

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE ETHICS
APRIL 4, 2024
1:30 PM**

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

[1:31:26 PM](#)

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Deb Fancher called the meeting of the House Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Legislative Ethics to order at 1:31 PM. She directed Tamara Maddox to conduct roll call.

Roll Call

Representative Sara Hannan
Representative Mike Prax
Member Joyce Anderson
Member Jerry McBeath
Member Conner Thomas
Member Skip Cook

There was a quorum.

Others

Tamara Maddox
Jacqui Yeagle

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair Fancher entertained a motion to approve the agenda. Representative Sara Hannan so moved. There were no objections and the agenda was approved.

[1:32:46 PM](#)

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Fancher entertained public comment.

Patrick Martin of Wasilla, representing Alaska Right to Life, responded to the committee's dismissal order in Complaints H 22-01 Former Representative Christopher Kurka and H 22-02 Former Representative David Eastman, which were

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

dismissed due to lack of probable cause. He reported the complainant, Representative McCabe, was not in the Capitol on the dates mentioned in the complaints so the representative had no firsthand knowledge of what transpired that day. He spoke to the excessive length of time - 18 months - it took to resolve the complaints when the committee could have viewed the security camera footage from the days he was in the Capitol. He argued the representatives suffered thousands of dollars in legal fees with no way to recoup the money. He maintained the outcome of the complaints seem to be a complete corruption of the Ethics Act, and would like the Ethics Committee to change its policies, procedures, and how it conducts business.

Chair Fancher responded the committee did not have access to the security camera video, and she acknowledged 18 months is a long time to resolve a complaint, explained it was due to unusual circumstances, and apologized.

Stephanie Taylor, of Anchorage, expressed frustration and concern about the reappointment of Joyce Anderson and Skip Cook to the Ethics Committee. She believes they should remove themselves and allow other members of the public to take their places. She opined that multiple consecutive terms undermine the purpose and objectivity of a publicly appointed membership. The committee is tasked with adjudicating reported ethics violations, which often come about through inappropriate political favors, relationships, and corruption. Ms. Anderson and Mr. Cook's sustained presence on the committee creates the perception that they serve as a special class of officials who maintain significant influence on the body as a whole and enjoy special political privileges and relationships with government officials by their tenured status - clearly demonstrated by the fact that Ms. Anderson took a leave of absence from her public membership to take the paid staff position for the committee only to return to her seat as a public member. She asked why this public seat was reserved for Ms. Anderson and not filled by a new member from the public.

Ms. Taylor reported that recent unethical actions taken by Ms. Anderson and Mr. Cook were also concerning. Public committee members are asked to abstain from engaging in partisan activity, yet they both admitted to signing the recall petition against the duly elected Republican

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Governor. Their participation in this effort can reasonably be understood as being partisan.

Ms. Taylor thinks the public membership role should have term limits. This would enhance confidence that no single public member holds greater influence over others or enjoys special privileges and sway over ethics investigations merely due to their long-term presence on the committee. She fails to see how senior members of this committee who push the envelope regarding their own personal ethics can objectively adjudicate the ethics violations brought before the committee. The attitude that suggests that their presence on this committee is vital, is an insult. Not just to the public, but to the members who serve alongside them as well. They have served Alaska well, but it is past time for them to take their leave. Ms. Anderson and Mr. Cook's continued presence on the Select Committee on Legislative Ethics will damage its credibility and integrity. Thank you.

Jerry McBeath responded to Ms. Taylor that her allegations that the actions of the committee were corrupt do not seem to be focused on anything in particular. For instance, the recall petition that the two members signed was not in response to small private interest but to a groundswell of support for the recall across the state about events happening prior to Covid-19.

Mr. McBeath went on to say that Joyce Anderson's temporary and brief leave of absence was due to unusual circumstances. The arrangement was approved through proper channels. It was not done in secret. Opportunities for the public to comment were available. Nothing illegal or inappropriate transpired. He added he appreciated Ms. Taylor's taking a position on the topic in public and suggested her opinions may be based on a different reading of the facts than what he actually observed.

Chair Fancher replied to Ms. Taylor's comments by saying the committee welcomes new members when people volunteer to be on the committee. She mentioned she thinks the scrutiny to which the committee members are subjected is a deterrent.

