

**From:** Susan A <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2025 1:08 PM  
**To:** House Resources  
**Subject:** Public Testimony Bloomquist

## Public Testimony on the Nomination of Aaron Bloomquist to the Big Game Commercial Services Board

Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

I submit this testimony to urge caution and demand further scrutiny regarding the nomination of Aaron Bloomquist to the Big Game Commercial Services Board (BGCSB). While Mr. Bloomquist has extensive experience in the commercial hunting industry, serious concerns arise regarding conflicts of interest, his lack of engagement with subsistence rights, conservation policies, and indigenous treaty rights.

### 1. Conflict of Interest in Favor of Commercial Hunting

Mr. Bloomquist's professional background is entirely rooted in the guiding and outfitting industry, raising concerns that his decisions on the board could favor commercial interests over sustainable wildlife management, conservation ethics, and public access to hunting resources. The BGCSB is responsible for regulating a delicate balance between subsistence needs, conservation, and the commercial hunting economy—and yet, Mr. Bloomquist's record suggests an exclusive focus on monetized hunting services, rather than a broader perspective that includes public and indigenous stakeholders.

### 2. Lack of Public Stance on Subsistence Rights

Alaska's subsistence hunting traditions are a fundamental right for rural and indigenous communities, protected under both state and federal law. However, no public statements or records indicate that Mr. Bloomquist has taken a position on how commercial hunting impacts subsistence hunters or the need to uphold these rights. The concern is that without a demonstrated commitment to these principles, he may prioritize policies that benefit large-scale guiding businesses at the expense of rural residents and indigenous communities.

### 3. No Clear Position on Indigenous Treaty Rights or Conservation

The BGCSB plays a role in decisions affecting wildlife resources, protected species, and indigenous hunting rights, including obligations under tribal treaties and federal laws. However, Mr. Bloomquist has not publicly engaged on these issues, raising doubts about his willingness to consider them as part of the board's regulatory framework. His appointment must not undermine indigenous rights, conservation policies, or sustainability efforts that extend beyond commercial hunting interests.

### Conclusion: Further Transparency and Information Required

Before confirming Aaron Bloomquist's nomination, this committee must seek clear and direct answers to the following:

How does he plan to balance commercial guiding interests with subsistence hunting rights?

What are his views on the conservation of Alaska's wildlife resources beyond monetized hunting?

Does he acknowledge and respect indigenous treaty rights in game management decisions?

How will he ensure that board policies are not disproportionately benefiting commercial outfitters at the expense of local and indigenous communities?

Without satisfactory responses to these critical questions, his appointment risks deepening existing conflicts between commercial hunting and public wildlife access, subsistence rights, and conservation efforts. The state must prioritize nominees who demonstrate an understanding of and commitment to all aspects of Alaska's game management—not just the profitability of commercial hunting.

For these reasons, I urge the committee to demand greater transparency before approving Mr. Bloomquist's appointment. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

Myself

**From:** Susan A <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2025 1:22 PM  
**To:** House Resources  
**Subject:** Public Testimony Boniek

## Public Testimony on the Nomination of Martin Boniek to the Big Game Commercial Services Board

To the Members of the Committee,

I come before you today to express concerns regarding the nomination of Mr. Martin Boniek to the Big Game Commercial Services Board, based on findings from his professional history, personal interests, and involvement in legal matters. While Mr. Boniek has demonstrated significant professional experience in Alaska's private sector, it is essential to examine his potential conflicts of interest and his stance on critical issues, particularly those affecting public land use, conservation, and subsistence rights.

### 1. Conflicts of Interest and Ethical Concerns

Mr. Boniek's professional affiliations raise serious concerns about potential conflicts of interest in his role on the board. As a managing member of Copper Valley Air Service, LLC, Mr. Boniek holds a significant stake in a private company that could directly benefit from decisions made by the Big Game Commercial Services Board. His private business interests may clash with the public interest, particularly when it comes to decisions regarding access to hunting lands, the management of wildlife, and the allocation of permits for commercial services. Additionally, his involvement with Copper Valley Air Service, which operates in the same sector of Alaska's economy as the board, warrants closer scrutiny to ensure that he can act impartially and without bias.

### 2. Lack of Involvement in Conservation and Public Land Issues

There is a notable lack of clear public stance from Mr. Boniek on issues of conservation, public land access, and the rights of indigenous communities. His professional background, while extensive in business operations, does not indicate significant engagement with the complex issues of wildlife conservation, subsistence rights, or the stewardship of Alaska's natural resources. These issues are at the heart of the board's mission and require members to have a deep understanding of how to balance commercial interests with the preservation of ecosystems and respect for indigenous rights.

