From:	
То:	Rep. Matt Claman; House Judiciary; House Rules; Rep. Chris Tuck; Rep. Cathy Tilton
Cc:	; Rep. Zack Fields; Rep. Andy Josephson;
Subject:	Please open public testimony up for Taylor consideration
Date:	Tuesday, March 16, 2021 9:29:20 AM

Dear Rep. Claman,

Could you please open public testimony back up for the Treg Taylor's consideration item....since you've left the item open in your committee to allow time for legislators to speak on the matter of his confirmation?

For a host of reasons this year, it's been quite a challenge to figure out when some folks would be in what committee for consideration/confirmation.

Last week I kept calling legislators' offices to figure out when Taylor would be scheduled in what committee. Phones either went unanswered by a person or no one knew when he was scheduled.

Yesterday, by chance, I found out he was in your committee. I still can't figure out and no one seems to know what's going on in Senate Judiciary re: Taylor.

Taylor's confirmation is seriously problematic. It'd be prudent for your committee to allow important public testimony on this consideration in order to speak to committee members directly and to the record.

I appeal to your empathy to open public testimony back up on this Taylor item. It's difficult trying to keep up with committee information as things are happening so fast down there.

Please advise. Andrée McLeod

From:	
То:	Rep. Matt Claman; Rep. Liz Snyder
Subject:	Treg Taylor appointment to AG
Date:	Wednesday, March 17, 2021 8:49:56 AM

Dear Representative Claman and Ms. Liz Snyder:

It is clear from recent testimony from Treg Taylor, the Governor's new choice for Alaska's Attorney

General that he is not qualified to be Attorney General. His testimony was incoherent even laughable. A competent attorney would not try to make the case that Taylor attempted by saying that in the case of a conflict of interest the responsibility lays with the person who has the conflict of interest. In this case, the former Chief of Staff, Ben Stevens would be responsible for contacting the Department of Law that he has or might have a conflict of interest with work he will be doing for Conoco Phillips Oil Company. It is embarrassing that an attorney at a confirmation hearing might be confirmed to the job of Attorney General would make such testimony.

Sincerely, Kathrin McCarthy

Dear members of the House Judiciary Committee,

After hearing Treg Taylor's responses to questions from this committee, I'd like to share my reasons on why he should not be confirmed as Alaska's next Attorney General.

First, he doesn't appear to have a full grasp of the dynamics of Alaska's sexual assault crises. His defense of AG Clarkson as a "good guy" clearly shows he does not understand the gravity of Clarkson's actions, and their direct ties to sexual assault in Alaska.

Secondly, Mr. Taylor has willfully ignored our conflict of interest laws and enables corruption when he should prevent it.

Treg Taylor doesn't understand what it takes to enforce the laws that protect the public interest and should not be confirmed.

Thank you for your time.

Charlene Aqpik Apok Iñupiaq, Executive Director, Data for Indigenous Justice she/her/they/them Iñuuruŋa savaktuŋalu Dena'ina-t nunaŋanni Kisagvigmun. 'I live and work on the land of the Dena'ina in Anchorage'





JOELLE HALL Executive President



JAKE METCALFE Secretary / Treasurer

March 19, 2021

The Honorable Matt Claman Chair of House Judiciary

Dear Representative Claman and members of the committee,

We would like to go on record expressing some concerns about the confirmation of Treg Taylor to AG.

The tenure of this Governor has been marked by frequent abuses of the constitution noted and discussed by the courts. For example, failure to appoint judges, failure to fund pieces of the budget that he disagrees with. These are violations of the separation of powers and are very dangerous.

In addition to these unsuccessful unconstitutional actions, the Governor has asked his prior AG's to engage in a losing series of lawsuits surrounding a radical interpretation of the US Supreme Court's JANUS decision. The interpretation and follow-on administrative action undertaken by AG Clarkson flies in the face of any rational interpretation of the law and resulted in immediate lawsuits and a well-deserved injunction.