Aldena Woody spoke in support of Representative David Eastman. She believes it is wrong to weaponize the Ethics

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Committee and use the [committee member] position to attempt to silence those with whom we disagree.

Skip Cook replied he agrees with Ms. Woody. He explained the committee does not [usually] bring forth the complaints. A complaint comes to the committee, they vet the complaint, and trying to be a completely unbiased entity, resolve the complaint.

Laura Temple called in support of Representative David Eastman. She thinks that 18 months [to resolve a complaint] is ridiculous, and in spite of unusual circumstances, it should have been dealt with more quickly. She also would like to see new people on the committee; however, she understands it is difficult to get people involved. She thinks it would help if the public had more information about the committee. She likes the idea of term limits.

Skip Cook thanked Ms. Temple. He explained there is a plan in place to go to community councils and talk about the work of the committee. But, he said candidly, it's pretty tough to have people sign on when you get abused and can't respond.

Jerry McBeath addressed Ms. Temple, saying to the best of his knowledge no one from the Wasilla area has volunteered to be a public member of the committee when there were vacancies. He added appointments to the committee are made by the Supreme Court [Justice], who accepts nominations or self-nominations from throughout Alaska.

Steve Miley, from Nelchina, thanked the previous callers for their astute observations. He is not a lawyer but he knows socialist hacks are tying up the courts with lawfare. They long-in-advance craft laws through politics that militate against public servants that are patriots or conservatives. This is not a socialist country. People are entitled to a speedy trial. Skip Cook and Joyce Anderson shouldn't be there. He thinks conservatives and patriots need to find good lawyers and start using RICO laws and other such laws to prosecute, tie up the time, of the courts, and the finances of liberal representatives.

Gregory Van Thiel, from Wasilla, said he believes the Legislative Ethics Committee is a lopsided committee that has members who currently are, or have been in the past Democrats, which makes them very liberal. He knows there

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

are different degrees of Democrat, just like there are different degrees of Republican, which in his opinion is itself unethical. Two committee members should recuse themselves and they should be replaced with two conservative members who are as emphatically interested in voicing their conservative opinions as the two remaining are emphatically liberal. Also, it's one thing to censor a legislator for conduct legitimately violating ethical standards, but it should stop there. He thinks the committee has no right or power to determine how an individual can defend themselves or finance their defense. He thinks if changes aren't made in the Legislative Ethics Committee, it will continue to be, in his estimation, a sham, which is actually kind of an oxymoron [because] it's not ethical in itself.

Jerry McBeath asked Mr. Van Thiel if he had knowledge of the complaint process. The committee doesn't [generally] make complaints. Essentially anyone can make a complaint about a legislator claiming that her or his actions violated the Ethics Act. The committee receives the complaints, and ascertains whether there is sufficient information to proceed or not. The committee doesn't instantly respond to complaints. There's a process. It sometimes takes quite a long time to establish whether there are sufficient facts for the committee to move forward or not. He thinks many of the comments reflect perhaps a lack of understanding of the committee's charge.

Joyce Anderson explained the committee may initiate complaints, but the majority of complaints are initiated by individuals.

Jacob Magoon, from Wasilla, spoke to what he said is a frivolous attack on Representative David Eastman and raising money outside of campaign season. Representative Eastman was raising money for a legal defense for defending against a disenfranchisement attempt against the residents of [House] District 27.

Andy Cizek, from Soldotna, commented on decisions in two earlier complaints, against Democratic party legislators, in which the committee decided in their favor. But now, when it comes to conservatives, the committee is "nailing them to the cross." The committee is not allowing the legislators to raise funds from conservatives to pay their bills. He wants to know why conservatives are being

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

persecuted more than Democrats. He reported he has sent numerous letters to officials about SB 140 and Senator Hoffman getting millions of dollars through the Bethel Native Corporation, of which he is the president and his family fill most of the other positions. Is there not an ethics problem here? We need to deal with things that are actual ethics concerns and not "little, tiny things." Representative David Eastman has been picked on way more than anyone else. Maybe the committee needs to initiate a complaint against the person that is bringing up all these so called ethics charges. He would appreciate it if the committee would quit spending tax dollars on frivolous stuff.

