

January 7, 2024

Dear Mayor Morphet and Assembly members Aultman-Moore, Dawson, Forster, Loomis, Schnabel, and Thomas,

1) I am writing to express my appreciation for your service. The voting public chose each of you with large margins over other candidates. The October 2023 vote that put 3 new assembly members and a new mayor, plus 7 new planning commissioners, into office was a vote for transparency.

The public wants to be informed and wants their elected officials to be informed—in real time—to ensure that the best possible decisions can be made for Haines. People are tired of business happening behind closed doors without their elected officials being informed.

It is refreshing and exciting to hear you asking important questions and engaging in discussion in order to clarify your understanding of particular issues and to brainstorm for ideas and options for solving problems. I am grateful for your persistence in requesting information especially from the manager in order to make appropriate decisions for Haines.

This is a big shift from previous assemblies which often appeared content to take direction from the manager and vote with little discussion.

2) I believe the assembly should fire manager Kreitzer for improper handling of the Porcupine Road FEMA grant and the Lutak Dock RAISE grant which could result in Haines citizens being left with huge debt.

A. The manager should have been familiar with FEMA's Code of Regulations and Policy in order to ensure that any work on the Porcupine Road would comply with FEMA regulations. However since the manager allowed road repairs beyond the approved scope of work, FEMA had to deny the Haines Borough Eligibility Determination because federal funding for those repairs would violate National Environmental Policy Act, the National Historic Act, and Executive Order 13175-Tribal Consultation.

The result of the manager's mishandling of the FEMA grant is that Haines Borough citizens are now "out" \$1,435,834.75. Based on the 11/27 and 12/21/23 documents from FEMA, it seems extremely unlikely that an appeal would succeed, and quite likely that an appeal would result in Haines citizens owing even more \$.

The manager stated that the borough lawyer suggested it was okay to go ahead with the un-approved repairs on the road. Is there proof of this and is it possible the borough lawyer can be held liable for the sum owed? Seems likely law firms are insured to protect municipalities from any faulty advice they provide.

B. The manager has failed to communicate with the assembly in a timely manner about Lutak Dock issues. Although she received a November 17 email from Jason Davis informing her of Turnagain's purchase of \$10+million of steel, she did not inform the assembly of that for over a month. The purchase occurred prior to Marad finishing their work and making a determination on whether or not Haines was eligible to receive the RAISE \$. Manager Kreitzer's failure to communicate may have put the Haines Borough and its citizens in a very precarious financial position, and the assembly in an awkward position concerning potential support for an alternate dock design.

The manager has failed to do her job responsibly. It appears that the borough attorney has also failed to do his job responsibly. The actions or failures to act by each may result in huge costs to Haines citizens. Both should be fired asap.

3) I am one of the majority who think Haines should be provided with a smaller dock design alternative. I also believe that WE are responsible for removing whatever toxic materials may be found in the innards of the crumbling dock rather than leaving them for future generations to clean up. Encapsulation will not keep toxins from leaking out into Lutak Inlet. It is an irresponsible if not criminal practice.

Thank you for your service during this very challenging time.

Sincerely,
Katey Palmer