This one case has resulted in staggering costs for the State of Alaska. The State lost on every provision and as a result is required to pay \$185K in damages. The union in question made the offer to the state that if they walked away from this loser case, they would not sue for attorneys' fees. The failure to walk away and persist on this quest has resulted in attorney's fees of over \$250K. This failure by the that AG to quell the unconstitutional impulses of Governor Dunleavy have been over \$500k in this case alone. There are 4 more cases that will likely go the same way.

We bring this up because we think it is important for lawmakers and the public to understand if this AG will be more forceful when pushing back against the Governor. These trips to court to defend his actions are time-consuming and very expensive.

Yesterday, a member of the House expressed concerns about the use of state funds to pursue this case over the express objections of the Legislature, the appropriators. The pursuit of this case that is clearly unwelcome by lawmakers, costing us hundreds of thousands of dollars and potentially headed to a higher court, should be a grave concern.

Mr. Taylor should agree to drop this case.

The Attorney General is the people's lawyer, not the Governor. We put him or her in the position to defend our Constitution, not to enable a politician's petty grievances against it. We urge the committee and the Legislature during the confirmation process to review these principles, go over the past improper practices of this Governor's previous AG's and to get a commitment to uphold our Constitution.

Alaskans are being asked to sacrifice services and our future will surely require Alaskans to pay for the services they receive. If this AG nominee cannot stand up against these constitutional windmills, Alaska cannot afford him.

Respectfully,

Joelle Stall

Joelle Hall President Alaska AFL-CIO



The Alaska Public Interest Research Group (AKPIRG) is testifying today in opposition to Treg Taylor's confirmation for Alaska's next Attorney General. AKPIRG is a non-partisan, non-profit, state-wide organization advocating on behalf of consumers and the public interest.

I would like to just briefly touch on something Mr Taylor said today--that we cannot judge people on our worst days. On Tuesday, a white supremacist killed six Asian-American women, and Cherokee County Sheriff's Office Capt. Jay Baker said that he was 'having a bad day'. This rhetoric is used to absolve and forgive predators, murders, and white supremacists in positions of power, while women, communities of color, and other marginalized communities are left to bear burdens of violence without ever seeing accountability.

When former AG Clarkson resigned, AKPIRG sent a letter alongside many other groups, requesting Governor Dunleavy commit to combatting the sexual assault crisis in Alaska, starting by ensuring that the next AG be a woman and/or person of color, and not a sexual predator. Instead, the Governor appointed another predator, Mr. Sniffen, who <u>then resigned due to sexual improprieties</u> with a high school student.

In the House Judiciary Committee on March 15th, Mr. Taylor claimed that Mr. Clarkson was "a good friend" and "an honorable man". Mr. Taylor plainly announced complicity with predacious, harmful behaviors that share the same root as the current sexual violence crisis that Alaska faces and Mr. Taylor purports to address as attorney general, the <u>top legal officer</u> for our state.

Mr. Taylor's doublespeak continues into the realm of public trust in government. Through recent requests for information with the Department of Law, AKPIRG has learned that Mr. Taylor has actively colluded to circumvent ethics statutes clearly detailed in Alaska's laws as they relate to written waiver mandates for certain conflicts of interest. This was confirmed on Monday, again, by Mr. Taylor's confusing responses to straight-forward questions posed by House Judiciary members.

During testimony, Mr. Taylor said that under the law, "only under certain circumstances would there be a need arise for a conflict waiver," circumstances of which have already been satisfied by Ben Stevens' job description of "government affairs", thus triggering AS 39.52.180. Taylor then continued, "And then [the law] also makes clear that the governor and the AG would take a look at that issue and it's to their discretion whether to grant such a waiver. And that discretion is left to what they feel is in the best state interest."

Mr. Taylor unironically asserted there is no obvious conflict here. There clearly is. Mr. Taylor is also creating dangerous precedent by placing the duty solely on Mr. Stevens to voluntarily alert the state of future circumstances where he has insider knowledge that might unjustly enrich private industry who now signs his paychecks. This is entirely unworkable. Most critically, Mr. Taylor revealed why he and Governor Dunleavy have gone to great lengths to avoid putting details on paper that would limit Mr. Stevens--they are acting in their discretion to determine what "they feel is in the best state interest" and maybe intimate entanglements with private industry is part of that state plan. Unfortunately, the law requires a determination to protect the public interest, which honestly requires much more than Mr. Taylor seems ready to champion.