Given his lack of visible advocacy for these causes, it is crucial to question whether Mr. Boniek will prioritize the sustainable use of Alaska's wildlife resources and recognize the rights of indigenous communities, especially in the context of traditional hunting and land use practices.

### 3. Legal Involvement and Ethical Concerns in Litigation

It has come to our attention that Mr. Boniek is involved in ongoing litigation with various parties, including his role as managing member of Copper Valley Air Service, LLC, in a case that involves substantial stakeholders and raises ethical questions about land rights and business practices. The case, Daniel

Anderson, et al. v. Kirk Wilson and Julie Wilson (Supreme Court of Alaska, 2024), underscores the legal complexities that may arise when private commercial interests intersect with public land and landowner rights. Mr. Boniek's involvement in this litigation may present a conflict of interest should matters related to land rights, conservation, or commercial access to hunting areas arise within the Big Game Commercial Services Board's responsibilities.

#### 4. Lack of Clear Stance on Public vs. Private Land Issues

Mr. Boniek's stance on the balance between private and public land management remains unclear. This is a critical issue for the Big Game Commercial Services Board, as decisions regarding hunting and wildlife management frequently involve navigating the intersection of public and private land. A transparent and balanced approach is essential to ensure fair access to natural resources for both commercial enterprises and the public, particularly for subsistence hunters and indigenous communities who rely on traditional land use practices.

#### Further Information is Needed

In light of the above concerns, I urge the committee to carefully consider the nomination of Mr. Martin Boniek. While his professional experience in business operations is commendable, it is essential to ensure that his appointment would align with the goals of conservation, fair access to wildlife, and the protection of indigenous and subsistence rights. The lack of clear engagement with these issues, coupled with potential conflicts of interest in his private business dealings and legal involvement, raises questions about his capacity to serve impartially and effectively on the board.

I respectfully request that further information be sought to clarify these issues, and that any decisions regarding Mr. Boniek's appointment be made with full consideration of these factors.

Thank you for your attention.

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

Myself

**From:** Susan A <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2025 12:46 PM  
**To:** House Resources  
**Subject:** Public Testimony Chmielowski

**Public Testimony: Concerns Regarding the Appointment of Jessie Chmielowski to the AOGCC**

Date: March 17, 2025

To: The Alaska State Legislature Committee Resources

Subject: Concerns Regarding the Appointment of Jessie Chmielowski to the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC)

Honorable Committee Members,

I come before you today to express concerns regarding the nomination of Jessie Chmielowski to serve as a Commissioner on the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC). While Ms. Chmielowski's qualifications, including over 19 years of experience in Alaska's oil and gas industry, are noteworthy, there are significant ethical considerations and potential conflicts of interest that must be addressed before proceeding with her appointment.

**Key Concerns and Recommendations:**

**Past Employment with BP and Potential Bias in AOGCC Oversight:** Ms. Chmielowski's extensive background with BP Alaska, including her roles in managing complex projects and ensuring regulatory compliance for oil fields like Prudhoe Bay, creates potential concerns regarding her ability to remain impartial in her role as a regulator. Given that BP's assets in Alaska have since been acquired by Hilcorp, which remains a major operator in the region, there exists a significant risk that her past relationships and knowledge of these fields could influence her future decisions as a commissioner.

**Recommendation:** I urge the committee to examine how her past work with BP and her ongoing relationship with the oil and gas industry could affect her ability to regulate impartially. A full ethical review should be conducted, with particular focus on whether any existing or potential conflicts of interest could influence her decision-making process.

**Potential Future Employment Conflicts:** Many individuals in regulatory positions transition into private sector roles post-tenure, often within the same industries they once regulated. Given Ms. Chmielowski's deep ties to the Alaska oil and gas industry, including her tenure at BP and ongoing technical expertise, there is concern that her appointment could be viewed as a stepping stone to a future position with Hilcorp or other major oil companies.

**Recommendation:** The committee should consider the long-term implications of Ms. Chmielowski's appointment on industry oversight and public perception. We recommend that post-appointment employment restrictions be considered and that her financial disclosures be reviewed to identify any potential financial interests in companies under AOGCC oversight.

Lack of Transparency and Oversight: The public's trust in regulatory bodies such as the AOGCC is paramount. Transparency in decision-making processes and public accountability for commissioners' actions is necessary to ensure that regulatory oversight serves the best interests of all Alaskans, not just those of industry stakeholders. Given Ms. Chmielowski's extensive network in the oil and gas sector, including her work with both state and federal agencies, there is a need for clarity regarding how her decisions might benefit or hinder specific industry players, especially Hilcorp and BP-related assets.

