

Jim Christen  
P.O. Box 300  
Tahuya, WA  
98588-0300  
(360)275-7100

Taxpayers and Voters  
Of the Port District  
Of Tahuya

Re: Citizens to Save Tahuya letter dated July 27, 2005.

Please note from the start that the above mentioned letter was unsigned. Everything that I and others have produced has been signed. We put our names on and stand behind what we say. After you read my rebuttal you can formulate your own opinion as to why their letter was done anonymously. Maybe they will check their facts and feel more comfortable about signing the next one. As an indicator of who might have sent it I can tell you that according to the Mason County Auditors Office only four people have requested Port of Tahuya voter information in the last year. They were Brad Carey, Jeff Carey, Cynthia Olsen and Dan Gentry. Cynthia Olsen on June 22, 2005 and Dan Gentry on July 19, 2005.

I am disappointed when Cynthia and her group say things like misinformation and lies but fail to tell what these things are. I guess that you are just supposed to think that everything bad that is said about Cynthia is a lie. It makes it hard to rebut a statement when it contains no facts, but I guess that was the whole idea. I and others have, in countless meetings, asked them to be specific and have as yet been unable to convince them to do so. The answer is always, you know what I mean or I am not going to get into that.

The letter questions why Cynthia is seen as such a threat. I can tell you that I have seen first hand why. She continually fails to perform her duties as prescribed by law. As an indicator of her inability to change, the port just received a letter from the Washington State Auditor, Brian Sonntag. In this letter he was informing the port that the 2004 Certified Financial Statement was over due. This statement was required by law to be on file with his office no later than the end of May of this year. The financial officer for the port had five months to complete this task and failed. This was a responsibility of Cynthia Olsen and her failure put the port out of compliance with the laws of the State of Washington.

With regards to her performing her duties with impartiality. I question how you claim to have acted impartially when you voted to find your self innocent of wrong doing and then voted to have the port taxpayers supply your defense not only now but also in the future for any suit connected to your time on the commission.

THESE PROPOSALS ARE CONCEPTUAL. Catchy phrase isn't it. There is just one problem; it does not exist in the adopted version. For the past two years Cynthia has come to meeting after meeting and read aloud to the audience page thirty five paragraph two of the February 2003 Draft of the Plan. The problem is that the August 2003 adopted version does not contain that key and crucial line. It was deleted prior to the Plans formal adoption and full incorporation into the ports Comprehensive Plan as an Official Plan of the Port of Tahuya. She could have said it was a pink elephant in the February Draft and as long as it was removed before its adoption it would mean absolutely nothing just like the other phrase that was removed prior to adoption. The two editions of the Plan are out there. You don't have to take my word for it, please take the time to look at them for yourself, seeing is believing.

With regards to the invalidation of the Public Access Plan, it is well documented in the approved minutes and the video of the November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2004 special meeting that I did not wish to defend a plan with your tax dollars that the Citizens Advisory Committee along with the ports ex-attorney and the attendees of two very well attended public hearings said should be removed from the ports Comprehensive Plan. Cynthia personally approved those minutes. It was not the lack of an attorney but what I believe was common sense that led to the removal of the Plan. As a note you should know that two thirds of the Board voted in February of this year to remove it any way.

The letter misses the mark on even the smallest details. In the letter it talks about the port reviewing the Plan every year but in the Plan it talks about every five to six years. It becomes clear that the person writing the letter is not well acquainted with the Plan and that they are working without benefit of first hand knowledge of the facts.

Another small point that they missed the mark on was my deposition for the PDA trial. In it I said that it was my opinion that Cynthia could have gone through the files in under four hours given the fact that she had been the secretary for so long. Cynthia had been the secretary for almost eight years at the time that the request was received. She personally placed many of the requested documents in the ports one and only four drawer file cabinet. Many in the court room were shocked when she said that she and her daughter spent twenty five hours searching four drawers.

The letter has an interesting item on the ports attorney quitting. It would have you believe that he quit because I refused to pay his bill. I questioned some of the entries in his bill and Cynthia could not identify them so she and I voted as a Board to return the bill for clarification. His bill showed him meeting with various county officials and no one could tell me who he was meeting with and who sent him there. I am a member of the Board and had every right and a responsibility to know, before I signed his voucher under the penalty of perjury, what work he was doing and that he had properly completed it. It should be noted that at the same meeting I approved the other port attorney's bill for over twice the amount of the contested one but the letter does not tell you that. The writer left out details that did not meet their obvious need to cast dispersions on my character.

The real question should be why was Cynthia so willing to sign a voucher when she could not verify the work contained within.

With regards to the alleged audits mentioned in item four, I would like to point out that I contacted Jan Jutte of the Washington State Auditors Office and she made it quite clear that not only were there no multiple audits performed but that there was not even one audit performed. She made it clear that she informed Cynthia of that fact and was unhappy that the letter contained a statement saying that there were audits. Jan Jutte has agreed to field calls from people who would like to hear this first hand from her. She can also explain the exaggeration comment and what was really said including the fact that all of these things were explained to Cynthia in numerous conversations. Her phone number at the Washington State Auditors Office is (360)725-5359. Please take a moment to thank her for agreeing to help clear up this matter.