From his testimony, Mr. Taylor seems to not understand the law, though it is quite clear. Indeed, Mr. Taylor admitted in his testimony that Stevens would likely encounter issues during his tenure that would pose a conflict. It is exactly *for* this reason that individuals leaving state service, even <u>in other cases</u> with far less potential for serious conflict, are either required to wait two years or to affirmatively demonstrate--with their department head and AG's approval--why their new position would not pose a conflict *through a written waiver*. This process is key to ensuring that particular State employees are acting in the public's best interest, and not being influenced by financial prospects of a lucrative job--and not creating market imbalances through their use of privileged and confidential information.

The point here is to ask for permission--Mr. Taylor seems to have directed Mr. Stevens to ask for forgiveness instead, with Alaskans having to bear the brunt of this callous abdication of the public interest. If Mr. Taylor does not believe that a blanket waiver is appropriate to grant to Mr. Stevens, perhaps that is because Mr. Stevens *will* encounter conflicts that *will* be in direct opposition to the public interest, and that Mr. Taylor could not, in good faith, approve a waiver of such conflicts. In this case, Mr. Stevens should not be permitted to bring his privileged knowledge to benefit ConocoPhillips--in policy decisions or bottom lines--a fact which the Governor, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Stevens have rushed to brush aside for Mr. Stevens' personal benefit.

The process is clear and has been repeatedly followed before. We know from the Department of Law that the Governor and Acting AG have discussed this issue, and the AG has essentially given a verbal waiver--which is a clear deviation from Alaska's conflict of interest and lobbying laws. None of the statutory requirements have been followed--instead we have vague assurances with no accountability, and an administration that considers itself above its own laws, making a mockery of public trust in government.

It is not satisfactory that Mr. Taylor does not *think* there's a conflict--he must follow the clear processes laid out in statute to say so, in written format and with clear justification, through the same procedure that's been used for over a decade.

Mr. Taylor cannot be expected to enforce our laws and protect the public's interest while simultaneously believing it's acceptable for the state to operate on a wink and a promise.

AKPIRG believes Mr. Taylor is unfit to serve the public's interest, as he believes these laws clearly do not apply to himself or his boss, the Governor. We oppose Mr. Taylor's nomination as Attorney General, and instead recommend that a woman and/or person of color be appointed as Attorney General.

Sincerely,

Veri di Suvero Executive Director AKPIRG

From:	
To:	House Judiciary; Rep. Harriet Drummond; Rep. Matt Claman; Rep. Liz Snyder; Rep. Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins; Rep. David Eastman; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Christopher Kurka
Cc:	; Rep. Andy Josephson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson
Subject:	McLeod HJ Taylor confirmation testimony
Date:	Friday, March 19, 2021 5:47:45 PM
Attachments:	McLeod re AG confirmation House Judiciary.pdf

Hello all.

Attached is my testimony from today's meeting in House Judiciary re: the Treg Taylor consideration as attorney general.

I've already submitted a link to the documents of **written waivers** submitted to the AG for approval or disapproval which are on file since 2005. They were received from the Department of Law in response to a records request late last year. It shows how the state has traditionally handled these waivers.

Please note: the specifics of these written waivers are available for our review because they were written, as mandated by the Alaska Executive Branch Ethics Act.

They are documented for the record and available for review. Not, as Mr. Taylor has done with Ben Stevens and wants to implement, based on a wink and a nod, oral conversations through back channels, and other worthless, ambiguous, and illegal rules and procedures that lack transparency and accountability.

Here's the link of the written waivers for your review: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59f229bd2aeba5312c87df44/t/6047d6a30ec59f735249422a/1615320769918/Public%2BInterest%2BDetermination%2BWaivers.pdf

Please call if you have questions or concerns.

Thank you. Andrée McLeod



March 19, 2021

House Judiciary - Consideration of Treg Taylor as attorney general

My name is Andrée McLeod. I serve at the Alaska Public Interest Research Group as a Good Government Director.