Recommendation: I strongly urge the committee to implement measures that ensure transparency in Ms. Chmielowski's decisions. This could include regular public reporting on regulatory activities, as well as a mechanism for addressing concerns about potential undue industry influence.

Ethical Standards and Conflict of Interest Policy: While Ms. Chmielowski's resume demonstrates significant technical expertise, it is crucial that she is held to the highest ethical standards given her potential involvement in decisions impacting companies with which she has had prior business relationships. A clear conflict of interest policy should be established, and it should include guidelines for recusal in matters where Ms. Chmielowski has had prior involvement or personal interest.

Recommendation: The committee should seek to implement a formal conflict of interest policy for AOGCC commissioners and ensure Ms. Chmielowski adheres to it. Additionally, regular ethical audits of her decisions could help protect against potential biases or perceived conflicts.

Call for Further Information: The findings presented today are based on publicly available information. However, given the sensitive nature of this issue and the potential legal and financial implications, I encourage the committee to seek further information regarding Ms. Chmielowski's financial disclosures, specific relationships with Hilcorp and BP, and any future employment opportunities that might arise from her regulatory role. This additional scrutiny will help ensure that her appointment will be in the best interest of Alaskans and the integrity of the AOGCC.

In conclusion, I urge this committee to exercise caution in proceeding with the appointment of Ms. Chmielowski. While she brings valuable expertise, it is critical that potential conflicts of interest and ethical concerns be fully examined before confirming her appointment. Only by addressing these concerns with thorough investigations, clear conflict of interest policies, and public transparency can we ensure that the AOGCC remains an effective, unbiased, and accountable agency.

I appreciate the committee's attention to this matter and look forward to the opportunity for further discussion.

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

Myself

[REDACTED]

**From:** Susan A [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2025 1:58 PM  
**To:** House Resources  
**Subject:** Public Testimony Laffey

## Public Testimony Regarding the Nomination of Sam Laffey to the State Assessment Review Board

Date: March 17, 2025  
To: Resource Committee  
From: Susan Allmeroth  
Subject: Public Testimony on the Nomination of Sam Laffey for the State Assessment Review Board

Honorable Members of the Committee,

I am submitting this testimony to express concerns regarding the nomination of Sam Laffey to the State Assessment Review Board. While his legal qualifications and volunteer efforts are commendable, I believe it is important to address his apparent lack of understanding of Alaska's unique traditions, particularly those of Indigenous and tribal communities, and the potential implications of his background for decisions that could affect our state's land, culture, and people.

### Lack of Understanding of Alaskan Traditions and Indigenous Rights

One of the key issues I would like to highlight is Sam Laffey's views on Alaska's traditions, as seen in his article on nuisance law in the mushing community. In the article, Laffey discusses the challenges of dog kennels and the mushing lifestyle in a manner that shows a significant disconnect from the cultural significance of mushing to Alaska's communities, particularly Indigenous groups who have used dog teams for generations. His article does not seem to fully grasp the cultural heritage and connection to land that mushing represents for many Indigenous Alaskans. The mushing community is an integral part of Alaska's Native cultures, and the way he addresses legal challenges surrounding this tradition reveals a lack of consideration for the long-standing tribal and Indigenous rights tied to dog sledding and the land itself.

In this context, I am concerned that his nomination to the State Assessment Review Board might be indicative of a broader lack of sensitivity to the rights and interests of Alaska's Indigenous and tribal communities. Decisions made by the State Assessment Review Board, which affects property assessments and land use, could inadvertently undermine these communities' rights, potentially disregarding tribal sovereignty and the importance of land as part of Indigenous cultural practices.

### Potential Unintended Consequences: The Risk of Wealthy Buyouts

Beyond his perceived misunderstanding of Alaska's traditions, it is essential to raise concerns about the broader economic implications of having someone like Sam Laffey on the State Assessment Review Board. Given his connections to legal and business communities, we must be vigilant about the possibility of decisions benefiting the ultra-wealthy at the expense of Alaska's working families and small landowners. In these times of economic instability, rising taxes, and legal costs, it is often the wealthy

elite who step in and acquire land—often at significantly reduced prices due to forced sales or distressed circumstances.

