Subj: **Studies find no increase in crime around Methadone Clinics**
Date: 8/26/2015 10:36:50 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: GDelgado@desmoineswa.gov
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, desmnsdave@aol.com

Gentlemen:

The below referenced information supports the feedback I got from surrounding area Chiefs. Also, I spoke with Renton Mayor Denis Law at the SCORE Admin meeting. Renton has two clinics that in his words, have had almost no impact on crime in his city.

George Delgado

Of most interest is the academic article.

Subj: **Re: Withdrawal of funds from Valley Cities**
Date: 9/9/2015 9:03:39 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: jgmayne@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

That is what he has said, per my story posted this morning. Here is the graf from the letter he wrote:

> Therefore, in my role as Chair of the King County Council Health, Housing and Human Services Committee, and member of the Budget Committee, I have decided to oppose any King County funding moving forward for this project until the site plan is amended to remove plans for the methadone clinic on this site. Another suitable site in South King County should be found. Today, I notified Valley Cities Counseling and the relevant King County agencies of my decision. This should give the community leverage to help get the site plan amended as they negotiate a good neighbor agreement with the provider as part of the City permitting process.
>

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

On Sep 9, 2015, at 8:48 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

> Jack,
>
> Based on what Councilmember Upthegrove has written here, it appears that he's talking about withholding funds for only the methadone dispensary. You should check with him to clarify.
>
> Dave Kaplan
> Mayor & Councilmember
> City of Des Moines, WA
>
>
>
> In a message dated 9/8/2015 8:26:05 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, jgmayne@gmail.com writes:
>
>
>
>

>
> John Castronover, a Des Moines resident opposing the establishment of Woodmont Recovery Campus on Pacific Highway South, informs the South King Media blogs (specifically the Waterland Blog) that he has a message from King County Councilmember Dave Upthegrove that the King County Council will withdraw its financial support of the Des Moines facility construction. Is this true?
>
> The issue, as most of you may know, has been controversial in Des Moines (see attached analysis I posted (Monday, Sept. 7). Castronover has been a vocal opponent of the facility and made demands it be stopped. After my analysis he then said the money would be removed. I am seeking any and all information on the matter. Right now I have only Castronover's claim, not sufficient for a news story, but one I will be following as best as possible.
>
> I will be available any time Wednesday at the below number of email address.
>
> Appreciate any information.
>
> Jack Mayne
> Senior Writer
>
> B-Town Blog,
> SeaTac Blog,
> Waterland Blog,
> Normandy Park Blog,
> White Center Blog
>
> jgmayne@gmail.com
> Home/Office 206.274.6069
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

Subj: **Re: FW: Woodmont Rehab**
Date: 9/9/2015 8:50:37 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Yes.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/9/2015 8:10:21 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> We received a question from April Chavarria regarding the next permit steps for the Woodmont Recovery Campus. This is Dan's draft response. Look OK?
>
> Tony Piasecki
>
> Des Moines City Manager
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.
>
> **From:** Dan Brewer
> **Sent:** Wednesday, September 09, 2015 8:09 AM
> **To:** Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Cc:** Denise Lathrop <DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Subject:** RE: Woodmont Rehab
>
> Tony:
>
> Here you go.....

.....Draft Response.....

April:

Thanks for your question regarding the permit process for the Valley Cities Proposed project. There are currently two applications being reviewed by City staff, which I've outlined below:

The first is a request for ***Design Review*** approval. ***Design Review*** is a process by which we review a proposed project for compliance with the zoning regulations in the Des Moines Municipal Code (DMMC) and other conditions that may be placed on a proposed project. In This case, there are some added requirements placed on the project by the Hearing Examiner when he approved the Condition Use Permit on April 15, 2015.

The Design Review application was originally submitted to the City on April 22, 2015. Staff provided some initial comments to the applicant on June 1, 2015, and received a re-submittal on August 3, 2015. We are nearing the final stages of that review and will be issuing a decision on that soon. In accordance with Condition 5 of the Hearing Examiner's April 15, 2015 Decision on the Conditional Use Permit, the City will be sending out a notice next week of the pending Design Review Decision, and providing an opportunity for public comment. Comments will be due back to the City by October 2, 2015. The City will review and consider any comments received in the context of Design Review process (how the project does or does not meet the requirements of the DMMC), and issue a final Design Review Decision on the project. That will happen no later than mid October.

The second is a ***Building Permit*** application for the construction of the Evaluation and Treatment Facility which was submitted to the City on August 18, 2015. This permit is currently being reviewed by staff, and will likely take several more weeks before staff has completed its review of the plans. At that point comments (if necessary) will be provided to the applicant to address any necessary plan revisions or alterations. The applicant will need to make the revisions and resubmit for additional review, before the building permit is ready for issuance. The Building Permit will not be approved until after the Design Review Decision has been issued. So the very earliest that the Building Permit could be issued is mid October, but that would require that there are no revisions necessary on the application currently being reviewed.

While City Administration is processing these applications, which we are obligated to do by law, the Mayor and other members of the City Council are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities

to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, or look at other mitigating measures. Valley Cities will have to agree to any of these potential options. In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved, in accordance with Condition 1 of the Hearing Examiner's April 15, 2015 Decision on the Conditional Use Permit, Valley Cities is required to enter into a separate Agreement with the City to mitigate impacts on public services. This has come to be called the ***Good Neighbor Agreement*** you may have heard about. This Agreement must be approved by Valley Cities and the City a minimum of five months prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (the permit to occupy and use the building once construction is complete). The City has not started work on the Agreement with Valley Cities at this time. There will be some discussions soon with Valley Cities on the formation of a Committee that will begin the process of developing and negotiating the terms of the required Agreement. There will be several members of the public that will participate on that committee, in addition to some elected officials from the City, and representatives from Valley Cities.

Let me know if you have other questions or need additional information.

From: Denise Lathrop
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 5:03 PM
To: Dan Brewer
Subject: FW: Woodmont Rehab

FYI - not sure if you received this. I wanted to discuss how we should respond. I was thinking I could let her know we will be mailing out our draft decision.

Denise E. Lathrop, AICP

Community Development Manager

City of Des Moines Planning, Building and Public Works Department

21630 11th Avenue S, Suite D

Des Moines, WA 98198-6398

Phone: 206-870-6563

Fax: 206-870-6544

IT TAKES A PLACE TO CREATE A COMMUNITY, AND A COMMUNITY TO

CREATE A PLACE

From: apandjesus@gmail.com [mailto:apandjesus@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:03 AM
To: Nikole Coleman <NColeman@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Woodmont Rehab

Good morning, Mrs. Coleman,

I am contacting you to see where in the permit approval Valley Cities is. I know that they summited their last permit on Aug 18th. How long do they have till they receive final approval.

Thanks,

April Chavarria

Sent from Windows Mail

Subj: **Re: Withdrawal of funds from Valley Cities**
Date: 9/9/2015 8:48:05 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: jgmayne@gmail.com
CC: dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Jack,

Based on what Councilmember Upthegrove has written here, it appears that he's talking about withholding funds for only the methadone dispensary. You should check with him to clarify.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/8/2015 8:26:05 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, jgmayne@gmail.com writes:

> John Castronover, a Des Moines resident opposing the establishment of Woodmont Recovery Campus on Pacific Highway South, informs the South King Media blogs (specifically the Waterland Blog) that he has a message from King County Councilmember Dave Upthegrove that the King County Council will withdraw its financial support of the Des Moines facility construction. Is this true?
>
> The issue, as most of you may know, has been controversial in Des Moines (see attached analysis I posted (Monday, Sept. 7). Castronover has been a vocal opponent of the facility and made demands it be stopped. After my analysis he then said the money would be removed. I am seeking any and all information on the matter. Right now I have only Castronover's claim, not sufficient for a news story, but one I will be following as best as possible.
>
> I will be available any time Wednesday at the below number of email address.
>
> Appreciate any information.
>
> Jack Mayne
> Senior Writer
>
> B-Town Blog,
> SeaTac Blog,
> Waterland Blog,
> Normandy Park Blog,
> White Center Blog
>
> jgmayne@gmail.com
> Home/Office 206.274.6069

Subj: **FW: Woodmont Rehab**
Date: 9/9/2015 8:10:21 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Dave,

We received a question from April Chavarria regarding the next permit steps for the Woodmont Recovery Campus. This is Dan's draft response. Look OK?

Tony Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

From: Dan Brewer
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 8:09 AM
To: Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Cc: Denise Lathrop <DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: RE: Woodmont Rehab

Tony:

Here you go.....

.....Draft Response.....

April:

Thanks for your question regarding the permit process for the Valley Cities Proposed project. There are currently two applications being reviewed by City staff, which I've outlined below:

- The first is a request for ***Design Review*** approval. ***Design Review*** is a process by which we review a proposed project for compliance with the zoning regulations in the Des Moines Municipal Code (DMMC) and other conditions that may be placed on a proposed project. In This case, there are some added requirements placed on the project by the Hearing Examiner when he approved the Condition Use Permit on April 15, 2015.

  The Design Review application was originally submitted to the City on April 22, 2015. Staff provided some initial comments to the applicant on June 1, 2015, and received a re-submittal on August 3, 2015. We are nearing the final stages of that review and will be issuing a decision on that soon. In accordance with Condition 5 of the Hearing Examiner's April 15, 2015 Decision on the Conditional Use Permit, the City will be sending out a notice next week of the pending Design Review Decision, and providing an opportunity for public comment. Comments will be due back to the City by October 2, 2015. The City will review and consider any comments received in the context of Design Review process (how the project does or does not meet the requirements of the DMMC), and issue a final Design Review Decision

on the project. That will happen no later than mid October.

- The second is a ***Building Permit*** application for the construction of the Evaluation and Treatment Facility which was submitted to the City on August 18, 2015. This permit is currently being reviewed by staff, and will likely take several more weeks before staff has completed its review of the plans. At that point comments (if necessary) will be provided to the applicant to address any necessary plan revisions or alterations. The applicant will need to make the revisions and resubmit for additional review, before the building permit is ready for issuance. The Building Permit will not be approved until after the Design Review Decision has been issued. So the very earliest that the Building Permit could be issued is mid October, but that would require that there are no revisions necessary on the application currently being reviewed.