Thank you for reopening public testimony from Monday's meeting.

That meeting was stunning. Mr. Taylor's statements left, without a doubt, that he ought not to be confirmed as Alaska's attorney general. I won't repeat them. You heard them and he was clear.

Although he promises the sun, the moon and the stars, his actions and positions related to the Ben Stevens' jump from the Governor's office to the golden towers of ConocoPhillips reveals that either he doesn't understand our laws or he actually does understands them and has purposefully, willfully, and intentionally chosen to ignore and disregard them.

I've submitted to the committee a copy of all written waivers filed since 2005 per the Alaska Executive Branch Ethics Act.

It shows that many former public officials did take to heart their oaths to do right by the public they served and did follow our laws regarding written waivers. They knew that appearances of conflicts of interests existed and took them seriously. They knew the reason for those 'waiting periods' because the read, understood and respected the law.

Oftentimes, we think of corruption as money changing hands. But on Monday, we saw corruption right under noses. When Mr. Taylor misconstrues laws put on the books to protect the public interest, and prevent and mitigate conflicts of interests, that's corruption.

After the 2006 FBI raids of legislative offices, legislators took great pains to right the wrongs that occurred because of the actions of corrupt public officials.

In John Steinbeck's novel, The Grapes of Wrath, a man who talked about oppression, inequality and class discrimination, among other disparate things, says:

"I got to figure," the tenant said. "We all got to figure. There's some way to stop this. It's not like lightning or earthquakes. We've got a bad thing by men and by God that's something we can change."

Corruption is not like lightning or earthquakes. And, it's a bad thing. And this time, again, it can be changed by you if you take the necessary actions to not confirm Treg Taylor.

House Judiciary
Treg Taylor AG Nomination
Friday, March 19, 2021 6:55:48 PM

To Chair Matt Claman.

Thank you for taking some additional public testimony today re Gov. Dunleavy's selection of Mr. Taylor to be our new/third AG under Governor Dunleavy. You said members of the public can submit written comments to be distributed to Committee Members. I am taking you up on your offer. Hopefully, this information can be circulated to all legislators, to Mr. Taylor and Governor Dunleavy for their feedback, and to Ben Stevens and ConocoPhillips for any comments they may have.

The AG position is perhaps one of the most important positions in our state government. While Mr. Taylor might be a nice guy, given his casual avoidance or minimization of Ben Stevens' and ConocoPhillips' very public interference in Alaskans' legacy oil fiscal policies, he does not have the character, integrity, and "high moral and ethical standards" required of those who serve Alaskans, or who are supposed to serve, Alaskans, under the Alaska Executive Branch Ethics Act, AS 39.52.010. When Ben Stevens, who admitted receiving \$43,000 to \$57,000 a year from an oil subcontractor, while serving in the legislature, never denied the testimony of Rick Smith, the subcontractor's Vice-President, that this money was for a bribe, no Alaska Attorney General should avoid or minimize these facts. Ben never, to my knowledge, provided Alaskans with any specifics of what he did for the \$240,000 plus in funds he admitted receiving from the oil subcontractor.

To Rep. Vance, who wanted to note that Ben Stevens was not found guilty (Chair Claman correctly noted he was not prosecuted), the fact that someone was not prosecuted does not mean they did not commit crimes and/or accept bribe money. Ben admitted receiving these substantial fees. From the perspective of public service, we should not want to say that if someone gets away with bribes, or avoided prosecution, that makes them a good, trusted, public servant. At the very least, we should want to know what Ben Stevens did for this money. If he is unwilling to tell Alaskans what he did for that \$240k plus from an industry subcontractor, while serving in our legislature, as Senate President at times, this is just another reason why he should not have been employed by Governor Dunleavy, or be employed by ConocoPhillips now.

CP's Code of Business Ethics and Conduct states, on page 32, in part: "As part of our commitment to winning business the right way, ConocoPhillips does not and will not tolerate bribery in any form." A "bribe" is an offer or gift of anything of value. . . .Bribes may include money. . .employment opportunities, political or or charitable contributions, or any benefit or consideration, direct or indirect." What does this language mean to ConocoPhillips? What does it mean to Mr. Taylor? While Ben Stevens' conflicts of interest are obvious, when he accepts a new job, within the same month he leaves state employment, why should anyone accept happy talk from anyone, especially Mr. Taylor, that Mr. Stevens and CP will know how to handle themselves to avoid conflicts of interest?

