let the consumer drive markets. I would like to hold less then honest contractors to the level of best practice. There are multiple layers of regulation on builders, supplies, and equipment. I have yet to see how "code" can save money or energy. If the private community wants to ensure green outcomes my message, buy green. I am strongly in support of education. Local communities have health fairs, safety fairs, bike fairs,... how about building fairs

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I do not plan on taking any money from the federal government for clean energy. They have proven time and again they do not hold Alaska interest as sacred as Alaskans. I would support private businesses and the development of co-operatives willing to invest and develop options in generating power. I would like to invite you to look at bore tide
generated power and the missed opportunity to harness in South Central. I will support measures that build the private and nonprofit and even partnerships in reducing carbon imprints.

**Jim Crawford**  
Senate District I

**Q1:** In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. **Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?**

A: No. The role of government is not to force economic answers but to facilitate them. For example, every village on the Kuskokwim or Yukon could have in river generation of electricity. Why has it not done? Lack of an accountable energy plan with goals and objectives stated in KW generation and costs. It’s time for the energy section of AIDEA to stop providing energy studies and start designing, constructing and operating energy production.

**Q2:** The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

**Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?**

A: No. What is economic dispatch of the Region’s generation assets?. I will not commit to a bill without reading it.
Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year.

Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods.

Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. I would want to see this as part of a strategy to merge AHFC and AIDEA and recover excess capital. A Small Business Investment Corporation should be capitalized by AIDEA to provide capital for small businesses to solve this problem. Another state loan program is not the answer. Properly capitalized small business and growing the private sector is a better answer.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: No. More control by a monolithic state government is not the answer. Properly capitalized small contractors is the better answer. Building codes in Fairbanks are materially different than Valdez or Anchorage. Local conditions must differentiate building codes. One solution is to stop AHFC from gouging small landlords with rates of 6.75%
versus AIDEA at 4.04% All renters and landlords are paying the price of higher debt cost and resultant higher rent

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”

What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: None.

Jesse Kiehl
Senate District Q

Q1: In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: No. I support a binding standard for our state. On the Juneau Assembly, I worked on our renewable energy strategy to reach 80% renewables by 2045. We have begun working to reach that goal, including planning for and building more charging stations to support and accelerate the growth of electric vehicles in Juneau. However, Alaska may need a longer time frame than the proposed 2030 deadline for a binding standard to double renewable electricity. Wind and solar can come on line quickly, but geothermal and hydroelectric often require 8-12 years for the permitting process before construction can begin. I look forward to working with REAP and colleagues across the state to develop a realistic, binding standard to aggressively advance Alaska’s use of renewables.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who
will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: Yes. An independent entity makes good sense to make sure the benefit to the consumer is the top priority. Utilities should be able to provide energy from the best power generators available, not just the closest, allowing the most efficient generation facilities to run at capacity and the least efficient to be idled or upgraded.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods. Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: Yes. A green bank has great potential to accomplish a lot of what Alaska did with general funds when oil money flowed freely. Tools like loan participation, secondary financing, and buying down credit risk can be very effective, and the benefit to Alaska residents and ratepayers can be tremendous. There may be other conservation tools outside of a “bank” structure that work, too—like changing our RCA rules so utilities can
invest in conservation, potentially earning a return from saving their customers energy and money.

**Q4:** As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate. **Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?**

A: Yes. If there is public sector investment in building housing, I agree it should meet a minimum statewide residential standard. At the same time, I want to make it clear that I oppose state preemption of local building codes. In unorganized areas of the state, privately funded homes and cabins without government participation should probably be left to the owner’s discretion.

**Q5:** Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.” [http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/](http://climatechange.gov.alaska.gov/policy-statements/investment/). **What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?**

A: Alaska needs a fossil fuel carbon export tax or fee, the revenues from which get invested in renewable energy and conservation. Let’s invest in renewable energy generation at both the utility and household levels. Let’s invest in conservation for both businesses and individuals. With a focus on incentives for individual Alaskans and a mix of incentives and requirements for the largest emitters, Alaska can do our part to significantly reduce carbon emissions.