While City Administration is processing these applications, which we are obligated to do by law, the Mayor and other members of the City Council are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, or look at other mitigating measures. Valley Cities will have to agree to any of these potential options. In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved, in accordance with Condition 1 of the Hearing Examiner's April 15, 2015 Decision on the Conditional Use Permit, Valley Cities is required to enter into a separate Agreement with the City to mitigate impacts on public services. This has come to be called the ***Good Neighbor Agreement*** you may have heard about. This Agreement must be approved by Valley Cities and the City a minimum of five months prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (the permit to occupy and use the building once construction is complete). The City has not started work on the Agreement with Valley Cities at this time. There will be some discussions soon with Valley Cities on the formation of a Committee that will begin the process of developing and negotiating the terms of the required Agreement. There will be several members of the public that will participate on that committee, in addition to some elected officials from the City, and representatives from Valley Cities.

Let me know if you have other questions or need additional information.

From: Denise Lathrop
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 5:03 PM
To: Dan Brewer
Subject: FW: Woodmont Rehab

FYI - not sure if you received this. I wanted to discuss how we should respond. I was thinking I could let her know we will be mailing out our draft decision.

Denise E. Lathrop, AICP
Community Development Manager
City of Des Moines Planning, Building and Public Works Department
21630 11th Avenue S, Suite D
Des Moines, WA 98198-6398
Phone: 206-870-6563
Fax: 206-870-6544

IT TAKES A PLACE TO CREATE A COMMUNITY, AND A COMMUNITY TO CREATE A PLACE

From: apandjesus@gmail.com [mailto:apandjesus@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:03 AM
To: Nikole Coleman <NColeman@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Woodmont Rehab

Good morning, Mrs. Coleman,

I am contacting you to see where in the permit approval Valley Cities is. I know that they summited their last permit on Aug 18th. How long do they have till they receive final approval.

Thanks,

April Chavarria

Sent from Windows Mail

Subj: **Withdrawal of funds from Valley Cities**
Date: 9/8/2015 8:26:05 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: jgmayne@gmail.com
To: jgmayne@gmail.com

John Castronover, a Des Moines resident opposing the establishment of Woodmont Recovery Campus on Pacific Highway South, informs the South King Media blogs (specifically the Waterland Blog) that he has a message from King County Councilmember Dave Upthegrove that the King County Council will withdraw its financial support of the Des Moines facility construction. Is this true?

The issue, as most of you may know, has been controversial in Des Moines (see attached analysis I posted (Monday, Sept. 7). Castronover has been a vocal opponent of the facility and made demands it be stopped. After my analysis he then said the money would be removed. I am seeking any and all information on the matter. Right now I have only Castronover's claim, not sufficient for a news story, but one I will be following as best as possible.

I will be available any time Wednesday at the below number of email address.

Appreciate any information.

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069

Subj: **Woodmont constituent response**
Date: 9/8/2015 5:19:00 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov
To: karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov, nalpakDLK@aol.com
CC: Jeff.Muhm@kingcounty.gov, Miranda.Leskinen@kingcounty.gov

Dave, Tina & Karen: Here is the constituent response I am using. Note that I am taking a position against county funding for the project if it includes a methadone clinic. Per your requests (Tina and Dave), I did not force the hand of the provider to take any action now. Any decision to amend the site plan will be up to the provider as they go through the city permitting process. I also have not done any public announcements other than replying to a few constituent emails.
-Dave

Dear _____ ,

Thank you for your email and phone call expressing your concern about Valley City Counseling's plans to locate a substance abuse and mental health treatment facility in the Woodmont neighborhood of Des Moines. I apologize for the delay in getting back to you.

As a long-time Des Moines resident, I value the quality of life in our community. I have been briefed on the project, have visited the site, and have done my best to listen to diverse opinions in the community. I also have carefully examined what role, if any, King County government plays in this decision making process. King County has no authority over land use and permitting decisions within the City of Des Moines. It is my understanding that the City of Des Moines is being diligent in their review of the proposal, to the extent allowed by law and conditions of the permit.

That being said, King County has contributed some capital funding to this project, and King County administers state mental health funding. In other words, King County has "the power of the purse." It has become clear to me that a large number of people in the community I represent do not feel safe with the operation of a methadone clinic as part of this treatment facility. Therefore, in my role as Chair of the King County Council Health, Housing and Human Services Committee, and member of the Budget Committee**, I have decided to oppose any King County funding moving forward for this project until the site plan is amended to remove plans for the methadone clinic on this site.** Another suitable site in South King County should be found. Today, I notified Valley Cities Counseling and the relevant King County agencies of my decision. This should give the community leverage to help get the site plan amended as they negotiate a good neighbor agreement with the provider as part of the City permitting process.

Now that I have taken this action, it is important to me to share some of my personal feelings. While I recognize that many people do not feel safe with a methadone clinic in our neighborhood—and I respect the right for people to feel safe in their community (and, thus, have taken the steps to get it moved)—I personally believe this facility (including the methadone clinic) actually would improve safety and quality of life in our community. Social science data I have reviewed does not show an increase in crime around methadone clinics.

People in our community who are struggling with addiction or mental illness should not have to travel to Seattle to receive treatment. We have a huge need for opiate treatment in South King County. Currently, about 500 people per day travel from South King County to Seattle for treatment. Imagine how many people in our community who are addicted to heroin or other opiates are not seeking treatment because of this geographic and transportation barrier. Without local treatment options, this population is more likely to engage in undesirable activities in Des Moines. Without treatment, more families will remain torn apart and more people will die. These are mothers and daughters, sons and fathers, friends and neighbors. Addiction and mental illness don't discriminate based on class or race. Most families I know have been impacted by addiction or mental illness.

I look forward to the day when mental illness and addiction are not stigmatized, and we as a community embrace rather than fear treatment and support services in our own community.

Sincerely,

Dave Upthegrove
King County Council
District 5

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan White <susanrdo@aol.com>
Date: August 20, 2015 at 5:34:47 PM PDT
To: daveup@comcast.net
Subject: Des Moines disaster

Hi Dave . . I know you are super busy but I know you have heard about this. This is about as low as the City can go as far as I am concerned putting a facility like this next to an Elementary school and in our community. Mind you I am not opposed to people getting treatment but really . . not here. This is a letter who is written by Candace Urquhart who was instrumental in organizing the meeting the other night at Woodmont. Everything she states in here is true!! I know you too live in DM and appreciate any input you may have.

There is no way such a facility should be near an elementary school or library. How many other cities would do this??

I am so upset about this as are many many people. Also what was Karen Kaiser thinking throwing so much state $$ at this????

Thanks for your thoughts and hope guys are well.

Susan

Subj: **FW: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST-Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/8/2015 11:29:30 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com, mmpina@comcast.net, JNutting@desmoineswa.gov, momeof2c@msn.com, desmnsluisa@gmail.com, shecklers@comcast.net, VPennington@desmoineswa.gov

Can you please check your home computers for any e-mails that did not come through the City server from 8/14/15 to current regarding the Woodmont Recovery Center.

Thank you!

Bonnie

From: candace [mailto:candace@bellamaterna.com]
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 4:29 PM
To: City Clerk <cityclerk@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST

To whom it may concern:

Pursuant to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, I request the public records identified below. If your agency does not maintain these public records, please let me know the proper agency and name and contact information for the proper custodian. Please feel free to communicate with me by e-mail; however, my preference for delivery of responsive records is to have them delivered, to the extent possible, in a digital, searchable format to maximize the possibility that the delivered records can be electronically reviewed and to be environmentally sensitive – thank you!

I understand that there may be a statutory fee or cost, which I agree to pay; however, please let me know if you anticipate that the cost will exceed $50.00 before proceeding so that I might make any required decisions to prioritize my requests.

Please consider the time frame for the records requested to cover the period from January 1, 2014, to present.

As the subject matter of the records is of great importance to me as a resident of the City of Des Moines, please let me know as specifically as reasonably possible if any of the requested records will not or cannot be provided, and please include an explanation of why such records, if they exist, are not being provided.

For clarity, when I reference a request for records from the City of Des Moines, I mean to include all records obtained or residing with the City of Des Moines as well as records obtained or residing with City employees, contractors, and elected officials, to the extent that such records are considered public records within the broadest meaning of the statute and case law. Similarly, when I reference Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation ("Valley Cities"), I mean to include all records obtained or provided by Valley Cities as well as records obtained or provided by Valley Cities owners, agents, or employees, to the extent that such records are considered public records within the broadest meaning of the statute and case law. To avoid any misunderstanding, the word "records" should be interpreted broadly as including but not limited to documents, electronic files or images, e-mails, social media, and text messages.

It is possible that many of the requests are, unintentionally, repetitive. I agree that a document, if responsive to more than one request, does not need to be provided twice.

Requested Records:

1)COPIES OF ALL ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS, RENDERINGS OR SKETCHES PROVIDED WITH BUILDING PERMIT OR PERMITS , SUBMISSION OR SUBMISSIONS FROM VALLEY CITIES TO THE CITY OF DES MOINES.

2) COPIES OF ALL BUILDING PERMITS FROM VALLEY CITIES TO THE CITY OF DES MOINES

3) A COPY OF THE SAFTEY MANAGEMENT PLAN FROM VALLEY CITIES TO THE CITY OF DES MOINES FOR THE PROPOSED DES MOINES VALLEY CITIES REHABILITATION CENTER.

4) A COPY OF THE OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE NEXT 10 YEARS FOR THE SAID VALLEY CITIES REHABILITATION FACILITY, IN DES MOINES AND PROOF OF SECURED FUNDS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE SAID BUDGET.

If there is any request for which you believe no responsive documents exist, please clearly advise so that I may timely review that determination, and so that I might assist in re-framing the request if in fact the language of the request is unclear.

Thank you in advance – your help is much appreciated!

