Money managers hurt Iowans by imposing expensive ESG mandates on utilities like MidAmerican Energy.

- A group of the world’s largest money managers is targeting specific companies, including Berkshire Hathaway—which owns MidAmerican Energy Company—to force them to comply with the aspirational climate goals of the Paris Agreement.
- Members of Climate Action 100+ like BlackRock are able to exert influence over companies because they manage large amounts of citizens’ retirement savings, including over $7 billion for IPERS.
- They are pressuring electric utilities to phase-out gas and coal power by 2040, which provide over 40% of Iowa’s electricity, while the Iowa Utilities Board is anticipating a power shortage this winter.
- This radical energy transformation would hurt Iowans, who enjoy lower electricity prices than states like California with green mandates.

Even worse, major banks have put similar pressure on energy companies in their lending practices.

- Wells Fargo, Bank of America, and JPMorgan Chase have all joined the Net-Zero Banking Alliance, committing to slash their financed emissions in the power sector by 60%-70% carbon intensity by 2030.

These financial institutions are also targeting food and agriculture, key Iowa industries.

- Climate Action 100+ is upending the agriculture and food sectors by pressuring companies to reduce emissions in their supply chain, increasing costs for farmers and consumers.
- They are pushing companies to go green by promoting lower-carbon alternatives to meat and dairy products, targeting fertilizer use, and electrifying farm machinery.
- They also pressure companies to align their lobbying practices and trade association memberships with net zero, assessing them based on if they lobby for climate policies and against agricultural subsidies.
- Iowa, who produces one-eleventh of the nation’s food supply, will bear the costs of this climate agenda.

How Iowa can push back: Legislative Solutions

Protect Iowa’s Pension Funds

- Enact a law, enforceable by the AG or an executive branch official, clarifying that the fiduciary duty of those managing Iowa’s pension funds is to consider only financial factors, for a financial purpose.
- Commitments to promote ESG goals are evidence of a motive to promote non-financial purposes.
- This will benefit retirees by shifting assets to asset managers focused on financial purposes.

Protect State Contracts And Investments

- Enact a law, enforceable by the AG or an executive branch official, prohibiting state contracts with companies that boycott or penalize companies for actions that do not violate the law, including:
  - engaging in mining, energy, agriculture, firearms, or commercial timber
  - not meeting corporate board composition criteria based upon protected characteristics
  - not meeting aspirational environmental or social standards
United Nations-inspired climate initiatives push the Paris Agreement on U.S. companies.

In the past few years, numerous financial initiatives have arisen to coordinate asset managers, banks, and other financial institutions to comply with the aspirational climate goals of the Paris Agreement—even though the Paris Agreement is not legally binding on U.S. companies.

Some of the most notable groups are Climate Action 100+, which is partially led by the UN-affiliated Principles in Responsible Investing, and the Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero (GFANZ), which is grounded in the UN-backed Race to Zero campaign.

Climate Action 100+ and GFANZ have enormous sway, controlling trillions of dollars.

Climate Action 100+ members collectively manage $68 trillion in assets and include two of the “big three” asset managers—BlackRock and State Street Global Advisors. They target certain companies and pressure them to commit to “[t]ake action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions across the value chain, consistent with the Paris Agreement’s goal.” Their sector strategies target power companies, agriculture (food & beverage), aviation, and steel.

GFANZ boasts that its members represent “over $130 trillion of private capital” that is “committed to transforming the economy for net zero.” Its Net-Zero Banking Alliance represents nearly 40% of global banking assets, including JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Citi, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley. Overseen by the UN, they commit to align their financed emissions with net zero by 2050 or sooner. Similarly, GFANZ’s Net Zero Asset Managers, including Blackrock and State Street, commit to “play [their] part to help deliver the goals of the Paris Agreement” by managing assets in line with net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 or sooner and fossil fuel phase out.

These groups are using Iowans’ hard-earned savings to advance their own radical goals.

Through these initiatives, financial organizations are advancing radical climate and social policy. Money managers should be focused on making money in a tough stock market. Banks should provide credit based on financial metrics. Instead, they are using Iowans’ money to force U.S. companies to comply with the UN’s aspirational climate goals—while China and others prioritize energy security and national interests.

Unless Iowa pushes back against this sweeping agenda, its citizens will suffer. Energy costs will go up, while reliability goes down. Jobs will be destroyed. National security will be jeopardized. Now is the time for Iowa to fight back.