In item five they talk about the ports insurance being canceled because of negative news stories. They said that it had nothing to do with what Cynthia had done. They failed to mention the fact that the letter from the insurance company also listed lawsuits as one of the two reasons for the cancellation. Both of the law suits were directly related to Cynthia's wrongful actions and alleged wrongful actions. That means that it did have something to do with what Cynthia had done. She was found to have violated the law in the one suit that has made it to trial. That was the June 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004 PDA trial. That violation of law cost you the taxpayers and she walked away with out paying a dime for her failure in the performance of her duty.

In the matter of stand alone parks. The ports attorney made it clear that port districts cannot go into the parks and recreation business as their reason for existence. We cannot simply start building parks every where. That is not in the purpose of a port. It is the reason that people form parks and recreation districts.

In item eight I thought that it was funny that they tried to make it sound like a bad thing when they said that I and the Residents support a survey. This survey is to give you, for the first time, an opportunity to say whether or not you want the port to continue to exist. If you do, it asks you to please give the Board your ideas about what you would like the port to work on. Specific projects that you the people would select and prioritize. My question is why Cynthia wouldn't support such a survey. It would, simply put, create a real record of the true wishes of the voters and taxpayers of this port district. Why would Cynthia object to the people being given this opportunity? Only two of the current Board members said they would do what the people wanted and Cynthia was not one of those Board members. WHY?

I applaud Cynthia for her volunteering her time in the community but am disappointed in her performance as a port commissioner. She has failed to conduct required hearings on more than one occasion. She has failed to properly handle records requests to the point that the port had to pay over 14 thousand dollars plus the ports attorney bills. She has refused to admit her mistakes and has walked out of four meetings when the citizens tried to get answers to questions that were about her actions as an elected official.

In the matter of Cynthia not being reelected to the office of County Commissioner for Mason County. I and a great many others remember the reason as being slightly different. It was my opinion as well as others that Cynthia never learned to do her job. I believe her inability to properly represent the citizens of this county was the reason she failed to be reelected.

I would like all of you to realize what this vote can do. Some times the person just does not fit the job. It's not their fault; it's just the way it is. I am asking you to help Cynthia to put all of this in the past and allow her to get on with life and allow the port and the community to move past this also. I am asking you to release her from this obligation.

Once again, I believe that it is in the best interest of the port district that we limit our liabilities by voting to remove Cynthia Olsen from office. I respect that there are other opinions out there and am always willing to talk openly with you on any issue.

Respectfully,

Jim Christen



Washington Governmental Entity Pool  
3709 W. Sunset Hwy, Suite 105 PO Box 19330 Spokane, WA 99219-9330 T. 800 462 8418 T. 509 838 0910 F. 509 747 3675

May 18, 2005

Board of Commissioners  
Port of Tahuya  
P.O. Box 90  
Tahuya, WA 98588-0090

Dear Board of Commissioners:

The Washington Governmental Entity Pool (WGEP) is a risk-sharing pool of local government entities in Washington State consisting of 380 special districts. WGEP purchases reinsurance at a discounted rate based on favorable claims and lawsuit history, and passes the savings through to the membership.

WGEP's contracted reinsurance company monitors the activity of pool members. Concern has been expressed regarding the extensive media coverage and lawsuits associated with the Port of Tahuya. The reinsurance company is concerned because they have extended \$9.5 million of financial credit to each every member of the pool.

To protect the members of the pool, the Intergovernmental Contract between WGEP and the Port of Tahuya allows the WGEP Board to cancel any member's participation in the pool. On April 15, 2005, the Board of Directors voted to not renew the Port of Tahuya's membership in the pool beginning next policy year, September 1, 2005.

This letter serves as your formal notification of non-renewal of coverage for the next policy year. If the Port of Tahuya can assure that positive changes have been made and documentation is available that will ensure confidence with the reinsurance company, the port can re-apply to join the pool.

The staff at WGEP will cooperate with your transition to a new insurance carrier and I am available to answer any questions your Board may have.

Very truly yours,

Mark A. Kammers  
Executive Director



Sunset Building  
PO Box 40021  
Olympia, Washington 98504-0021

**Washington State Auditor**  
**Brian Sonntag**

(360) 902-0370  
FAX (360) 753-0646  
TDD Relay 1-800-833-6388  
<http://www.sao.wa.gov>

July 18, 2005

Your annual financial report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2004 is overdue.

State law requires these reports be filed with our Office: "... the state auditor shall require from every local government financial reports covering the full period of each fiscal year ... prepared, certified and filed with the state auditor within one hundred fifty days after the close of each fiscal year."

All data for 2004 will be included on the Local Government Finance Reporting System, along with a list of entities that have not filed their annual financial reports.

I urge you to file your annual financial report referred to above as quickly as possible.

If you need assistance or have any questions, please call Duane Walz at (360) 725-5594.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian Sonntag".

**BRIAN SONNTAG, CGFM**  
STATE AUDITOR

BS:DW:lt