Candace Urquhart

25665 Marine View Dr S

Des Moines , WA 98198

g.urquhart@comcast.net

206-949-1001

Subj: **Re: Methadone Clinic in Des Moines**
Date: 9/7/2015 7:21:16 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: lindadfry@comcast.net, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov

Ms. Frye,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/7/2015 4:01:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, lindadfry@comcast.net writes:

> Des Moines Officials
>
> Two questions, why place this methadone clinic in Des Moines? Question number two: why put it so close to an elementary school? Why not close to an existing hospital that already has parking, adequate roads, etc. If you currently are supporting it, please reconsider your position. Speaking for my family, we do not want it opened where the plans current state.
>
> Linda Fry
> lindadfry@comcast.net

Subj: **Re: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
Date: 9/7/2015 11:24:58 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

This "topic" is not on the City Council agenda, but will likely be brought up by both citizens during public comment and by Councilmembers speaking to the issue.

We are talking with other elected officials, and will be engaging with Valley Cities to see what our options are. The Good Neighbor Agreement Committee will be formed soon, and that process will begin. Half of the committee will be members of the community who expressed interest in serving on the committee.

On the legal side, Valley Cities has submitted their design of the campus for review. Public input will be sought, though the comments must speak to the design of the campus. Valley Cities has also submitted an application for a building permit. The City of Des Moines is legally obligated to process these requests.

However, as noted above, we are continuing to explore what options are available to move or mitigate this project.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/7/2015 9:13:47 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:

> Good morning, before I answer, can you provide direction. I know the agenda for the 10th doesn't include this topic but as far as "next steps" my understanding is that the Council, you and Matt, are working with various State Reps to see what can be done. . .
> My position is that Land Use Permits are not within the Council's to deny yet I am not certain I know enough about the services that they provide and how the State rules a city must allow them to use the land. . .
> Hope I am making some sense. . .
> Thanks Dave
> Luisa
> --------- Forwarded message ---------
> From: **Kristin Steinmetz** <steinmetz5@comcast.net>
> Date: Sun, Sep 6, 2015 at 5:26 PM
> Subject: Re: Proposed Rehabilitation Center
> To: Luisa Bangs <desmnsluisa@gmail.com>
>
> Hello again,
> I am sorry I was not prepared to discuss my concerns when you called. I had hoped to meet you at my neighbors, Eileen and Rebecca's earlier this summer. My husband and mother-in-law were both able to make it.
>
> I completely understand/recognize the need for inpatient psych beds in S King County. I also recognize that Valley Cities is a strong organization and although the do not have direct experience with inpatient services, I am confident they will create a good program.
>
> No matter how great the need and no matter how well it is run, it does not make sense to me to create such a treatment complex so close to an elementary school and next to a library used by our neighborhood kids. I can't believe there isn't a more appropriate location. I also can't believe King County was not more helpful in working with VCCC to identify a more appropriate location. And I can't believe city officials in Des Moines weren't part of the process before VCCC purchased the property.
>
> I want to know your position on this issue. I want to know what you understand to be the next steps in

response to the motion for a 120-day review that passed during the last city counsel meeting. I want to know if this issue, progress of the review or any other discussion of this situation will be on the agenda for the coming meeting. Can you or will you request the issue to be on the agenda?

I will be available for your phone call this evening, all day Monday and/or after the school board meeting on Tuesday.

Thank you and I appreciate your time.

Kristin Steinmetz 206-293-0576

> On Sep 3, 2015, at 11:17 AM, Luisa Bangs <desmnsluisa@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Good morning Kristin I will call you later this evening. Luisa
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Sep 2, 2015, at 10:28 PM, Kristin Steinmetz <steinmetz5@comcast.net> wrote:
>>
>> Good evening,
>>
>> I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines and I am very concerned about the location of the proposed rehabilitation center and other treatment services.
>>
>> I am writing to request an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this topic and the potential implications to our city.
>>
>> I look forward to hearing from you.
>>
>> Kristin Steinmetz
>> 917 S 258th Pl
>> Des Moines, WA 98198
>> 206-293-0576
>>

Subj: **Fwd: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
Date: 9/7/2015 9:13:47 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Good morning, before I answer, can you provide direction. I know the agenda for the 10th doesn't include this topic but as far as "next steps" my understanding is that the Council, you and Matt, are working with various State Reps to see what can be done. . .
My position is that Land Use Permits are not within the Council's to deny yet I am not certain I know enough about the services that they provide and how the State rules a city must allow them to use the land. . .
Hope I am making some sense. . .
Thanks Dave
Luisa
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Kristin Steinmetz** <steinmetz5@comcast.net>
Date: Sun, Sep 6, 2015 at 5:26 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Rehabilitation Center
To: Luisa Bangs <desmnsluisa@gmail.com>

Hello again,
I am sorry I was not prepared to discuss my concerns when you called. I had hoped to meet you at my neighbors, Eileen and Rebecca's earlier this summer. My husband and mother-in-law were both able to make it.

I completely understand/recognize the need for inpatient psych beds in S King County. I also recognize that Valley Cities is a strong organization and although the do not have direct experience with inpatient services, I am confident they will create a good program.

No matter how great the need and no matter how well it is run, it does not make sense to me to create such a treatment complex so close to an elementary school and next to a library used by our neighborhood kids. I can't believe there isn't a more appropriate location. I also can't believe King County was not more helpful in working with VCCC to identify a more appropriate location. And I can't believe city officials in Des Moines weren't part of the process before VCCC purchased the property.

I want to know your position on this issue. I want to know what you understand to be the next steps in response to the motion for a 120-day review that passed during the last city counsel meeting. I want to know if this issue, progress of the review or any other discussion of this situation will be on the agenda for the coming meeting. Can you or will you request the issue to be on the agenda?

I will be available for your phone call this evening, all day Monday and/or after the school board meeting on Tuesday.

Thank you and I appreciate your time.

Kristin Steinmetz 206-293-0576

> On Sep 3, 2015, at 11:17 AM, Luisa Bangs <desmnsluisa@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Good morning Kristin I will call you later this evening. Luisa
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Sep 2, 2015, at 10:28 PM, Kristin Steinmetz <steinmetz5@comcast.net> wrote:
>>
>> Good evening,
>>
>> I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines and I am very concerned about the location of the proposed rehabilitation center and other treatment services.

>>
>> I am writing to request an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this topic and the potential implications to our city.
>>
>> I look forward to hearing from you.
>>
>> Kristin Steinmetz
>> 917 S 258th Pl
>> Des Moines, WA 98198
>> 206-293-0576
>>

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 4:03:53 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: johnblaue@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Thanks. Interesting: the context in Woodmont newsletter makes it easy to assume a broader screwup than the 'notification' part.

> On Sep 6, 2015, at 3:57 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:
>
> Mr. Blaue,
>
> What I meant by that was that, when it comes to facilities of that size and nature (essential public facilities), notice should go out to the entire City, and not just to those we're legally obligated to send it to. The law only provides for sending out notice to those property owners within 300' of a land use proposal. The City sent out notice to properties owners within 600' of the property (twice as far as legally required), but, given the nature of the facility, it should have gone out to a broader audience. That is what I meant by "the City screwed up." My comment was solely about the notice. Others have taken it to mean the project itself, but that's not true. The City was legally bound to approve the project, with conditions.
>
> Dave Kaplan
> Mayor & Councilmember
> City of Des Moines, WA
>
> In a message dated 9/6/2015 2:48:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:
>
> > One thing I hope you will answer to me: In the letter from the Woodmont Board to residents it says after the Aug18 Mayor's meeting Dave Kaplan said "The City screwed up." What does that mean?
> >
> > > On Sep 6, 2015, at 8:28 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:
> > >
> > > Mr. Blaue,
> > >
> > > Thank you for your email expressing a number of concerns. I'll try to answer them all.
> > >
> > > There are some things the City and City Council are responsible for, and many we are not.
> > >
> > > Take the Redondo Ace Hardware store and Marina District QFC as examples. We do not control whether a business makes money or not; the customers (or lack of customers) do. Both stores were only used as convenience stories, nothing more. Sorry, but you don't keep a QFC open when you average only 3 items sold per customer, when the chain-wide average is 13 items per customer and the average up at Manhattan Village in Normandy Park is 21 items per customer. That QFC was supposed to close 16 years before it did (when Kroger bought the chain), but they were also closing the store up at Midway Landing (now La Plaza) and didn't want to impact the community twice-over, so they kept it open until the cost of doing so was too much. The store was too small to meet the customers' needs. The community didn't shop their regularly enough to support it. Same thing with the Ace Hardware. People didn't shop there because Ace had limited inventory, and customers had to make multiple trips to different stores to get what they wanted. You can't keep full-sized stores open if people don't shop there. It's not the City's fault, or its elected officials, if people choose not to

shop in certain stores. Sorry, but it isn't.

Regarding the QFC block in the Marina District, the old QFC location is owned by one property owner and the strip mall and southern half of the block is owned by a second property owner. Both Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, staff, and I had a conversation with both owners. They both want to redevelop the block, but the rents aren't high enough yet for either the residential that would be built above, or for the commercial space that would be built at ground level, to support a development. As an MBA myself, I know that there's no property owner that I know of that let's a property sit vacant for more than two years without renting out the space. Dollar Tree is renting out the space. While not what we would like to see there in the long run (we want to see another grocery, eventually), that will at least bring in some revenue to the City for the next few years. It's better than a huge empty, non-revenue generating store front, and it will change in time.

Regarding economic development generally, if you want to blame someone blame the first 45 years of City Councils (circa 1959 to 2004.) They're the ones who have held up things changing in the Marina District, primarily due to not wanting views to be impacted. Most development today requires slightly taller buildings to pencil out; prior City Councils were unwilling to do that. This City Council has raised building heights and provided incentives in the Marina District for developers to build and businesses to locate. There are no less than five or six projects that have submitted designs and will be submitting for building permits. Why is this important? Because the absentee landlords which have used their properties strictly for rent (and not maintained them well) will have to either upgrade or redevelop if they want to keep the renters they have, or to lure new businesses to the vacant spaces they have. The City Council passed an ordinance last fall to go after commercial property owners who are not maintaining their buildings. Changes have already started to occur. As but one example, the Bebe Nails building was knocked down and a new building will be going in.

Unfortunately, we've lost a number of businesses because there is no place to move into; no new retail space has been built yet. They WANT to stay here, but there is no affordable or adequate space to move into. That is changing, but not as fast as we would like. But that's what happens when slumlord commercial property owners were allowed to let their buildings fester for decades, and while those with residential views up on the hill refused to let even a small sliver of their view be impacted to allow for new development.

