Mr. Mayor and Borough Assembly Members,

Thank you for reading my letter. I apologize for missing the packet deadline and not being in attendance to speak this in person.

I am writing to follow up my questions presented in a letter in the last Assembly packet:

1 & 2. Have you scheduled a representative from the borough to explain to the public exactly what the Lutak Dock project does and does not entail, and address all the misinformation and myths that are spreading around town? Myths such as, that after 70 years our freight dock, which isn't changing size during the rehab/repair, has suddenly turned into a MEGA Dock. This myth is so ridiculous it is laughable, yet people use it seriously.

3. What are your plans to save the Ro-Ro the next time it fails? Heavy equipment with operators won't be on site the next time.

4. What is your plan if the dock suffers the predicted catastrophic failure during that time when "there is no rush" to complete the repair project? If this failure happens while you are manipulating and delaying the project, how are you planning to fund the cleanup?

5. At the March 12 meeting you voted to add a third alternative design to the EA draft that has a smaller footprint than both the current encapsulation design and the alternative rubble mound design, both of which were vetted by due process. Where did your plan come from? What does it look like? Where is the approved design? According to Natalie Dawson who proposed this design, the consultants can work with the manager and assembly to answer additional questions and clarify exactly what that alternative looks like, and it shouldn't delay the permitting process by more than a few weeks. Every delay is one step closer to losing this whole project. So tell me: **Is that the plan, to step by step lose this project?**

This action is exactly the opposite of the fairness and transparency that you all promised when campaigning for office. Was this new "design" approved, or even seen by the harbormaster, the 2 primary dock users, Harbor Committee, Planning Commission, or the public? Are you making it up as you go along? Or does it come from that flawed LCC presentation? Nearly all of the assembly bought into and voted for this proposal with little discussion at the meeting. This is NOT fairness or transparency. This behavior is not just irresponsible; it is reprehensible and unacceptable.

This behavior is also fiscally irresponsible as every change and delay costs the Borough more money. **I** would like to see a public accounting of how much money this assembly has already cost the Borough and an ongoing accounting as you manipulate the project.

6. Assembly members Dawson and Aultman-Moore, when are you planning to declare your blatant conflicts of interest with the Palmer Project and the Lutak Dock project and recuse yourselves from proposing actions, discussion and/or voting?

Thank you.

Cynthia Jones

Cynthia Jones (CJ), Haines, AK.

Mr. Mayor, Borough Assembly Members, Borough Manager, and Borough Clerk,

I would like to file two Official Complaints: Conflict of Interest Violations (HBC 2.06.030), one each for Assembly Members Natalie Dawson and Ben Aultman-Moore

Ms. Dawson stated that she works for a "philanthropic non-profit" organization. Alaska Venture Funds, (AVF), her employer, solicits funds to "protect this region from industrial development" and states: "A large mine threatens" the Chilkat River Watershed... etc. etc. and solicits donations to fight against this non-existent mine.

Mr. Aultman-Moore sits on the Board of Directors of Lynn Canal Conservation (LCC) which also solicits donations to fight the non-existent mine, and has very openly linked our freight dock with this non-existent mine. LCC is openly fighting to change the reconstruction plan for our failing dock based on the premise that it will be used to ship ore by this potential mine.

According to HBC 2.06.045 Procedure for declaring potential conflict of interest- Borough officials, both assembly members are required to declare their conflicts of interest. It is NOT incumbent on the public to have to ferret out this information. Neither Ms Dawson, nor Mr Aultman-Moore have done so and thereby have violated their oaths of office, which is essentially their word of honor. It makes me sad to see this blatant disregard for the law.

By introducing, discussing (influencing), and/or voting on issues related to the Palmer Project and the Lutak Dock which has been openly (though erroneously) linked to the potential mine from the Palmer Project, both assembly members have violated Haines Borough Code (HBC) 2.06.030, Standards and Prohibited acts.

HBC 2.06.055 states that any borough official who knowingly conceals a financial interest in violation of this chapter, or who willfully violates the requirements of this chapter is guilty of malfeasance and shall be subject to forfeiture or suspension from office or employment.

Enough other residents have gone into great detail to lay out the facts and proof that I do not feel it necessary to quote all the references from the AVF and LCC websites, nor copy the entire contents of HBC.

I would suggest that this Assembly respect our laws, follow through with Haines Borough Code 2.06.055, and remove Assembly Members Dawson and Aultman-Moore from office.

Thank you.

Cynthia Zonis Cynthia Jones (CJ)

Cynthia Jones (

Haines, AK.