

September 26, 2007

Honorable Judge John Sedwick  
United States District Court  
222 West 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

Re: Tom Anderson sentencing

Judge Sedwick:

I have known Tom Anderson for about 10 years. In all of the time I have known Tom I found him to be honest, hardworking, caring and kind. I never saw or heard Tom say or do anything that led me to believe he was unethical, engaged in criminal activities or fraudulent in any way.

I also found him to sometimes be immature in his business thinking, and in a rush to get things accomplished rather than formulate a sound strategy before proceeding. He was always very generous and too eager to please everyone. I believe that is what happened to him regarding Mr. Prewitt and Mr. Bobrick.

Tom should have known better. He was given a public trust (quite possibly the highest honor we can bestow) and for whatever reason he allowed himself to continue in a situation that eventually became illegal and unethical.

Tom was accused, tried and found guilty. My letter to you is not to plead for leniency because Tom is deep down a good person, he is a good person, however, he is also a convicted felon who must pay the penalty for his actions.

The public trust must remain inviolate or our social structure, and our faith in that trust, will eventually disappear. If allowed to proceed uninterrupted, it will eventually lead to an environment where the honest and ethical people stop believing that truth, order (laws), and fair play create a level playing field for everyone's benefit.

I believe you alone are in the best place to pass sentence on Tom. Throughout this trial I imagine you saw Tom presented in every possible angle; some flattering, some unflattering, many true and many false. You saw the warts and you saw the underlying essence of the man. Because of what you have seen and

heard, you are in the best position to impose an equitable sentence. One that balances the debt still owed to society with the price Tom has already paid.

I do not know if you have the authority or desire to deviate from federal sentencing guidelines. But if you do, I would like to recommend that you consider having Tom spend one-third of his sentence in jail and the other two-thirds working full time for a local non-profit, at minimum wage. This should be a group with which Tom is not historically aligned say, a local Recycling Advocacy, etc.

Tom is very creative, passionate and persuasive. This will be punishment for Tom and a benefit for society. Nothing much will be gained after a few months or years in jail other than his not being there for his family. He will have suffered the social stigma and humiliation of jail. That will be accomplished fairly quickly in the process, I imagine.

But society benefits if his considerable talents and energy are focused towards something that benefits us all. I believe something like this serves to act as a deterrent to others, it punishes Tom, it may possibly serve as a rehabilitation tool, and the public faith would be restored in the good works he achieves in his non-profit sentencing.

Thank you for considering my suggestion.

Very truly yours,



Devery Prince