You don't turn a battleship on a dime. It's a long, slow gradual turn. That is what is happening here in Des Moines. And why is it happening at all? Because there's a City Council that understands that our City can't survive without revenues from the businesses that locate here ... including the ones we're working to attract to come here. In the past six years alone, we've: reviewed and implemented changes to our development regulations and permitting process to make them more streamlined; waived commercial parking requirements for the small lots in the Marina District; suspended the B&O tax for three years for any new business that pulls a business permit by December 31, 2015; and provided a height incentive for public benefits for new construction (which should help the Des Moines Theatre redevelop.) All of these things came from the current City Council, and are most definitely "progressive."

The Des Moines Creek Business Park is under development, and we're told it is about 80% leased out ... including the 1600 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration that are supposed to arrive in 2017. In Pacific Ridge, the Sheraton Fourpoint Hotel is nearing completion, and a number of other potential projects have come forward and submitted their plans for review. On Pacific Highway, south of Kent-Des Moines Road, Highline Place (next

to Highline College) is in design review. NONE of these projects would have occurred but for the efforts of the City Council to make changes to allow for them.

Which brings us to the Woodmont Recovery Center.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Lastly, your perception that there is "nothing progressive" going on is because of catering to the seniors in our community. Nothing can be further from the truth. All of the steps we've been taking have been for the betterment of all residents in Des Moines. ALL residents.

Nothing good happens immediately. It takes planning, resources, and implementation before you begin to see things pan out. The steps we've taken are beginning to pan out, and soon we'll see the results.

Thank you again for expressing your concerns.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
> **To:** mpina@desmoineswa.gov
>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
>> **Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
>> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
>> **To:** dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
>>
>> I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in

Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR home).

I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.

i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 4:03:53 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: johnblaue@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Thanks. Interesting: the context in Woodmont newsletter makes it easy to assume a broader screwup than the 'notification' part.

> On Sep 6, 2015, at 3:57 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:
>
> Mr. Blaue,
>
> What I meant by that was that, when it comes to facilities of that size and nature (essential public facilities), notice should go out to the entire City, and not just to those we're legally obligated to send it to. The law only provides for sending out notice to those property owners within 300' of a land use proposal. The City sent out notice to properties owners within 600' of the property (twice as far as legally required), but, given the nature of the facility, it should have gone out to a broader audience. That is what I meant by "the City screwed up." My comment was solely about the notice. Others have taken it to mean the project itself, but that's not true. The City was legally bound to approve the project, with conditions.
>
> Dave Kaplan
> Mayor & Councilmember
> City of Des Moines, WA
>
> In a message dated 9/6/2015 2:48:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:
>
> > One thing I hope you will answer to me: In the letter from the Woodmont Board to residents it says after the Aug18 Mayor's meeting Dave Kaplan said "The City screwed up." What does that mean?
> >
> > > On Sep 6, 2015, at 8:28 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:
> > >
> > > Mr. Blaue,
> > >
> > > Thank you for your email expressing a number of concerns. I'll try to answer them all.
> > >
> > > There are some things the City and City Council are responsible for, and many we are not.
> > >
> > > Take the Redondo Ace Hardware store and Marina District QFC as examples. We do not control whether a business makes money or not; the customers (or lack of customers) do. Both stores were only used as convenience stories, nothing more. Sorry, but you don't keep a QFC open when you average only 3 items sold per customer, when the chain-wide average is 13 items per customer and the average up at Manhattan Village in Normandy Park is 21 items per customer. That QFC was supposed to close 16 years before it did (when Kroger bought the chain), but they were also closing the store up at Midway Landing (now La Plaza) and didn't want to impact the community twice-over, so they kept it open until the cost of doing so was too much. The store was too small to meet the customers' needs. The community didn't shop their regularly enough to support it. Same thing with the Ace Hardware. People didn't shop there because Ace had limited inventory, and customers had to make multiple trips to different stores to get what they wanted. You can't keep full-sized stores open if people don't shop there. It's not the City's fault, or its elected officials, if people choose not to

shop in certain stores. Sorry, but it isn't.

Regarding the QFC block in the Marina District, the old QFC location is owned by one property owner and the strip mall and southern half of the block is owned by a second property owner. Both Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, staff, and I had a conversation with both owners. They both want to redevelop the block, but the rents aren't high enough yet for either the residential that would be built above, or for the commercial space that would be built at ground level, to support a development. As an MBA myself, I know that there's no property owner that I know of that let's a property sit vacant for more than two years without renting out the space. Dollar Tree is renting out the space. While not what we would like to see there in the long run (we want to see another grocery, eventually), that will at least bring in some revenue to the City for the next few years. It's better than a huge empty, non-revenue generating store front, and it will change in time.

Regarding economic development generally, if you want to blame someone blame the first 45 years of City Councils (circa 1959 to 2004.) They're the ones who have held up things changing in the Marina District, primarily due to not wanting views to be impacted. Most development today requires slightly taller buildings to pencil out; prior City Councils were unwilling to do that. This City Council has raised building heights and provided incentives in the Marina District for developers to build and businesses to locate. There are no less than five or six projects that have submitted designs and will be submitting for building permits. Why is this important? Because the absentee landlords which have used their properties strictly for rent (and not maintained them well) will have to either upgrade or redevelop if they want to keep the renters they have, or to lure new businesses to the vacant spaces they have. The City Council passed an ordinance last fall to go after commercial property owners who are not maintaining their buildings. Changes have already started to occur. As but one example, the Bebe Nails building was knocked down and a new building will be going in.

Unfortunately, we've lost a number of businesses because there is no place to move into; no new retail space has been built yet. They WANT to stay here, but there is no affordable or adequate space to move into. That is changing, but not as fast as we would like. But that's what happens when slumlord commercial property owners were allowed to let their buildings fester for decades, and while those with residential views up on the hill refused to let even a small sliver of their view be impacted to allow for new development.

You don't turn a battleship on a dime. It's a long, slow gradual turn. That is what is happening here in Des Moines. And why is it happening at all? Because there's a City Council that understands that our City can't survive without revenues from the businesses that locate here ... including the ones we're working to attract to come here. In the past six years alone, we've: reviewed and implemented changes to our development regulations and permitting process to make them more streamlined; waived commercial parking requirements for the small lots in the Marina District; suspended the B&O tax for three years for any new business that pulls a business permit by December 31, 2015; and provided a height incentive for public benefits for new construction (which should help the Des Moines Theatre redevelop.) All of these things came from the current City Council, and are most definitely "progressive."

The Des Moines Creek Business Park is under development, and we're told it is about 80% leased out ... including the 1600 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration that are supposed to arrive in 2017. In Pacific Ridge, the Sheraton Fourpoint Hotel is nearing completion, and a number of other potential projects have come forward and submitted their plans for review. On Pacific Highway, south of Kent-Des Moines Road, Highline Place (next

to Highline College) is in design review. NONE of these projects would have occurred but for the efforts of the City Council to make changes to allow for them.

Which brings us to the Woodmont Recovery Center.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Lastly, your perception that there is "nothing progressive" going on is because of catering to the seniors in our community. Nothing can be further from the truth. All of the steps we've been taking have been for the betterment of all residents in Des Moines. ALL residents.

Nothing good happens immediately. It takes planning, resources, and implementation before you begin to see things pan out. The steps we've taken are beginning to pan out, and soon we'll see the results.

Thank you again for expressing your concerns.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
> **To:** mpina@desmoineswa.gov
>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
>> **Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
>> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
>> **To:** dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
>>
>> I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in

Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR home).

I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.

i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 2:48:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: johnblaue@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

One thing I hope you will answer to me: In the letter from the Woodmont Board to residents it says after the Aug18 Mayor's meeting Dave Kaplan said "The City screwed up." What does that mean?

On Sep 6, 2015, at 8:28 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

Mr. Blaue,

Thank you for your email expressing a number of concerns. I'll try to answer them all.

There are some things the City and City Council are responsible for, and many we are not.

Take the Redondo Ace Hardware store and Marina District QFC as examples. We do not control whether a business makes money or not; the customers (or lack of customers) do. Both stores were only used as convenience stories, nothing more. Sorry, but you don't keep a QFC open when you average only 3 items sold per customer, when the chain-wide average is 13 items per customer and the average up at Manhattan Village in Normandy Park is 21 items per customer. That QFC was supposed to close 16 years before it did (when Kroger bought the chain), but they were also closing the store up at Midway Landing (now La Plaza) and didn't want to impact the community twice-over, so they kept it open until the cost of doing so was too much. The store was too small to meet the customers' needs. The community didn't shop their regularly enough to support it. Same thing with the Ace Hardware. People didn't shop there because Ace had limited inventory, and customers had to make multiple trips to different stores to get what they wanted. You can't keep full-sized stores open if people don't shop there. It's not the City's fault, or its elected officials, if people choose not to shop in certain stores. Sorry, but it isn't.

Regarding the QFC block in the Marina District, the old QFC location is owned by one property owner and the strip mall and southern half of the block is owned by a second property owner. Both Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, staff, and I had a conversation with both owners. They both want to redevelop the block, but the rents aren't high enough yet for either the residential that would be built above, or for the commercial space that would be built at ground level, to support a development. As an MBA myself, I know that there's no property owner that I know of that let's a property sit vacant for more than two years without renting out the space. Dollar Tree is renting out the space. While not what we would like to see there in the long run (we want to see another grocery, eventually), that will at least bring in some revenue to the City for the next few years. It's better than a huge empty, non-revenue generating store front, and it will change in time.

Regarding economic development generally, if you want to blame someone blame the first 45 years of City Councils (circa 1959 to 2004.) They're the ones who have held up things changing in the Marina District, primarily due to not wanting views to be impacted. Most development today requires slightly taller buildings to pencil out; prior City Councils were unwilling to do that. This City Council has raised building heights and provided incentives in the Marina District for developers to build and businesses to locate. There are no less than five or six projects that have submitted designs and will be submitting for building permits. Why is this important? Because the absentee landlords which have used their properties strictly for rent (and not maintained them well) will have to either upgrade or redevelop if they want to keep the renters they have, or to lure new businesses to the vacant spaces they have. The City Council passed an ordinance last fall to go after commercial property owners who are not maintaining their buildings. Changes have already started to occur. As but one example, the Bebe Nails building was knocked down and a new building will be going in.