Skip Cook responded the committee doesn't consider whether a subject is a Republican or a Democrat. He explained the outcome of the charge against Senator Olson resulted in a change of policy. He added that Mr. Cizek is welcome and encouraged to file a complaint as a citizen.

James Squyres, of Deltana, said there is a dark cloud over the House Ethics [Sub]committee, that is giving the members the appearance of impropriety. He has watched meetings, and a lot of the time, the committee is in executive session. It looks like the committee is some kind of secret tribunal, holding secret deliberations in executive sessions - even when the subject has signed a release of confidentiality. If there is some little bug in statute that doesn't allow you to go public about a situation when they have signed a release, legislators could pass a bill to try and sort that out. The accused needs to be able to face his accuser in public.

Mr. Squyres reflected back on the caller who talked about long baseless investigations. He is familiar with that situation because his wife was staff to Representative Eastman. There isn't the confidentiality the committee thinks exists; the word leaks out anyway. He thinks the committee should be ashamed of themselves for allowing something like that baseless allegation to go on for so long. What the committee is doing, whether on purpose or not, is promoting a lawfare where the legislator cannot recover their legal costs. His hat is off to the attorney that called in and said he's representing Representative Eastman because it might be a long time before he gets paid. He thinks the committee needs to take some steps to

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

clean up their act and provide some relief to this situation.

Former Representative Christopher Kurka commented that a majority of Alaskans did not sign the recall Dunleavy petition. The numbers don't add up. He expressed his opinion that the Ethics committee is pursuing a schizophrenic position in that the committee is equating raising funds for legal expenses during session with raising campaign funds during session. But they're not and yet Representative Eastman is restricted by the ethics rules from receiving anything more than \$250 in the course of a year from any individual as a contribution toward legal expenses. He added that while he understands the majority of complaints are not initiated by the committee, the committee decides when to pursue an investigation. It is a crime to file a frivolous ethics complaint, and it behooves the committee to ascertain if the complaint is frivolous and whether it should proceed. It seems the committee is pursuing investigations far beyond the rational point of deciding that it's frivolous.

Chair Fancher reported she had been made aware the committee members were not to respond to comments made by the public during public comment, instructed members to follow that guidance, and apologized for the committee having done so.

Chair Fancher closed public comment.

[2:06:36 PM](#)

4. COMMENT BY SUBJECT OF COMPLAINTS

Chair Fancher announced the committee was considering Complaint H 23-02. Representative David Eastman is the subject and he has waived confidentiality. The complaint alleges that Representative Eastman violated AS 24.60.031 because he allegedly used his campaign website to raise funds purportedly for legal fees. Under Section 24.60.170(d) of the Ethics Act, if it is determined that some or all of the allegations of a complaint if proven would violate the act, the committee shall investigate the complaint on a confidential basis. Again, confidentiality has been waived. Also, under Section 24.60.170(d), the committee shall afford Representative Eastman the

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

opportunity to explain the conduct alleged. He has the right to representation.

Chair Fancher invited Representative David Eastman and his attorney, Tom Hoffer, to comment.

[2:07:54 PM](#)

Mr. Hoffer asked whether Complaint H 23-02 is the same complaint as the committee heard in February.

Chair Fancher replied it was the same complaint.

Representative Sara Hannan asserted she believed Mr. Hoffer was asking why the committee was meeting again on this complaint. She recollected the reason for the meeting is the committee did not have all the information at the previous meeting and that Representative David Eastman had not responded to the investigation.

Mr. Hoffer asked why Representative David Eastman had not been provided with the new information before he was asked to address it.

Chair Fancher replied it was because Representative David Eastman had responded to the questions presented.

Mr. Hoffer asked if that was the only new information.

Chair Fancher replied yes.

Mr. Hoffer asked if it was limited to the complaint and the interview with the representative.

Chair Fancher replied it was.

Mr. Hoffer noted that while the committee may not have been supposed to respond to public comments, he thought it was actually helpful. An example is the committee expressing appreciation for people speaking publicly. He asked if the complainant would be testifying today in public.