There is also the June 6, 2006 FBI wiretapped conversation between Jim Bowles, then president of ConocoPhillips Alaska, and Bill Allen, president of the oil industry subcontractor, Veco. Mr. Bowles made it clear that killing the bill would be the best thing for his company and the entire oil industry. (What about the best, or even a good thing, for Alaskans? This is the obvious problem for everyone's constituents. When the industry gets the oil fiscal policy they want, and exclude Alaskans, as owners of this legacy oil, from even having substantive due process hearings so their interests are heard—Alaska suffers. We send extra money out of state. This leads to smaller PFD's, less money for pre-K-12 education and teachers and families, and all sorts of things Alaskans want their state officials to pay close attention to. Is Ben Stevens' conduct the conduct you want to hold up to teachers, students, parents and others, as exemplary behavior for elected (or appointed) officials?

Rep. Snyder appropriately asked Mr. Taylor what penalties were available to discourage violations of the Ethics Act and any agreements from Ben Stevens and ConocoPhillips. The bottom line is that there are no penalties sufficient to discourage violations of the Ethics Act, or agreements with Alaskans to behave. There are some

monetary fines (max 5k per AS 39.52.440). There are no criminal penalties, not even a misdemeanor, for Ethics Act violations, no matter how brazen. The Governor, Ben Stevens, Mr. Taylor, and CP are expecting legislators to trust them. To accept whatever assurances they give, and then to move on while they continue to obstruct efforts to fix your constituents' Prudhoe oil fiscal system. While there is still no effective oversight of Mr. Stevens/CP's involvement with your constituents' massive legacy oil wealth, even after the Veco corruption scandal.

No monetary penalty has sufficient deterrent effects. CP, in its 2017 Annual Report to Alaskans and others, noted net income of \$1.4 billion, for calendar year 2017, or \$3.8 million a day. At \$53 ANS prices. (They were in the sixties this month. DOR's Spring Forecast calls for \$53 ANS prices in FY 21, and \$61 in FY 22.) CP's report to Alaskans in early 2019, discussing 2018 calendar year net income of \$1.8 billion at \$71 ANS prices. And \$1.5 billion for calendar year 2019, at \$64 ANS prices. So, some \$5 billion dollars plus for 2017-2019. For just CP's share of your constituents legacy oil, which is a little more than a third of Prudhoe. Prices are very similar, production is very similar.

I mention these profits because they demonstrate why Alaskans must have a transparent, honest, state government. And central to this is that everyone must understand how much public wealth we are unnecessarily sending out of state, and out of our economy, with ANS pricing in the 40's and 50's. Production costs for Prudhoe are very low, around \$15 a barrel, per Ken Alper, recent DOR Tax Director. Note that the legislature, in the past, has refused to even allow Mr. Alper explain to Alaskans how he arrived at this figure. Why? Other explorers have noted a breakeven cost of \$30 or so, because they were close to the haul road and the pipeline. CP/Exxon/Hilcorp are already connected to this infrastructure, and all produce our low cost Prudhoe oil.

Here is what CP told Alaskans and Wall Street, in their 2019 Annual Report. Our legacy oil is "low cost" and they acquired more of it. When Alaskans and their legislators are trying to figure out a way to pay the remaining \$700,000,000 or so still owing to industry, why not start with ballot measure one's modest changes? 145,000 plus Alaskans, many of them your constituents, just voted to do this.

And what did CP say would happen re operations at your constituents' legacy oil fields, if those changes become law? Regular operations would continue at Prudhoe, Kuparuk, Colville. That was with ANS prices in the low 40's. (Again, it is above \$60 now. That 50% gain from 40 to 60, results in large additional profits to producers which are not equitably shared with your constituents.) This is highly relevant, apples to apples, information for you and your constituents. (Who still owe that \$700 million in unpaid debt, due to SB 21.). A win win situation for everyone.