Unfortunately, we've lost a number of businesses because there is no place to move into; no new retail space has been built yet. They WANT to stay here, but there is no affordable or adequate space to move into. That is changing, but not as fast as we would like. But that's what happens when slumlord commercial property owners were allowed to let their buildings fester for decades,

and while those with residential views up on the hill refused to let even a small sliver of their view be impacted to allow for new development.

You don't turn a battleship on a dime. It's a long, slow gradual turn. That is what is happening here in Des Moines. And why is it happening at all? Because there's a City Council that understands that our City can't survive without revenues from the businesses that locate here ... including the ones we're working to attract to come here. In the past six years alone, we've: reviewed and implemented changes to our development regulations and permitting process to make them more streamlined; waived commercial parking requirements for the small lots in the Marina District; suspended the B&O tax for three years for any new business that pulls a business permit by December 31, 2015; and provided a height incentive for public benefits for new construction (which should help the Des Moines Theatre redevelop.) All of these things came from the current City Council, and are most definitely "progressive."

The Des Moines Creek Business Park is under development, and we're told it is about 80% leased out ... including the 1600 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration that are supposed to arrive in 2017. In Pacific Ridge, the Sheraton Fourpoint Hotel is nearing completion, and a number of other potential projects have come forward and submitted their plans for review. On Pacific Highway, south of Kent-Des Moines Road, Highline Place (next to Highline College) is in design review. NONE of these projects would have occurred but for the efforts of the City Council to make changes to allow for them.

Which brings us to the Woodmont Recovery Center.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary

patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Lastly, your perception that there is "nothing progressive" going on is because of catering to the seniors in our community. Nothing can be further from the truth. All of the steps we've been taking have been for the betterment of all residents in Des Moines. ALL residents.

Nothing good happens immediately. It takes planning, resources, and implementation before you begin to see things pan out. The steps we've taken are beginning to pan out, and soon we'll see the results.

Thank you again for expressing your concerns.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
> **To:** mpina@desmoineswa.gov
>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
>> **Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
>> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
>> **To:** dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
>>
>> I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR

home).

I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.

i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

=

=

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 1:11:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: johnblaue@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

I appreciate your taking time to give such a detailed response. I 'almost don't deserve it' as although I am a good citizen, I am not a very involved citizen.....writing the brief email to you is about as much as I have been willing to put into either the Woodmont Community or city affairs.

Your responses make sense to me....still not pleased with what 'results' I see short term, but it is clear to me that you do have a sensible strategy for making progress.

On Sep 6, 2015, at 8:28 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

Mr. Blaue,

Thank you for your email expressing a number of concerns. I'll try to answer them all.

There are some things the City and City Council are responsible for, and many we are not.

Take the Redondo Ace Hardware store and Marina District QFC as examples. We do not control whether a business makes money or not; the customers (or lack of customers) do. Both stores were only used as convenience stories, nothing more. Sorry, but you don't keep a QFC open when you average only 3 items sold per customer, when the chain-wide average is 13 items per customer and the average up at Manhattan Village in Normandy Park is 21 items per customer. That QFC was supposed to close 16 years before it did (when Kroger bought the chain), but they were also closing the store up at Midway Landing (now La Plaza) and didn't want to impact the community twice-over, so they kept it open until the cost of doing so was too much. The store was too small to meet the customers' needs. The community didn't shop their regularly enough to support it. Same thing with the Ace Hardware. People didn't shop there because Ace had limited inventory, and customers had to make multiple trips to different stores to get what they wanted. You can't keep full-sized stores open if people don't shop there. It's not the City's fault, or its elected officials, if people choose not to shop in certain stores. Sorry, but it isn't.

Regarding the QFC block in the Marina District, the old QFC location is owned by one property owner and the strip mall and southern half of the block is owned by a second property owner. Both Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, staff, and I had a conversation with both owners. They both want to redevelop the block, but the rents aren't high enough yet for either the residential that would be built above, or for the commercial space that would be built at ground level, to support a development. As an MBA myself, I know that there's no property owner that I know of that let's a property sit vacant for more than two years without renting out the space. Dollar Tree is renting out the space. While not what we would like to see there in the long run (we want to see another grocery, eventually), that will at least bring in some revenue to the City for the next few years. It's better than a huge empty, non-revenue generating store front, and it will change in time.

Regarding economic development generally, if you want to blame someone blame the first 45 years of City Councils (circa 1959 to 2004.) They're the ones who have held up things changing in the Marina District, primarily due to not wanting views to be impacted. Most development today requires slightly taller buildings to pencil out; prior City Councils were unwilling to do that. This City Council has raised building heights and provided incentives in the Marina District for developers to build and businesses to locate. There are no less than five or six projects that have submitted designs and will be submitting for building permits. Why is this important? Because the absentee landlords which have used their properties strictly for rent (and not maintained them well) will have to either upgrade or redevelop if they want to keep the renters they have, or to lure new businesses to the vacant spaces they have. The City Council passed an ordinance last fall to go after commercial property owners who are not maintaining their buildings. Changes have already started to occur. As but one example, the Bebe Nails building was knocked down and a new building will be going in.

Unfortunately, we've lost a number of businesses because there is no place to move into; no new retail space has been built yet. They WANT to stay here, but there is no affordable or adequate space to move into. That is changing, but not as fast as we would like. But that's what happens when slumlord commercial property owners were allowed to let their buildings fester for decades, and while those with residential views up on the hill refused to let even a small sliver of their view be impacted to allow for new development.

You don't turn a battleship on a dime. It's a long, slow gradual turn. That is what is happening here in Des Moines. And why is it happening at all? Because there's a City Council that understands that our City can't survive without revenues from the businesses that locate here ... including the ones we're working to attract to come here. In the past six years alone, we've: reviewed and implemented changes to our development regulations and permitting process to make them more streamlined; waived commercial parking requirements for the small lots in the Marina District; suspended the B&O tax for three years for any new business that pulls a business permit by December 31, 2015; and provided a height incentive for public benefits for new construction (which should help the Des Moines Theatre redevelop.) All of these things came from the current City Council, and are most definitely "progressive."

The Des Moines Creek Business Park is under development, and we're told it is about 80% leased out ... including the 1600 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration that are supposed to arrive in 2017. In Pacific Ridge, the Sheraton Fourpoint Hotel is nearing completion, and a number of other potential projects have come forward and submitted their plans for review. On Pacific Highway, south of Kent-Des Moines Road, Highline Place (next to Highline College) is in design review. NONE of these projects would have occurred but for the efforts of the City Council to make changes to allow for them.

Which brings us to the Woodmont Recovery Center.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Lastly, your perception that there is "nothing progressive" going on is because of catering to the seniors in our community. Nothing can be further from the truth. All of the steps we've been taking have been for the betterment of all residents in Des Moines. ALL residents.

Nothing good happens immediately. It takes planning, resources, and implementation before you begin to see things pan out. The steps we've taken are beginning to pan out, and soon we'll see the results.

Thank you again for expressing your concerns.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
> **To:** mpina@desmoineswa.gov
>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
>> **Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
>> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
>> **To:** dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov,

mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov

I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR home).

I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.

i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

=

=

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 10:55:08 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: johnblaue@gmail.com

Mr. Blaue,

I see that I missed one of the issues you raised.

Regarding the Redondo Boardwalk, it takes money to rebuild it ... money the City doesn't have. That is why we worked to obtain federal funds, a state legislative appropriation, and are waiting on approval of the last $400,000 or so from the state Transportation Improvement Board to complete the project. The Boardwalk should be reopen by next summer. Construction can't occur during the "fish window," so that is part of the delay, though most of the delay has been in working to obtain the funding.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
> **To:** mpina@desmoineswa.gov
>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
>> **Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
>> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
>> **To:** dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
>>
>> I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR home).
>>
>> I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.

i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

=

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 3:57:21 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: johnblaue@gmail.com

Mr. Blaue,

What I meant by that was that, when it comes to facilities of that size and nature (essential public facilities), notice should go out to the entire City, and not just to those we're legally obligated to send it to. The law only provides for sending out notice to those property owners within 300' of a land use proposal. The City sent out notice to properties owners within 600' of the property (twice as far as legally required), but, given the nature of the facility, it should have gone out to a broader audience. That is what I meant by "the City screwed up." My comment was solely about the notice. Others have taken it to mean the project itself, but that's not true. The City was legally bound to approve the project, with conditions.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/6/2015 2:48:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> One thing I hope you will answer to me: In the letter from the Woodmont Board to residents it says after the Aug18 Mayor's meeting Dave Kaplan said "The City screwed up." What does that mean?
>
> > On Sep 6, 2015, at 8:28 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:
> >
> > Mr. Blaue,
> >
> > Thank you for your email expressing a number of concerns. I'll try to answer them all.
> >
> > There are some things the City and City Council are responsible for, and many we are not.
> >
> > Take the Redondo Ace Hardware store and Marina District QFC as examples. We do not control whether a business makes money or not; the customers (or lack of customers) do. Both stores were only used as convenience stories, nothing more. Sorry, but you don't keep a QFC open when you average only 3 items sold per customer, when the chain-wide average is 13 items per customer and the average up at Manhattan Village in Normandy Park is 21 items per customer. That QFC was supposed to close 16 years before it did (when Kroger bought the chain), but they were also closing the store up at Midway Landing (now La Plaza) and didn't want to impact the community twice-over, so they kept it open until the cost of doing so was too much. The store was too small to meet the customers' needs. The community didn't shop their regularly enough to support it. Same thing with the Ace Hardware. People didn't shop there because Ace had limited inventory, and customers had to make multiple trips to different stores to get what they wanted. You can't keep full-sized stores open if people don't shop there. It's not the City's fault, or its elected officials, if people choose not to shop in certain stores. Sorry, but it isn't.
> >
> > Regarding the QFC block in the Marina District, the old QFC location is owned by one property owner and the strip mall and southern half of the block is owned by a second property owner. Both Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, staff, and I had a conversation with both owners. They both want to redevelop the block, but the rents aren't high enough yet for either the residential that would be built above, or for the commercial space that would be built at ground level, to support a development. As an MBA myself, I know that there's no property owner that I know of that let's a property sit vacant for more than two years

without renting out the space. Dollar Tree is renting out the space. While not what we would like to see there in the long run (we want to see another grocery, eventually), that will at least bring in some revenue to the City for the next few years. It's better than a huge empty, non-revenue generating store front, and it will change in time.