---

**Don Etheridge**  
*Senate District Q*

**Q1:** In 2010, the Alaska Legislature passed a declaration of state energy policy (HB 306) that included reaching a goal of generating 50% of Alaska’s electricity from renewable energy sources by 2025. Today, Alaska gets less than 25% of its electricity from renewable
energy (including hydro) and many Alaskans feel that not enough progress is being made toward the 50% goal. One option is to make the 50% goal into a binding Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), as 29 other states have already done. Both Hawaii and California now have Renewable Portfolio Standards that require 100% renewable electricity in those states by 2045. Would you support legislation to create a binding 50% by 2030 Renewable Portfolio Standard for Alaska?

A: Although this is a good goal to shoot for in a long term, I cannot honestly commit to supporting anything that has a potential to cause more of a financial burden on the state budget until we have a solid fiscal plan. I would have to have information on the cost to the state. With the state already using half of peoples PDF to pay the bills I couldn’t commit to spending more funds at this time.

Q2: The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) sent a letter on June 30, 2015 to the Alaska Legislature containing Findings and Recommendations the Commission made regarding reform of the Railbelt electricity grid. Among those RCA Findings was that “[t]he Railbelt electric system does not deliver the maximum benefit possible to ratepayers, who will be paying approximately $1.5 billion for new generation.” The Commission went on to say that “[n]on-discriminatory access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of generation by an independent entity are key principles that must guide the transformation of the Railbelt electrical system.” Inefficiencies that raise electric rates in the Railbelt also negatively impact consumers in rural Alaska because higher urban electric rates raise the floor for the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) electricity subsidy. More than three years after the RCA made its Findings and Recommendations, the independent Railbelt entity that the RCA called for in its 2015 letter to the Legislature still does not exist.

Would you support legislation to create an independent entity in the Railbelt to ensure non-discriminatory open access to the grid, open and transparent system-wide transmission pricing and economic dispatch of the region’s generation assets?

A: I would have to see proposed legislation and better understand the issue.

Q3: Over the last decade the Alaska Legislature appropriated more than $640 million to support the AHFC home weatherization and rebate programs referenced above. The Legislature also appropriated $270 million for grants under the Renewable Energy Fund (REF) that the Legislature created in 2008. Those State REF appropriations leveraged more than $200 million in federal and private funding, and resulted in the construction of more than 70 renewable energy projects across the state that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) estimates are displacing the equivalent of more than 30 million gallons of diesel fuel every year. Because of the State’s fiscal situation, these large state appropriations for clean energy grants are unlikely to continue in the future. Furthermore, energy efficiency in particular is something that can and should be financed, often with very short payback periods. Other states are forming clean energy development banks (often called “green banks”) that are successfully taking modest amounts of state money and using it to decrease the perceived risk of clean energy financing that still exists with many banks in the private sector. In states like Connecticut, public money is leveraging large amounts of
private capital into carefully designed loan programs that consumers can easily access to borrow money to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their homes and businesses.

Would you support the creation of a State clean energy development bank that develops energy efficiency and renewable energy loan programs that can attract private banks as partners and provide affordable loans to Alaska’s energy consumers?

A: I like the idea but once again I would have to see the cost and how we are going to fund the program.

Q4: As noted above, AHFC’s home weatherization and rebate programs touched more than 50,000 residences that received state grants to make their homes more energy efficient, resulting in energy savings that have averaged 30%. And yet, Alaska still does not have a statewide building code for new residential home construction that would ensure that new homes being built are energy efficient, with lower operating costs and higher market values than inefficient housing. Several local jurisdictions in the state do have such building codes, leading to a patchwork of regulation that is often difficult for home builders to navigate.

Would you support the creation of statewide residential building code for new home construction?

A: No. Having worked construction and having built and remolded homes I have learned what works in one area of the state don’t work in others. With the all the different weather zones this state has it would be very costly to a builder to build a home that would meet the requirements needed to cope with such a verity of weather and terrane.

Q5: Many leaders believe that addressing the threat of our changing climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the biggest challenge of our time. Jurisdictions all over the world have already put a price on carbon emissions by either setting up carbon cap-and-trade systems or instituting carbon taxes (or fees). Many of the world’s leading economists and businesses, including the oil industry, support putting a price on carbon. To develop and implement equitable funding mechanisms for the State’s climate change strategy, Governor Walker’s Climate Action for Alaska Leadership Team has recommended that the State “evaluate the development of a carbon fee and dividend program.”


What measures do you believe the State of Alaska should take to put a price on carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop funding mechanisms to adapt to the impacts of climate change and support clean energy programs and financing?

A: I have not had time to look at the recommendation yet but would be very interested in hearing more about this.