Chair Fancher replied not to her knowledge. Mr. Hoffer reported that Representative David Eastman had asked that the complainant testify in public and noted he understood the committee feels they may not have the ability to do so.

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Given that, Mr. Hoffer asked if the committee would make public, and part of this meeting's record, the portion of the executive session in which he and Representative David Eastman had participated in February.

Chair Fancher replied she did not believe the committee may make executive session public. The complainant had not waived confidentiality. She asked Tamara Maddox to respond.

Tamara Maddox said committee deliberations on complaints are confidential.

Representative Sara Hannan added that by statute [the identity of] the complainant must remain confidential.

Mr. Hoffer said Representative David Eastman believes deliberations may be confidential but not the testimony from the complainant. The testimony should be public.

Mr. Hoffer went on to say that AS 24.60.170(b) allows for the committee to ask the complainant to testify at any stage of the proceeding. That has been requested and it has not been done publicly. It is a constitutional right. Representative David Eastman has waived confidentiality. AS 24.60.170(1) says that proceedings relating to complaints are confidential. However, later in that same paragraph it says the confidentiality provisions of this subsection may be waived by subject of the complaint. That language is important because it comes after the discussion of what is and what is not confidential. It also says the confidentiality provisions of this subsection may be waived by the subject of the complaint. That is what has happened here, yet the proceedings are not being conducted outside of closed sessions. Some are public, some are not. Representative Eastman believes that is a deprivation of his rights under Alaska law.

Chair Fancher noted his concern and encouraged a change in the statute.

Mr. Hoffer said the idea of doing things in "the sunlight" in government is not a novel concept. It goes back to at least 1788. The liberties of a people never were nor ever will be secure when the transactions of the rulers may be concealed from them. [Supreme Court Justice Louis] Brandeis said sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants... Even JFK commented on the word secrecy, calling it

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

repugnant to a free and open society. Here the protections that are afforded for confidentiality are designed for Representative Eastman and there's really not much to change. It's the manner in which they're being applied. That's where the disagreement comes from.

Chair Fancher replied that would probably not change today.

Mr. Hoffer said he recognized it would not change today but it is important to have it on the record. AS 24.60.170 proscribes a step-by-step procedure for addressing complaints. He maintained the committee deviated from that procedure by investigating additional allegations that were not part of the original complaint. The [original] complaint is limited in time and scope. When a complaint is submitted, a staff recommendation can be made based on information evidence contained in the complaint as supplemented by the complainant, and by the subject of the complaint if requested by a staff member. Essentially, staff can invite information from either the complainant or Representative Eastman in this case, as to the complaint.

2:16:30 PM

Mr. Hoffer said AS 24.60.170(d) outlines the next step. If the committee determines that some or all the allegations of the complaint, if proven, would constitute a violation of this chapter, or the committee has initiated a complaint, and in this case, the complaint was not initiated by this committee, the committee shall investigate the complaint before beginning investigation of a complaint and adopt a resolution defining the scope of the investigation. The adopted resolution needs to be tied to the complaint. The scope [of investigation in these proceedings] added in a related statute, which was never part of the complaint, without filing its own complaint. The only complaint before the committee to be addressed today is a violation of AS 24.60.031, and yet the notice provided is broader than that. That is the crux of the issue here.

Tamara Maddox noted Mr. Hoffer was referring to the complaint alleging Representative David Eastman was raising funds purportedly for legal funds. The original complaint alleged violation of statute between January and May of 2023. The committee added additional information to that

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

complaint. Attorney Hoffer is aware that under Section 24.60.170(c), the committee may ask the complainant to provide clarification or additional information before it makes a decision under the subsection and may request information concerning the matter from the subject of the complaint as well. Neither the complainant nor the subject is required to provide that additional information. However, in this case, the committee already had the additional information because Representative Eastman filed the disclosures. Those disclosures illustrate the exact same nature and behavior that are described in the complaint from the complainant that he's raising funds or receiving cash donations for a legal fund or a legal defense. That was a conversation Representative Eastman had with the former administrator as well, that those disclosures were disclosing funds above the \$250 or more limit, which clearly showed that they were not in-kind contributions covered under the statute. The section provides and allows the committee to add that activity to the complaint. That information was provided to Representative Eastman and his attorney, Mr. Hoffer.