Regarding economic development generally, if you want to blame someone blame the first 45 years of City Councils (circa 1959 to 2004.) They're the ones who have held up things changing in the Marina District, primarily due to not wanting views to be impacted. Most development today requires slightly taller buildings to pencil out; prior City Councils were unwilling to do that. This City Council has raised building heights and provided incentives in the Marina District for developers to build and businesses to locate. There are no less than five or six projects that have submitted designs and will be submitting for building permits. Why is this important? Because the absentee landlords which have used their properties strictly for rent (and not maintained them well) will have to either upgrade or redevelop if they want to keep the renters they have, or to lure new businesses to the vacant spaces they have. The City Council passed an ordinance last fall to go after commercial property owners who are not maintaining their buildings. Changes have already started to occur. As but one example, the Bebe Nails building was knocked down and a new building will be going in.

Unfortunately, we've lost a number of businesses because there is no place to move into; no new retail space has been built yet. They WANT to stay here, but there is no affordable or adequate space to move into. That is changing, but not as fast as we would like. But that's what happens when slumlord commercial property owners were allowed to let their buildings fester for decades, and while those with residential views up on the hill refused to let even a small sliver of their view be impacted to allow for new development.

You don't turn a battleship on a dime. It's a long, slow gradual turn. That is what is happening here in Des Moines. And why is it happening at all? Because there's a City Council that understands that our City can't survive without revenues from the businesses that locate here ... including the ones we're working to attract to come here. In the past six years alone, we've: reviewed and implemented changes to our development regulations and permitting process to make them more streamlined; waived commercial parking requirements for the small lots in the Marina District; suspended the B&O tax for three years for any new business that pulls a business permit by December 31, 2015; and provided a height incentive for public benefits for new construction (which should help the Des Moines Theatre redevelop.) All of these things came from the current City Council, and are most definitely "progressive."

The Des Moines Creek Business Park is under development, and we're told it is about 80% leased out ... including the 1600 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration that are supposed to arrive in 2017. In Pacific Ridge, the Sheraton Fourpoint Hotel is nearing completion, and a number of other potential projects have come forward and submitted their plans for review. On Pacific Highway, south of Kent-Des Moines Road, Highline Place (next to Highline College) is in design review. NONE of these projects would have occurred but for the efforts of the City Council to make changes to allow for them.

Which brings us to the Woodmont Recovery Center.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone

claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Lastly, your perception that there is "nothing progressive" going on is because of catering to the seniors in our community. Nothing can be further from the truth. All of the steps we've been taking have been for the betterment of all residents in Des Moines. ALL residents.

Nothing good happens immediately. It takes planning, resources, and implementation before you begin to see things pan out. The steps we've taken are beginning to pan out, and soon we'll see the results.

Thank you again for expressing your concerns.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

Begin forwarded message:

From: john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines
Date: September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
To: mpina@desmoineswa.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines
Date: September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
To: dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov

I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR home).

I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.

i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

Subj: **RE: Drug Free zone question**
Date: 9/6/2015 9:15:18 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
To: mpina@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, penningtonvl@hotmail.com, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, TGeorge@desmoineswa.gov

Matt – we will look into it and hopefully have something to tell you by Thursday -

From: Matt Pina
Sent: Saturday, September 05, 2015 1:55 PM
To: Pat Bosmans
Cc: Tony Piasecki; Michael Matthias; Vic Pennington; Dave Kaplan
Subject: Drug Free zone question

Hi Pat,
I got some information today suggesting that Woodmont elementary was part of a drug free zone. It also notes that this designation carries a distance of 1000 feet from the school facility. Do we know if that's true? Is there a way we can find out? Not knowing all the specifics about drug free zones, if it is true that Woodmont Elementary is a drug free zone, then is it reasonable/legal that the Valley Cities facility would have a dispensary within that zone?

Your help with understanding this is appreciated.

Thanks,
Matt

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Subj: **Re: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
Date: 9/6/2015 8:28:49 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: johnblaue@gmail.com
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

Mr. Blaue,

Thank you for your email expressing a number of concerns. I'll try to answer them all.

There are some things the City and City Council are responsible for, and many we are not.

Take the Redondo Ace Hardware store and Marina District QFC as examples. We do not control whether a business makes money or not; the customers (or lack of customers) do. Both stores were only used as convenience stories, nothing more. Sorry, but you don't keep a QFC open when you average only 3 items sold per customer, when the chain-wide average is 13 items per customer and the average up at Manhattan Village in Normandy Park is 21 items per customer. That QFC was supposed to close 16 years before it did (when Kroger bought the chain), but they were also closing the store up at Midway Landing (now La Plaza) and didn't want to impact the community twice-over, so they kept it open until the cost of doing so was too much. The store was too small to meet the customers' needs. The community didn't shop their regularly enough to support it. Same thing with the Ace Hardware. People didn't shop there because Ace had limited inventory, and customers had to make multiple trips to different stores to get what they wanted. You can't keep full-sized stores open if people don't shop there. It's not the City's fault, or its elected officials, if people choose not to shop in certain stores. Sorry, but it isn't.

Regarding the QFC block in the Marina District, the old QFC location is owned by one property owner and the strip mall and southern half of the block is owned by a second property owner. Both Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, staff, and I had a conversation with both owners. They both want to redevelop the block, but the rents aren't high enough yet for either the residential that would be built above, or for the commercial space that would be built at ground level, to support a development. As an MBA myself, I know that there's no property owner that I know of that let's a property sit vacant for more than two years without renting out the space. Dollar Tree is renting out the space. While not what we would like to see there in the long run (we want to see another grocery, eventually), that will at least bring in some revenue to the City for the next few years. It's better than a huge empty, non-revenue generating store front, and it will change in time.

Regarding economic development generally, if you want to blame someone blame the first 45 years of City Councils (circa 1959 to 2004.) They're the ones who have held up things changing in the Marina District, primarily due to not wanting views to be impacted. Most development today requires slightly taller buildings to pencil out; prior City Councils were unwilling to do that. This City Council has raised building heights and provided incentives in the Marina District for developers to build and businesses to locate. There are no less than five or six projects that have submitted designs and will be submitting for building permits. Why is this important? Because the absentee landlords which have used their properties strictly for rent (and not maintained them well) will have to either upgrade or redevelop if they want to keep the renters they have, or to lure new businesses to the vacant spaces they have. The City Council passed an ordinance last fall to go after commercial property owners who are not maintaining their buildings. Changes have already started to occur. As but one example, the Bebe Nails building was knocked down and a new building will be going in.

Unfortunately, we've lost a number of businesses because there is no place to move into; no new retail space has been built yet. They WANT to stay here, but there is no affordable or adequate space to move into. That is changing, but not as fast as we would like. But that's what happens when slumlord commercial property owners were allowed to let their buildings fester for decades, and while those with residential views up on the hill refused to let even a small sliver of their view be impacted to allow for new development.

You don't turn a battleship on a dime. It's a long, slow gradual turn. That is what is happening here in Des Moines. And why is it happening at all? Because there's a City Council that understands that our City can't survive without revenues from the businesses that locate here ... including the ones we're working to attract to come here. In the past six years alone, we've: reviewed and implemented changes to our development regulations and permitting process to make them more streamlined; waived commercial parking requirements for the small lots in the Marina District; suspended the B&O tax for three years for any new business that pulls a

business permit by December 31, 2015; and provided a height incentive for public benefits for new construction (which should help the Des Moines Theatre redevelop.) All of these things came from the current City Council, and are most definitely "progressive."

The Des Moines Creek Business Park is under development, and we're told it is about 80% leased out ... including the 1600 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration that are supposed to arrive in 2017. In Pacific Ridge, the Sheraton Fourpoint Hotel is nearing completion, and a number of other potential projects have come forward and submitted their plans for review. On Pacific Highway, south of Kent-Des Moines Road, Highline Place (next to Highline College) is in design review. NONE of these projects would have occurred but for the efforts of the City Council to make changes to allow for them.

Which brings us to the Woodmont Recovery Center.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Lastly, your perception that there is "nothing progressive" going on is because of catering to the seniors in our community. Nothing can be further from the truth. All of the steps we've been taking have been for the betterment of all residents in Des Moines. ALL residents.

Nothing good happens immediately. It takes planning, resources, and implementation before you begin to see things pan out. The steps we've taken are beginning to pan out, and soon we'll see the results.

Thank you again for expressing your concerns.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 9:23:46 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, johnblaue@gmail.com writes:

> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:22:44 PM PDT
> **To:** mpina@desmoineswa.gov
>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> **From:** john blaue <johnblaue@gmail.com>
>> **Subject: I am astounded and even ashamed at the leadership of City of Des Moines**
>> **Date:** September 5, 2015 at 9:21:09 PM PDT
>> **To:** dkaplan@desmoineswagov.com, mpina@desmoineswagov.com, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vicpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
>>
>> I am a Naval Academy graduate with MBA, Navy veteran, business owner (in Kent), raised a daughter on Mercer Island (sold that property to build in Woodmont Beach....modest 2 BR home).
>>
>> I am astounded at how poorly the city has used its beautiful geographic location. Seemingly the only thing that thrives is Nail shops. Somehow you allow a Top Dollar as part of the community. The Ace Hardware closes. It takes forever to repair the Redondo boardwalk. When I compare what you have done compared to City of Burien I am envious of residents of Burien. I have wondered if you do NOTHING PROGRESSIVE because so much of your voting base lives in retirement homes and does not want anything progressive/expensive.
>>
>> i am further very disturbed that somehow you give a permit to a 5-building Recovery Center adjacent to the library and under a thousand feet from the Woodmont Elementary school. Just do NOT see how anyone capable

allows this trend of degradation to occur for citizens of Des Moines.

