

This resolution regarding the waterfront should be voted Down. A no vote.

I do support a waterfront development, not this version. The very reason to avoid political interference by the 2005 council's vote establishing the DHA's authority over the waterfront charette development has evolved before our eyes. It has been politicized and manipulated to benefit a developer who loves secret non-public meetings and a few others whose motivations are yet to be determined. The obvious reasons to vote NO on this Resolution are:

*To NO
AM Concern*
There are no deed restrictions in the term sheet supposedly protecting Dover citizens from the switching to apartments or flipping the land.

Are you aware there has not been an engineering survey to establish meets and bounds for an accurate description of the land under agreement? How could an accurate appraisal be completed and submitted or an accurate price established without a survey? They admittedly cannot determine an accurate acreage

Are you aware there is now talk of taking of land by eminent domain? This previously was never mentioned in the 2 appraisals and has never been publicly mentioned by City Hall. The Dover Housing Authority has the power to take your land by eminent domain, you could be next!

Are you aware the developer has taken liberties in insisting on private non public meetings with some city councilors and who knows who else within our city government over the past two years? In my opinion that is influence peddling no matter how it's packaged! This method of doing business should give way to serious consideration when the Council

votes tonight. If they were a jury in a court trial it would be considered witness tampering and those who participated would be prosecuted.

His insistence on meeting with city officials in non-public sessions is unethical. He assumes that non-public meetings to gain favor are OK because that is how he has always done business (as stated in Foster's interview relating to his meeting with councilors). I'm sure the Dover citizens do not want their representatives to meet in non-public sessions where their public assets are at risk.

Let's bond a waterfront the correct way. We have the momentum and the will to proceed under an authority that reports to the council, our representatives. ~~V~~ote no on this resolution to give our only waterfront property away where there exists so many unknowns and too much risk for Dover's citizens.

Yesterdays Fosters Editorial says a small group of malcontents have dedicated their time and efforts to put the waterfront development in an unfavorable light. Their arsenal is made up of half-truths, misrepresentations and mis information. They twist the truth to such a degree as to cause pain to the language of responsible discourse. They go on to say the terms under which Dickinson's proposal will bear fruit have been articulated over and over again. Their strategy is to tell an untruth over and over again and if one untruth wears thin to invent another.

I have never to my knowledge spoke or written anything in reference to the politics of Dover that was not factual though I and many others have been attacked for stating what really hurts, the truth.

This whole editorial is poppycock and is truly loaded with the same deceitful accusations Fosters promotes whenever anything that they would gain from is opposed by the citizens of Dover who dare speak out! They have the loudest voice in Dover and like a bully they abuse their advantageous position of power.