This dynamic is particularly concerning in the context of property assessments. Decisions made by the State Assessment Review Board can directly influence the market value of land, which in turn impacts property taxes and the ability of working-class Alaskans to retain their homes and businesses. Given Mr. Laffey's professional background, there is a real risk that his perspective may align more with corporate or wealthy interests rather than the well-being of local communities, especially in times when displacement and property buyouts are increasingly common. This could exacerbate the trend of consolidating wealth and land in the hands of the ultra-rich, further marginalizing Alaska's hardworking families and undermining our state's economic diversity.

### The Need for Cultural Sensitivity and Economic Fairness

The role of the State Assessment Review Board is crucial in ensuring that land assessments are fair, transparent, and sensitive to the needs of Alaska's communities. However, as we've seen from recent trends and legal battles like those surrounding mushing and the mushing community, the lack of understanding of Alaskan traditions and tribal rights can lead to unintended consequences, particularly when it comes to the value and use of land.

It is essential that board members like Sam Laffey demonstrate a deep respect for Alaska's Indigenous cultures and local communities, and that they are attuned to the potential economic consequences of their decisions. Given the growing concerns about wealth consolidation and displacement, I urge the committee to carefully consider how Mr. Laffey's nomination could affect property assessments in a way that may harm Alaska's cultural heritage and disproportionately benefit those with already significant resources.

While Sam Laffey may bring legal expertise to the State Assessment Review Board, it is critical that the committee consider his disconnect from the traditions and rights of Alaska's Indigenous communities and his potential alignment with interests that may inadvertently lead to wealthy buyouts of Alaska's land. Alaska's land is not just an economic asset; it is deeply tied to our culture, history, and communities. We must ensure that decisions made at this level reflect these values, and that all Alaskans, especially Indigenous and local communities, are treated equitably and fairly.

Without any clarification on this issues, I urge you to hesitate and inquire into these issues before approving his nomination. Outward appearances are just what I see.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

Myself

**From:** Susan A <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2025 1:13 PM  
**To:** House Resources  
**Subject:** Public Testimony McCarthy

Public Testimony on the Nomination of Keegan McCarthy to the Big Game Commercial Services Board

Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

I submit this testimony to express concerns regarding the nomination of Keegan McCarthy to the Big Game Commercial Services Board (BGCSB). While Mr. McCarthy's extensive experience in Alaska's hunting industry is notable, it is imperative to address potential conflicts of interest and his stance on critical issues such as subsistence rights, conservation policies, and indigenous treaty rights.

### 1. Potential Conflict of Interest

Mr. McCarthy has over 30 years of hunting experience in Alaska and has been guiding big game hunts for the last 20 years. In 2014, he was awarded his Master Guide License, reflecting his significant involvement in the commercial hunting sector.

While his expertise is valuable, his deep ties to the commercial hunting industry may influence his decisions on the board, potentially favoring commercial interests over subsistence needs and conservation efforts. It is crucial that board members maintain impartiality to ensure fair representation of all stakeholders.

### 2. Unclear Position on Subsistence Rights

Subsistence hunting is vital to Alaska Native culture and the traditional way of life, encompassing gathering, hunting, and fishing for food.

There is no public record of Mr. McCarthy's stance on subsistence rights. Understanding his perspective is essential to ensure that the BGCSB supports policies that protect these rights and do not disproportionately favor commercial hunting.

### 3. Limited Engagement with Indigenous Treaty Rights and Conservation

The BGCSB's decisions significantly impact wildlife resources and indigenous hunting rights. However, there is no clear evidence of Mr. McCarthy's involvement or stance on indigenous treaty rights and broader conservation efforts beyond commercial hunting.

### Need for Clarification and Transparency

Before confirming Mr. McCarthy's nomination, it is essential to seek clarity on the following:

How does he plan to balance commercial hunting interests with subsistence rights?

What are his views on conservation efforts beyond the scope of commercial hunting?

How will he ensure that the board's policies respect and uphold indigenous treaty rights?

Without clear answers to these questions, there is a risk that his appointment could favor commercial hunting interests over the rights and traditions of indigenous communities and broader conservation goals. It is imperative that the BGCSB includes members who represent all stakeholders fairly and uphold the diverse interests of Alaska's communities.

Given these additional concerns, it is imperative that the committee conducts a thorough evaluation of Mr. McCarthy's nomination. This includes assessing his potential conflicts of interest, commitment to ethical standards, and positions on subsistence rights, conservation policies, and indigenous treaty rights. Ensuring that nominees uphold the board's integrity and represent all stakeholders fairly is essential for the responsible management of Alaska's wildlife resources.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

Myself