=

Subj: **Re: Drug Free zone question**
Date: 9/5/2015 4:04:20 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mpina@desmoineswa.gov

The drug free zone is regarding the sale and distribution of illegal drugs, not legal ones.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/5/2015 1:55:23 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, mpina@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Hi Pat,
> I got some information today suggesting that Woodmont elementary was part of a drug free zone. It also notes that this designation carries a distance of 1000 feet from the school facility. Do we know if that's true? Is there a way we can find out? Not knowing all the specifics about drug free zones, if it is true that Woodmont Elementary is a drug free zone, then is it reasonable/legal that the Valley Cities facility would have a dispensary within that zone?
>
> Your help with understanding this is appreciated.
>
> Thanks,
> Matt
>
> *Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID*

Subj: **Fwd: Kids before addicts**
Date: 9/5/2015 4:01:27 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mark.miloscia@leg.wa.gov

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: colleenwa@me.com, karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, mia.gregerson@leg.wa.gov, mark.miloscia@le.wa.gov, carol.gregory@leg.wa.gov, linda.kochmar@leg.wa.gov, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/5/2015 4:00:30 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Re: Kids before addicts

Mr. and Mrs. Washington,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recovery Center. I appreciate and understand the concerns you and those in the area have expressed.

I just want to make one important clarification: my comment about the City "screwing up" was not in relation to the siting of this facility (of which we have little to no say), but was solely in regard to letting more people know about it ... broader notice. My comment has nothing to do with the siting of the facility.

Also, there are a few points listed below that need correction.

First, regarding returning to the city of origin, I'm unsure where that "two bus pass" reference comes from, but it is not true. As with the SCORE jail, the involuntary commitments at this facility would be shuttled back to their community of origin or picked up by a relative. They would not be given bus passes and left to make their way home. That's untrue.

Second, Woodmont Elementary is 657ft from the property line, not the proposed methadone dispensary. It is further away than that. As currently outlined in their plans, the dispensary would be built on the Pacific Highway S side of the property.

Those corrections aside, please know that we are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 3:29:03 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, colleenwa@me.com writes:

Dear Representatives and Senators,

We are writing to inform you of our disappointment and concern for the consideration of Valley Cities here in our community of Woodmont located in the city of Des Moines.

While we firmly believe there is a great need for this facility in South King County, we are uncomfortable with the location and it is also the opinion of the Board that this rehabilitation campus will be a negative addition to Woodmont. Here are a few bullet points:

1. Valley Cities, a non-profit, has received a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the City of Des Moines to build a 5-Building campus on Pacific Highway near 272nd Street. This campus will be comprised of: a 16-Bed involuntary commitment evaluation and treatment facility, 42-Bed dependency recovery center, a "Recovery Cafe" (where patients who have been sober for 24-hours will come to commune with other newly sober patients), and a Methadone dispensary building that will operate 6 days a week. This will be the largest recovery campus in the state!

2. Woodmont Elementary School is 657 feet from the Methadone dispensary.

3. The campus is located next door to the Woodmont Library.

4. The campus will have an entry off of 16th Avenue. Their Traffic Impact Analysis estimates 1,500+ trips in and out of the facility every weekday and will dramatically alter traffic on 16th Avenue.

5. Valley Cities has only committed to controlling security on their campus. They operate with a "Return to City of Origin" policy that consists of 2 bus passes. If the bus passes are used, this will impact daily users.

6. The City of Des Moines currently staffs four police officers. The police office located at the Redondo Square shopping center is unstaffed.

7. The Des Moines City Council claims they are unable to prohibit Valley Cities from operating at this location. "The City screwed up," Mayor Dave Kaplan wrote following the August 18th Mayor's Meeting. When asked directly if he thought it was a good location, Mayor Kaplan responded, "No."

8. The Woodmont name will forever be associated with substance rehabilitation.

9. State Senator Karen Keiser allocated $5 million dollars of tax payer dollars to help with capital costs of this project.

10. Woodmont property values will be negatively compromised.

If Valley Cities is permitted to build and operate this campus, at this location, the face of our community will be forever changed. The total lack of regard for the Elementary school has caused many to fear that the long-term strategy is a relocation of Woodmont Elementary. The school property will leave our community vulnerable to further undesirable development.

Please do a land swap and move the Valley Cities to an area less situated around our precious children

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Michael and Colleen Washington

Subj: **Re: Kids before addicts**
Date: 9/5/2015 4:00:36 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: colleenwa@me.com, karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, mia.gregerson@leg.wa.gov, mark.miloscia@le.wa.gov, carol.gregory@leg.wa.gov, linda.kochmar@leg.wa.gov, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Mr. and Mrs. Washington,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recovery Center. I appreciate and understand the concerns you and those in the area have expressed.

I just want to make one important clarification: my comment about the City "screwing up" was not in relation to the siting of this facility (of which we have little to no say), but was solely in regard to letting more people know about it ... broader notice. My comment has nothing to do with the siting of the facility.

Also, there are a few points listed below that need correction.

First, regarding returning to the city of origin, I'm unsure where that "two bus pass" reference comes from, but it is not true. As with the SCORE jail, the involuntary commitments at this facility would be shuttled back to their community of origin or picked up by a relative. They would not be given bus passes and left to make their way home. That's untrue.

Second, Woodmont Elementary is 657ft from the property line, not the proposed methadone dispensary. It is further away than that. As currently outlined in their plans, the dispensary would be built on the Pacific Highway S side of the property.

Those corrections aside, please know that we are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 3:29:03 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, colleenwa@me.com writes:

> Dear Representatives and Senators,
>
> We are writing to inform you of our disappointment and concern for the consideration of Valley Cities here in our community of Woodmont located in the city of Des Moines.
>
> While we firmly believe there is a great need for this facility in South King County, we are uncomfortable with the location and it is also the opinion of the Board that this rehabilitation campus will be a negative addition to Woodmont. Here are a few bullet points:
>
> 1. Valley Cities, a non-profit, has received a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the City of Des Moines to build a 5-Building campus on Pacific Highway near 272nd Street. This campus will be comprised of: a 16-Bed involuntary commitment evaluation and treatment facility, 42-Bed dependency recovery center, a "Recovery

Cafe" (where patients who have been sober for 24-hours will come to commune with other newly sober patients), and a Methadone dispensary building that will operate 6 days a week. This will be the largest recovery campus in the state!

2. Woodmont Elementary School is 657 feet from the Methadone dispensary.

3. The campus is located next door to the Woodmont Library.

4. The campus will have an entry off of 16th Avenue. Their Traffic Impact Analysis estimates 1,500+ trips in and out of the facility every weekday and will dramatically alter traffic on 16th Avenue.

5. Valley Cities has only committed to controlling security on their campus. They operate with a "Return to City of Origin" policy that consists of 2 bus passes. If the bus passes are used, this will impact daily users.

6. The City of Des Moines currently staffs four police officers. The police office located at the Redondo Square shopping center is unstaffed.

7. The Des Moines City Council claims they are unable to prohibit Valley Cities from operating at this location. "The City screwed up," Mayor Dave Kaplan wrote following the August 18th Mayor's Meeting. When asked directly if he thought it was a good location, Mayor Kaplan responded, "No."

8. The Woodmont name will forever be associated with substance rehabilitation.

9. State Senator Karen Keiser allocated $5 million dollars of tax payer dollars to help with capital costs of this project.

10. Woodmont property values will be negatively compromised.

If Valley Cities is permitted to build and operate this campus, at this location, the face of our community will be forever changed. The total lack of regard for the Elementary school has caused many to fear that the long-term strategy is a relocation of Woodmont Elementary. The school property will leave our community vulnerable to further undesirable development.

Please do a land swap and move the Valley Cities to an area less situated around our precious children

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Michael and Colleen Washington
=

Subj: **Drug Free zone question**
Date: 9/5/2015 1:55:23 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: mpina@desmoineswa.gov
To: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, penningtonvl@hotmail.com, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Hi Pat,
I got some information today suggesting that Woodmont elementary was part of a drug free zone. It also notes that this designation carries a distance of 1000 feet from the school facility. Do we know if that's true? Is there a way we can find out? Not knowing all the specifics about drug free zones, if it is true that Woodmont Elementary is a drug free zone, then is it reasonable/legal that the Valley Cities facility would have a dispensary within that zone?

Your help with understanding this is appreciated.

Thanks,
Matt

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Subj: **Re: Kids before Addicts please**
Date: 9/5/2015 12:36:41 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: kristibrewer@hotmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Ms. Brewer,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this don't know what the they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/5/2015 11:39:03 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, kristibrewer@hotmail.com writes:

Hello,

I currently live in the Woodmont community and am so incredibly disappointed in the decision to build Valley Cities 5 Buildings, including a Methodone Clinic. I have a 2 1/2 year old son that I was planning to have attend Woodmont Elementary. Now I will be forced to move or try to come up with a way to afford private school. I cannot and will not expose my child to the dangers that will now be within 700 feet of his school. I am also appalled that this would not only be built by an elementary school, but also next to a library. This will also be lowering our property value which will lower property taxes in the area. We already have a high crime rate in Des Moines and little money funding our police department. This is only going to make things worse. I understand the need for such a facility, but this was not well thought out. Please reconsider and move this facility somewhere that is not next to a school, park or library. Admit the mistake that has been made and rectify it for our children and communities sake.

Kristi Brewer

=

Subj: **Kids before Addicts please**
Date: 9/5/2015 11:39:03 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: kristibrewer@hotmail.com

Hello,

I currently live in the Woodmont community and am so incredibly disappointed in the decision to build Valley Cities 5 Buildings, including a Methodone Clinic. I have a 2 1/2 year old son that I was planning to have attend Woodmont Elementary. Now I will be forced to move or try to come up with a way to afford private school. I cannot and will not expose my child to the dangers that will now be within 700 feet of his school. I am also appalled that this would not only be built by an elementary school, but also next to a library. This will also be lowering our property value which will lower property taxes in the area. We already have a high crime rate in Des Moines and little money funding our police department. This is only going to make things worse. I understand the need for such a facility, but this was not well thought out. Please reconsider and move this facility somewhere that is not next to a school, park or library. Admit the mistake that has been made and rectify it for our children and communities sake.