Mr. Hoffer said he agrees with what the statute says. What it does not say is that the committee can add new allegations. That requires a complaint, and like anyone else in Alaska, the committee can initiate a complaint. But the complaint that should be before the committee is the complaint filed, which does not contain any of the things to which Ms. Maddox referenced. That was additional information that was not requested. It was gathered by the committee, or its investigators, or its staff, and piggybacked into an existing complaint. That is a violation of procedural protections afforded by AS 24.60.170. That is the disagreement. Everything should tie back to the complaint. That is the law in Alaska the committee is bound to follow. The violation of AS 24.60.080(c) is not in the complaint. It is in a related statute and the scope of investigation, which is not a complaint.

Mr. Hoffer offered that he thought the committee was trying to do the right thing, which is not always easy or convenient. The committee adding allegations to a complaint has a chilling effect. Unfortunately, it can lead to political witch hunts. There needs to be some gatekeeping, and that gatekeeping exists in AS 24.60.170. Representative Eastman has to deal with this now as opposed to doing the work that he was elected by large margins to do because one

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

person filed a complaint. As a threshold issue, was Representative Eastman even a candidate during this time? No. You cannot have this sort of violation if you are not a candidate. That should have led to an outright dismissal based on the complaint as it was filed. But it was expanded through what they contend is an improper expansion. Ultimately, the general public loses confidence in the process.

Mr. Hoffer added the unfortunate part is that it leads people to wonder if this is politically motivated. The committee members [say they] don't know the affiliation of the people that are investigating. It may not be published on a form, but I think people know who people are generally in Alaska. Especially if they are involved in the way that someone volunteering in this process would be generally aware. Without the adherence to the statutes, without strict adherence to procedures, with it being conducted somewhat semi-private, some public, some private, despite the waiver of confidentiality, which protects Representative Eastman, the fact is that he was not a candidate at this time, so how could there be a violation of AS 24.60.031? And the fact that's gone on for months and months and months. Is this another situation that's going to be resolved or be adjudicated on the eve of an election, which happened before with Representative Eastman? That's a concern. I think people should be concerned. The committee should wonder about why it is taking so long. Why didn't the investigator follow up with Representative Eastman promptly after he asked her to? Why did she drop off and not respond to his correspondence until it was rescheduled after the last meeting? These questions need to be answered and for Representative Eastman to properly respond, the information needs to be provided. And there's more. For example, the scope of investigation that authorized the investigator to presumably use public funds or seek reimbursement to make a contribution to Representative Eastman. Trying to entrap him? Those are questions that are troubling, and we would ask the committee to answer those questions before Representative Eastman has to respond to allegations of which he is not fully advised.

[2:30:30 PM](#)

Chair Fancher asked the Mr. Hoffer if he was still on the phone.

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Mr. Hoffer responded he was waiting for the committee to respond to his questions.

Chair Fancher asked Mr. Hoffer if he was finished. The committee wanted to hear from Representative David Eastman.

Mr. Hoffer replied he was finished and repeated that before Representative David Eastman speaks, the representative wants to know of what he is accused.

Chair Fancher asked what it was that Mr. Hoffer and Representative David Eastman wanted the committee to do.

Mr. Hoffer replied they wanted the committee to adhere to Alaska statutes. Practically, to let the representative see the evidence so he knows what he is facing.

Chair Fancher asked Mr. Hoffer if Representative Eastman did not know what H 23-02 says.

Mr. Hoffer replied that Representative Eastman knows what the complaint says but that is not what he was advised the meeting would address.

Chair Fancher said as far as she was concerned, the complaint was what the committee was addressing in the meeting.

Mr. Hoffer stated what he heard in Chair Fancher's response is that the committee was not going to provide the requested information.

Chair Fancher said the only thing the committee had other than the complaint are interview notes.

Mr. Hoffer expressed that the committee should limit the complaint to AS 24.60.031. But, he said, Ms. Maddox indicated the complaint includes additional allegations, which were not part of the complaint. That's the information desired.

