

application process. I would suggest that is an easier course but I'll throw it back to you and we can talk here.

Greg Matson: We have a motion with support, still in discussion. Corinne.

Corinne Robella-Zhuckkahoese: My privileged question is, will that affect the process of, what do you call that before, you go through the primary?

Melinda Danforth: No, it will not affect the primary because the judges did not have to go through the primary.

Corinne Robella-Zhuckkahoese: Oh, ok.

Melinda Danforth: Thank you.

Greg Matson: There is a privileged question, Sharon House; can you get to the microphone, Sharon?

Sharon House: Good afternoon, has anyone asked for any other ideas how to deal with this? With all due respect, or was it just the council?

Melinda Danforth: It was just the council in discussion this morning.

Sharon House: It is my understanding that was a chief justice position that was in question? Is that correct?

Melinda Danforth: Yes.

Sharon House: And it was the trial judge's chief judge? Is that correct?

Melinda Danforth: It would be the chief judges all together.

Sharon House: Was anyone else denied?

Melinda Danforth: I'm not sure about that.

Greg Matson: That's where we're not sure if there would have been other applicants or not.

Sharon House: Would you ask who the election board if it was denied, they are sitting there right? Was somebody else denied, with all due respect? The suggestion is no matter what she says, just kidding, is to just do it for that position then instead of a whole new election for everyone. To open up the applications for that position because how much does it cost for an election?

Greg Matson: That is what we're talking about, where Vince's recommendation was to open that up.

Sharon House: I would recommend, with all due respect, dealing with just the chief judges position because we have 4 weeks approximately. Please answer.

Lisa Liggins: There were 5 denials for eligibility, total. 1 for chief judicial judge and the rest were non chief judges. Does that answer the question? Ok, thank you.

Greg Matson: Thank you. We have a motion with support and a call for the question.

Tina Danforth: Mr. Chairman, can you clarify the motion because it was hard to read it as she was saying and I didn't know that was going to be the motion so I would have wrote more notes. I'm not really sure what I'm voting on right now.

Melinda Danforth: Basically, in January 7, 2013 when the GTC passed the judiciary they also passed the qualifications for judges and at that time the qualifications for chief judges, and we're going to call them non chief judges, so chief judges are chief judges appellate court, chief judge of trial court and also the non chief judges would be the trial court judges, they are not chief judges. Basically the GTC approved 2 sets of qualifications. They said that for chief judges you have to meet all of these qualifications, you have to either have a Juris doctorate degree, a master's degree and you have to have bachelor's degree, it didn't matter, in any kind of field. And also 3 years of experience. For the non-chief judges it was Juris doctorate degree, a master's degree and a bachelor's degree, and the GTC laid out a whole entire field of degrees that would have to, a bachelor's degree in one of the following fields and it lists out criminal justice, education, political science, human rights, journalism, legal studies, etc. But at the time GTC was in discussion of January 2013 they also added provisions as you seen in the presentation off the floor. They added in a degree in family law which you can't go get a family law degree in any accredited institution, they added a number of other degrees. So basically, there were 2 sets of qualifications when you passed the law in January 2013. What had transpired when our team, our judiciary team was looking at the qualifications it was thought the GTC was intending that those bachelor's degree fields would apply also for the chief judges. In March of this past year, the BC took emergency action, which they have the right to do under the legislative procedures act, we have a right to change laws based on an emergency basis and the qualifications of judges were changed to include those specific bachelor degree for chief judges positions. When that occurred, the candidates went to go apply and after that, in April the candidates went and applied to be a judge, this is the position I'm running for. And unfortunately, the information that was in the candidates packet that the election board had sent out had incorrect information on the qualifications for judges. At that time as well, we were going through the process these last couple of weeks as well because we did receive a challenge. The election board did receive a challenge from an applicant that thought they were qualified based upon GTC's motion in January 2013. Therefore, the BC, the LRO, my staff, parts of the judiciary team that were responsible for legislation went back and looked through all the documents. They went through the GTC meeting minutes, line by line. They went through the LOC meetings to look at the intent. They went through all the record to say what is exactly it is the intent of the GTC. At that time, the GTC intent was that there were 2 sets of qualifications that were distinctly different for chief judges and non-chief judges. The March 26, 2014 action by the BC was nullified this morning by the BC. However, because it would potentially negatively impact affect the applicants and the candidates that had applied and those who may have applied, it is the recommendation that we motion to withdraw from this election all of the judges positions and that they be rescheduled to a new special election. That would be fair to all the applicants, it would be fair to the GTC and it unfortunately it is a mistake and an oversight, we'll take responsibility for that.

Greg Matson: Thank you, Melinda.

Loretta Metoxen: Mr. Chairman, I move that recommendation.

Greg Matson: We're going to have some discussion on that as well. Loretta, your motion is to support the special election?

Loretta Metoxen: Pardon?

Greg Matson: Your motion is to recognize what Melinda is proposing and that is to hold a special election?

Loretta Metoxen: Yaw-ko and there is a second right behind me here.

Greg Matson: We have a motion by Loretta, supported by Don McLester. Discussion, Vince.

Vince DeLaRosa: Loretta and all due respect Mr. McLester and Melinda, we talked about this earlier Melinda. We really could just reopen the application process. We could simply just do that. That is all we'd have to do is just because we have a course that is already set. All we have to do is just reopen the

EXHIBIT E

Page 1 of 1