In terms of the high moral and ethical standards we expect from our Governor, let's remember that he told Alaskans that he really did not have any plans to cut education, or the ferry system, or other things Alaskans rely on. Then, in October 18, in a strange 3 way race for governor, business interests sent \$2.7 million to Alaska, to help Mr. Dunleavy's campaign. The old Pelosi/Begich taxes taxes taxes ads. Without any substance, as usual. Mr. Dunleavy won, based in part on his campaign promises to be conservative, but not to cut much from anyone's budget.

Bingo. For only \$2.7 million, your constituents got AEP and other oil industry interests running your constituents "public" budget roadshow. Invitation only at first. Then only at small gatherings, no dissent or citizens even being allowed to inquire about their Prudhoe Bay oil wealth. (Remember, CP had just told Alaskans and Wall Street that our legacy oil was low cost, and that they netted income of \$1.8 billion on Alaska oil in calendar year 2018—so of course the owners of that legacy oil wealth must not learn the highly relevant facts about this.). Seem fair to you? Ben Stevens and CP do not, as demonstrated by the Veco scandal, have your constituents' interests close to their hearts. Legislators should. You dealing with your constituents' publicly owned property. And anyone stepping into our AG position, who claims there is nothing to see here and that Ben/CP of course will act honorably, ethically, and in compliance with ethical codes, is not qualified to act in your constituents' best interests—or to even be fair to them when it comes to looking the other way re our legacy oil field fiscal policies.

After the 2018 election, the legislature and constituents got Donna Arduin's scorched earth ideology, and massive vetoes. This was 180 degrees from what Mr. Dunleavy told Alaskans he would do, as their governor. This was/is not what the vast majority of Alaskans want. Mr. Dunleavy was/is the subject of a bipartisan recall effort. His initial AG delayed the process, and those involved in the recall had to go to court to let Alaskans have their say on whether to recall Mr. Dunleavy. Alaskans can see they are not running the show when it comes to due process

hearings and appropriate management of their public property.

There are many other qualified attorneys who understand that Ben Stevens can't go from the Governors office directly to CP's executive offices, without delay of any sort. There are many other attorneys who did not work for a major oil industry subcontractor in December 2018, and who did not shift into a high level state government AG position the same month, right after Mr. Dunleavy's election win. These industry/government things are revolving doors. Not good for fair balanced treatment of Alaskans, especially when it comes to transparency, or lack thereof, re their legacy oil wealth and market competitiveness. People should not look on service in state government as a ticket to employment in the oil industry, or the reverse. Best to keep things separated. This just avoids the obvious conflicts of interests between Alaskans, as owners and sellers of oil, and producers, as buyers of our oil. How about a designee who has not worked for the oil industry?

I have only provided some of the public data to the Veco scandal, and ConocoPhillips/Veco/Ben Steven's involvement in it. Mr. Taylor was here when the FBI went into six legislators offices, including Ben Stevens', in 2006. He presumably would have followed these developments, as did most Alaskans, especially attorneys. Having Mr. Taylor suggest that Mr. Stevens can go directly to CP, without any delay, shows poor judgment. This is almost a do you even care gut check for our legislators. Our Ethics Act appropriately notes that Alaskans should expect "high moral and ethical standards among public officers in the executive branch" which "are essential to assure the trust, respect, and confidence of the people of this state." Accepting bribes/fees/jobs/money to direct Alaskans' oil fiscal policies to the detriment of Alaskans as sellers and in favor of the buyers of our oil, in various ways, does not qualify for this respect. Nor does pretending these matters do not qualify for public transparency, with full disclosure of payments, contracts, salaries, and other information relevant to legislators and Alaskans being vigilant about what is happening to their owner state public property, and savings. ANS is still pumping out some \$9-10 billion in wealth, annually. Careful monitoring of how that wealth is shared between producers and Alaskans is very important—and has been missing since SB 21 was enacted into law in 2013.