Tamara Maddox responded that after the complaint was filed, Representative Eastman and his attorney received the scope of investigation issued on June 12, 2023. The scope of investigation includes allegations under Section 24.60.031 Restrictions on Fundraising. The scope of investigation also includes AS 24.60.080 Gifts. The additional

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

information comes directly from Representative Eastman because he filed three disclosures, copies of which he has been provided. There is no additional information to the information he was provided in June of 2023.

Mr. Hoffer supposed the committee was in agreement with him that that the complaint does not include anything about AS 24.60.080. It first came to light in the scope of investigation, which by statute is to define an investigation. And the allegation of a violation of AS 24.60.080 does not exist in the complaint that was filed.

Joyce Anderson commented that the complaint says Representative Eastman began to use his campaign website to raise funds for his purported, and that's in parentheses, legal fees. Alaska statute 24.60.080[(c)(8)], deals with legal fees. There are many times when someone files a complaint that the individual is not familiar with the statutes and does not know all the statutes that need to be referenced. When the Ethics Committee prepared the scope of investigation, they included AS 24.60.080 because it deals with legal fees. Again, complainants are not familiar with all the applicable statutes, and it is bound upon the Ethics Committee to identify other parts of statute that may apply.

Tamara Maddox added the dates alleged in the complaint are from January 17, 2023, through the time that the complaint was filed, which was in May. The disclosures were filed specifically within that timeframe. The activity not only matches the complaint itself, the disclosures also fall well within the dates of the complaint. It is a reasonable addition.

Mr. Hoffer replied he appreciated that clarification. The words of the complaint itself are, "There is clear evidence that this is campaign fundraising," and that is what the complaint is about. The committee could have filed its own complaint but they chose not otherwise. Instead, they added allegations on its own accord, which may be something the committee does as a practice, but perhaps it is part of the problem. It becomes weaponized when [a person] can make allegations, then the committee adds on its own what it thinks better fits.

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Chair Fancher thanked Mr. Hoffer for calling. She thanked Representative David Eastman for his patience and asked him if he had anything to say.

Representative Eastman indicated issues with the timeframe - January 17 through May 5, 2023. He asserted that none of the donations he received [to his legal defense fund] were made during the timeframe contained in the complaint. He questioned why the additional allegations were included in the original complaint rather than start a new complaint. The additional allegations cited an entirely different statute and the allegations are unclear, which means he and his attorney must infer what specifically is the allegation. He reported he, his family, and his staff, including former staff, have had to deal with multiple complaints in the last year, requiring multiple interviews.

[2:39:30 PM](#)

Representative Eastman reported that based on his personal experience with the investigator's inaccurate reporting and timeliness issues, he filed a formal complaint about the investigator. He was informed that there was only one investigator.

Representative David Eastman contacted the committee as soon as he received the complaint and said there seemed to be misunderstanding. He was accused of raising money for a political campaign. That seemed to be easily answered as he was not a candidate and he had no political campaign. It surprised him that the complaint continued regardless. Other questions that the committee had, which existed before the complaint was even filed, were piggybacked and smuggled into this complaint. If the committee had questions they wanted answered, there are ways to go about it. He reported he had interacted with and talked at quite some length with Jerry Anderson about all manner of topics both before and after he served on the committee.

Representative David Eastman continued that it is not appropriate [for the committee] to wait until someone files a complaint so the committee can then file its complaint under the name of someone else from the public when the person in the public has no idea that the committee had any concerns or questions, was not privy to the discussions or the legal arguments involved. It's taking advantage of whoever files a complaint when the committee does that sort

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

of thing, and it takes advantage of him as well. He encourages the committee in this investigation and all future investigations to look carefully at a complaint and to try to address the concern and not substitute separate unrelated concerns that took place in an entirely different time period and that involved an entirely different section of law with very different allegations.

Representative David Eastman added the public were told repeatedly the committee doesn't file complaints. But that is literally what is happening today. The committee is filing its own complaint, but they're doing it under the name of someone else. The committee added its own allegations the last time he was before the committee - when he himself was on the committee. When a complaint is filed, there is a process that results in some kind of decision. Either it moves forward and there is a hearing, or it does not and it is dismissed. Yet since 2017, he has had at least one allegation, generated by the committee, which has never been resolved. Never been to a hearing and never been dismissed. The committee does not seem terribly concerned about that. But as someone who potentially has to expend legal funds to address that, to pay an attorney to help fight is of great concern and he wishes that it was of greater concern to members of the committee. He acknowledged some members are new to the committee and probably would not be aware of that. He thanked the committee.

