

To the Clerk, Manager, and Assembly:

I recently submitted a Public Records Request for all conversations of the Assembly related to Lutak Dock between October 3, 2023 and January 12, 2024. It is my opinion that I have not received all that I requested. There have been several misrepresentations that I strongly believe need correction and for the community to hear the truth.

At the January 9, 2024, meeting Ms. Dawson denied that she had direct contact or communications with Marad or Senator Murkowski's office. I have recordings from the November 15, 2023, meeting at the 1:37 Minute marker and again at the 2:29 minute marker where she states that she has communicated with Marad. My public records request also contained correspondence directly from Ms. Dawson on November 16, 2023, to Marad representatives requesting information regarding the draft EA. I have attached this email for your consideration. I also found email communications directly from Kaleb Frohlich of Senator Murkowski's office on November 16, 2023, at 9:07 am acknowledging an email he had received from Ms. Dawson, however the actual communication from Ms. Dawson to Mr. Frohlich was not submitted.

It appears from my records request that Assembly Members Loomis, Thomas, and Forester have had no communication, even in response to emails from other members of the Assembly or Administration regarding Lutak Dock. Assembly Member Forester submitted multiple emails from others regarding Lutak Dock and yet appears to have not responded in any way to any of the emails. Same with Assembly Member Loomis. Did they never respond? To ANY of the emails? Not even an acknowledgement of receiving them?? This is questionable in my mind.

Mayor Morphet, in an email to Marad on December 29, 2023, insinuated we had a whole new assembly who were having issues with Lutak Dock and the current design. He falsely claimed most of the assembly now favored a completely different design. The Mayor only corrected this a month later on January 22, 2024, only in response to scrutiny from another public records request per his own admission. Because he was caught.

In another example, Assembly Member Schnabel submitted a December 23, 2023, email from Gershon Cohn addressed to both her and Mayor Morphet about Lutak Dock, and yet that same correspondence does not appear anywhere in the Mayor Morphet's submission to my request.

I had hoped that this records request would help to clarify some of the issues and concerns that I and others have about the honesty and integrity of our elected officials. In reviewing the documents I received, there are email threads referring to other emails or in response to emails which seem to be missing. Some of you ran and were elected advocating for increasing transparency in our government. Missing records to a legitimate request do not give the impression of transparency.

There is a saying *"If you are perceived to be something, you might as well be it, because that is truth in people's minds."* So far, things don't look too good.

Mr. Don Turner, Jr.

RECEIVED

FEB 26 2024

**HAINES BOROUGH
CLERK'S OFFICE**

From: [Natalie Dawson](#)
To: [Alekka Fullerton](#)
Subject: Fwd: Haines Borough Draft EA Lutak Dock Replacement Project
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:38:08 AM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

>> On Nov 16, 2023, at 11:20 AM, Natalie Dawson <ndawson@haines.ak.us> wrote:

>>

>> Hello Norman and Erin,

>> I am writing as a Haines borough assembly member. We had an assembly workshop for new assembly members such as myself on the Lutak Dock replacement project for which we received funding from your agency.

>>

>> One of the questions we received was about the BCA for the Lutak Dock replacement project. Since we have already moved forward with one design, and then changed our scope, if the borough decided to change the scope again, would we run into an issue because of our current BCA, or would the borough just complete a new BCA because we would be doing a change of scope in the project design? This was an issue raised by our contract engineer when a member of the assembly asked about changing the scope of the project.

>>

>> Second, we just found out last night from the borough manager that the Draft EA was sent to MARAD for review, though the borough assembly has not had time to review the draft EA. It has been my understanding for NEPA compliance that an Environmental Assessment cannot be complete until a section 106 review is completed. Is this correct?

>>

>> Because the draft EA has been sent to MARAD for review, but the Haines Borough is listed as a co-creator on the draft document, does this mean that the Haines borough government can still provide feedback on the draft EA, or at this point in the process, is all formal review of the draft EA now in the hands of MARAD?

>>

>> Thank you for answering these clarifying questions. And please feel free to forward this to relevant agency staff who may be able to answer the questions. I received your names from prior borough correspondence on the project. I have copied our borough manager and mayor in the hopes of saving them the intermediary task of forwarding my email.

>>

>> All the best,

>> Natalie Dawson

>> Haines Borough Assembly Member