Alaskans ask that legislators honor the high moral and ethical standards applicable to these matters, and ask the Governor to submit someone who is not so conflicted with employment connections, past or future, with the the buyers of our oil. I am not commenting on Mr. Taylor's responses to any other matters, although I recognize those exist. The handling of the Ben Stevens matter should be an automatic disqualifier. If not, what level of misbehavior is required to apply our Ethics Act standards to Mr. Taylor's analysis of these matters? Other capable candidates are out there. There is no need to rush anyone through the confirmation process—which should not be a rubber stamp matter. Governor Dunleavy is supposed to represent all Alaskans, not just those associated with the oil industry, even if they did pay for his election.

Thanks for reading and sharing. More information is better than less information. David Carter. Retired attorney, Anchorage

House Judiciary
Ak House Judiciary Today Regarding Mr. Taylor"s Confirmation & HB 109
Monday, March 22, 2021 3:26:17 PM
ADN Ethics Act & BEN STEVENs 3-21-21.pdf Cole Penney Contract for \$441,000 2-15-21.docx

Dear Alaska House Judiciary:

I logged in late today and was told that "Public Testimony" was concluded.

Below are two issues:

Vote Against confirmation of Mr. Tregarrick Taylor as Alaska Attorney General.

Alaska Bar Assn. is an integrated Bar Assn. which means all practicing Alaska attorneys are due paying members. Mr. Taylor is a member, Alaska Bar Assn.

I have emailed all of you separately but want to emphasize that you should vote "No" on Mr. Tregarrick Taylor to be confirmed for Alaska Attorney General for the following reasons:

1.) His lack of respect for your public office by leaving your meeting early during his confirmation 3-19-21. What could have been more important than his own confirmation hearing before you?

2.) His continual statement: "Good people do bad things." That was ridiculous. If he becomes Alaska Attorney General will anyone on his staff of 300 Alaska attorneys be allowed to do anything they want without repercussions?

3.) The fact that Mr. Kevin Clakrson, Mr. Ed (Clyde) Sniffen, and Mr. Ethan Berkowitz have not been disciplined in any way by Alaska Bar Assn.

4.) Mr. Taylor's statements that he is just going to let it go and possibly monitor about Mr. Ben Stevens signing "Public Interest Waiver" as he left as Chief of Staff for Governor Dunleavy. Attached is an editorial in ADN yesterday about this;

5.) Excellent "Public Testimony" of Mr. Barry Jackson, 30 years employee of AK Dept of Administration regarding Mr. Taylor's action at AIDEA regarding a no bind contract for \$441,000 for Mr. Clark Penney. Attached is an article by Dermot Cole about this issue dated 2-15-21.

HB 109 "An Act extending the termination of the Board of Governors of Alaska Bar Assn." giving an eight year extension. This HB 109 was introduced by Mr. Claman, Chair, AK House Judiciary 2/22/21.

I request that you put Alaska Bar Assn. on probation for one year and ask for a thorough Audit of their activities.

Alaska Bar Assn. has two functions:

1.) Alaska law licensure- My husband, Thomas S. Obermeyer, Attorney has dedicatedly

attempted to be licensed to practice law in Alaska for 37 years without a positive result. We know many ABA Accredited law school graduates who have not "passed Alaska Bar Exam." We question the validity of this Exam and ask why the passage rate is so low. Tom who has been licensed since 1990 by similar Missouri Bar Exam, should have been licensed by reciprocity many years ago but has been denied admission for 37 years.

2.) Alaska Bar Discipline- The fact that recently Mr. Kevin Clarkson, Mr. Ed Sniffen, and Mr. Ethan Berkowitz have not been disciplined in any way is a clear message that Alaska Bar Assn. cannot discipline its members. I am willing to submit a list of a total of 31 complaints I have filed against Alaska Bar members over a long period of time that went nowhere. I believe today that my treatment was worse because I filed these Alaska Bar complaints. I believe they were used against me so that my treatment was worse.

Alaska Bar Assn. fails on both Alaska law licensure and Alaska Bar discipline.

The only proper course is to put Alaska Bar Assn. on probation for one year until you can thoroughly review their practices.

I will try to log in to your AK House Judiciary Committee Meeting on Wednesday, March 22, at 1:30 P.M.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Theresa Nangle Obermeyer, Ph.D.