Representative Mike Prax said he had a couple of questions for Representative David Eastman.

Chair Fancher indicated consent.

Representative Mike Prax asked Representative David Eastman for more information about the complaint from 2017 about which he had mentioned.

Representative David Eastman replied in that case, the committee, later in the process, added allegations. Each of those allegations deserves and according to statute needs to be resolved.

Representative Mike Prax asked Representative Eastman if he had the complaint number.

Representative Eastman responded yes, in his office.

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Representative Mike Prax asked if there was a copy of the current complaint.

Tamara Maddox replied the complaint was in tab 13 of the committee binder.

Representative Mike Prax asked Representative Eastman if he had seen the complaint.

Representative Eastman replied he had and he had responded to it.

Representative Mike Prax noted there were several websites mentioned in it. He asked if davideastman.org was Representative David Eastman's campaign website.

Representative David Eastman replied he did not have campaign website at that time. He said the website mentioned is a personal one. He uses all of his websites when he is campaigning to get the word out about various things.

Representative Mike Prax clarified that the website is sometimes a campaign website and sometimes it is not.

Representative David Eastman replied yes, if he was a candidate, he would use it and his other websites for campaigning purposes.

Representative Mike Prax asked Representative Eastman about davidlegal.org, which is paid for by Freedom-Loving Alaskans for David Eastman-davideastman.org. He asked what was the distinction between the two websites.

Representative Eastman replied if a candidate has a site that will be used for communications relating to politics, the Alaska Public Office Commission requires paid by words, whether or not money is involved.

Representative Mike Prax asked who owned davidlegal.org.

Representative Eastman replied that he did.

Representative Mike Prax asked if Freedom-Loving Alaskans for David Eastman is Representative Eastman's campaign committee.

Representative Eastman replied yes, when he was a candidate.

[2:51:02 PM](#)

5. MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chair Fancher again entertained a motion to go into executive session *to discuss matters which by law must remain confidential under AS 24.60.160, Uniform Rule 22(b) regarding executive sessions, and Rules of Procedure Section 5: Executive Sessions and discussion of matters, the immediate knowledge of which would adversely affect the finances of a governmental unit, and discussion of subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of a person.*

Jerry McBeath so moved.

Representative David Eastman objected.

Chair Fancher said she did not think Representative David Eastman could object to the committee going into executive session.

Representative David Eastman said he wanted to renew the objection from the previous meeting. He asserted the rules of procedure state that members must be present for meetings such as the current meeting. He cited the Rules of Procedure in Section 6, on page 6, under complaints, the use of teleconference or telephonic equipment is only permitted for the initial review of the complaint, which this is not, and discussion of the scope of investigation, which this also is not, unless the subject of the complaint in written form waives the in-person participation requirement by committee members in advance of the meeting, which he certainly has not done in this case. He asked that the rules be followed. [He was referring to Conner Thomas's participation in the meeting via teleconference.]

With a motion by Jerry McBeath on the floor, Chair Fancher entertained objections to moving to executive session. Hearing none, the committee moved to executive session.

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION

[4:10 PM](#)

Minutes approved May 30, 2025

Chair Fancher called back to order the meeting of the House Subcommittee at 4:10 PM. She directed Tamara Maddox to conduct roll call.

Roll Call

Chair Deb Fancher
Representative Sara Hannan
Representative Mike Prax
Joyce Anderson
Jerry McBeath
Skip Cook

Conner Thomas was absent.

There was a quorum.

7. PUBLIC SESSION

Chair Fancher reiterated the subcommittee had gone into executive session to discuss Complaint H 23-02. By a majority of the House subcommittee members, the committee dismissed Complaint H 23-02. She said the information regarding the dismissal will be issued no later than Tuesday, April 9, 2024.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Fancher entertained a motion to adjourn.

Jerry McBeath so moved.

Hearing no discussion or objection, Chair Fancher adjourned the meeting at 4:11 PM.

[4:11:30 PM](#)

ADJOURN