Kristi Brewer

=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Good Neighbor Agreement Committee**
Date: 9/4/2015 8:23:01 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com
CC: DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Will do
Dan another committee member
Thanks
Michael

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 4, 2015, at 8:11 PM, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

FYI. Please add him to the list of potential committee members.

Dave K.

From: Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/4/2015 5:23:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Good Neighbor Agreement Committee

Hello Mayor Kaplan,

If this project moves forward (I hope it does not), I would like to be involved in the Good Neighbor Agreement Committee.

Please continue the efforts available to you in preventing this facility so close to our Woodmont Elementary and our library.

Best Regards,

Kevin Hay

From: Kevin Hay
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 9:23 AM
To: 'DesMnsDave@aol.com'
Cc: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Subject: RE: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities

Hello Mayor Kaplan,

Thank you for your response and your continued efforts toward seeing that this facility is not located in the proposed location.

Best Regards,

-Kevin Hay

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 8:16 PM
To: Kevin Hay
Cc: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Subject: Re: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities

Mr. Hay,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

First, let me say thank you for the polite tone of your email. It stands in stark contrast with most of those I've received thus far. That is greatly appreciated.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. The City Council has had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan

Mayor & Councilmember

City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 1:00:38 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com writes:

> Hi Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I am a resident of Des Moines with a Kindergartener ready to attend Woodmont Elementry – No doubt you can guess my concern. I am very concerned about the choice to locate a large drug rehab, methadone clinic and mental health service facility 1000 feet away from my child's elementary school.
>
> I acknowledge the importance of this facility to our state. I am not opposed it being located in Des Moines, but this is certainly is not the correct location within our city for this facility.
>
> Please consider the following:

- As planned, the facility spans from Pacific Highway to 16th ave with access to the facility on both 16th and Pacific Highway.
- Methadone access is planned for the 16th ave side of the facility
- Woodmont Elementary is located on 16th ave.

Please, please, please visit this site in person in the morning on a school day – See the children arriving and walking to school - Imagine this environment with the addition of a dozens of former heroin addicts waiting outside the clinic as our kids walk to school. This is a dangerous situation by design – you are actively involved in the design of this very risky situation.

This choice will have consequences – the consequences will occur to our children. This cannot be the correct choice

As an aside, we understand our city does not have resources for extra police force to keep this dangerous disaster under control.

Please Help,

Kevin Hay

253-508-4075

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Good Neighbor Agreement Committee**
Date: 9/4/2015 8:11:31 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

FYI. Please add him to the list of potential committee members.

Dave K.

From: Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/4/2015 5:23:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Good Neighbor Agreement Committee

Hello Mayor Kaplan,

If this project moves forward (I hope it does not), I would like to be involved in the Good Neighbor Agreement Committee.

Please continue the efforts available to you in preventing this facility so close to our Woodmont Elementary and our library.

Best Regards,

Kevin Hay

From: Kevin Hay
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 9:23 AM
To: 'DesMnsDave@aol.com'
Cc: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Subject: RE: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities

Hello Mayor Kaplan,

Thank you for your response and your continued efforts toward seeing that this facility is not located in the proposed location.

Best Regards,

-Kevin Hay

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 8:16 PM
To: Kevin Hay
Cc: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Subject: Re: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities

Mr. Hay,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

First, let me say thank you for the polite tone of your email. It stands in stark contrast with most of those I've received thus far. That is greatly appreciated.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. The City Council has had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under

state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan

Mayor & Councilmember

City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 1:00:38 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com writes:

> Hi Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I am a resident of Des Moines with a Kindergartener ready to attend Woodmont Elementry – No doubt you can guess my concern. I am very concerned about the choice to locate a large drug rehab, methadone

clinic and mental health service facility 1000 feet away from my child's elementary school.

I acknowledge the importance of this facility to our state. I am not opposed it being located in Des Moines, but this is certainly is not the correct location within our city for this facility.

Please consider the following:

- As planned, the facility spans from Pacific Highway to 16th ave with access to the facility on both 16th and Pacific Highway.
- Methadone access is planned for the 16th ave side of the facility
- Woodmont Elementary is located on 16th ave.

Please, please, please visit this site in person in the morning on a school day – See the children arriving and walking to school - Imagine this environment with the addition of a dozens of former heroin addicts waiting outside the clinic as our kids walk to school. This is a dangerous situation by design – you are actively involved in the design of this very risky situation.

This choice will have consequences – the consequences will occur to our children. This cannot be the correct choice

As an aside, we understand our city does not have resources for extra police force to keep this dangerous disaster under control.

Please Help,

Kevin Hay

253-508-4075

Subj: **Fwd: Accepted: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/4/2015 6:42:33 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Miloscia, Sen. Mark" <Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov>
> **To:** "Michael Matthias" <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Subject: Accepted: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery**
Date: 9/4/2015 1:36:35 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

FYI. Another name for the list.

Dave K.

From: steinmetz5@comcast.net
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/3/2015 4:39:55 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Re: Woodmont Recovery

Thank you for your response.
If the project does come to completion, I would be interested in participating on the committee. My background is in mental health treatment and I have experience as a provider and administrator of inpatient hospital units.
Thank you
Kristin Steinmetz

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 7:59 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

Kristin,

Thank you for your thoughtful email regarding the Woodmont Recovery Center. I understand and appreciate your concerns.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any

potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

Regarding the E&T facility (the knot), my understanding is that Valley Cities would not be running that facility, but would contract with Navos to actually run it. My understanding is that Navos has experience running such facilities in a safe, responsible manner. You would have to ask Valley Cities to confirm whether Navos is who would be running that unit.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Would you be interested in serving on that Committee?

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 9:19:01 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, steinmetz5@comcast.net writes:

> I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines. I do not support the plan to build what is being called the Woodmont Recovery Center.
>
> First-I do not believe this is an appropriate location. I am offended that Valley Cities started there were only two viable locations in all of S. King County. That seems ridiculous.
>
> Secondly-I donor believe our city is prepared to support this project. I have been the clinical director of inpatient psychiatric units for both private non-profit as well as DSHS. While Valley Cities is a strong organization they do not have experience running an knot unit. They will call police for support.
>
> Lastly, j understand current funding only supports the E&T. However once that is in, it appears there will be no stopping the rest.
>
> Kristin Steinmetz
> 206-293-0576
> Sent from my iPhone=

Subj: **Re: Drug Rehab Campus**
Date: 9/3/2015 11:22:09 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: bayberries2@comcast.net
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Thank you for your quick response. I contacted you and our Senator. Haven't heard from her yet. From your response I'm having low expectations that she will have much more to offer. I'm wondering just who is ultimately in charge here. Small wonder about current cynicism with government.
M Berry

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: bayberries2@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2015 11:29:39 AM
Subject: Re: Drug Rehab Campus

Mr. Berry,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In

February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/3/2015 10:18:24 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, bayberries2@comcast.net writes:

> The subject facility to be built near Woodmont Elementary!!
> How in Gods name did you and the city fathers allow this to happen?? Suggests you have no clout! Likewise with our State senator Ms Keiser.
> That's what elections are for.
> M Berry (47 yr. resident)
>
> Sent from my iPhone=

Subj: **Drug Rehab Programs.**
Date: 9/3/2015 4:52:23 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: castrolnj@hotmail.com
To: karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov, gdelgado@desmoineswa.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov, mia.gregerson@leg.wa.gov
CC: kcexec@kingcounty.gov, pete.vonreichbauer@kingcounty.gov, dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov

Please, read this so that everyone knows just what we are getting ourselves into.
http://www.lifescript.com/health/news/reuters/2015/09/02/renowned_us_drug-rehab_program_spun_out_of_control.aspx

The Castronover's

Sent from my iPad

Subj: **Re: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities**
Date: 9/3/2015 9:47:24 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Thank you!!!

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 9:19 AM, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

> Just chatted with him on the phone, and sent him the handout we used at the last meeting (updated from my talking notes at the Woodmont mtg on August 18th. He's fine for now.
>
> Tony ... relax and enjoy the rest of your vacation. PLEASE!
>
> There will be more than enough to chew on after you return.
>
> Dave K.

In a message dated 9/3/2015 9:06:45 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave, what do you suggest?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Sep 3, 2015, at 8:49 AM, Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
>
> > Dave has already addressed this issue in some of his earlier email responses. Dave do you want to forward one of those to Jack?
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > On Sep 3, 2015, at 8:29 AM, "Tony Piasecki" <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
> >
> > > Anything we can do to help clarify the situation?
> > >
> > > Sent from my iPhone
> > >
> > > Begin forwarded message:
> > >
> > > **From:** Jack Mayne <jgmayne@gmail.com>
> > > **Date:** September 2, 2015 at 3:32:31 PM PDT
> > > **To:** Scott Schaefer <editor@b-townblog.com>
> > > **Subject: Fwd: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities**
> > >
> > > It continues to be a fact that no one, at any state agency, or King County agency, wants to give us a definitive answer on siting of Essential Public Facilities. I will follow some of these sources, then write a story that, as of now, will says everybody is confused and no one wants to be the person making the decision, so, in effect, "good luck Des Moines and see ya!"
> > >
> > > Jack Mayne
> > > Senior Writer
> > >
> > > B-Town Blog,
> > > SeaTac Blog,
> > > Waterland Blog,
> > > Normandy Park Blog,
> > > White Center Blog
> > >
> > > jgmayne@gmail.com
> > > Home/Office 206.274.6069
> > > Mobile: 206.369.6328
> > >
> > > Begin forwarded message:
> > >
> > > **From:** "Winans, Joby (DOH)" <Joby.Winans@doh.wa.gov>
> > > **Date:** September 2, 2015 3:17:08 PM PDT
> > > **To:** "jgmayne@gmail.com" <jgmayne@gmail.com>

Subject: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

Mr. Mayne,

Thank you for your e-mail below. While I appreciate that it appears you have been sent around through various agencies, I am afraid I will have to do the same, so as to ensure you properly receive the information you request.

While the Department of Health plays a role in the licensure of various types of treatment facilities, the placement of those facilities is outside of our purview. Below is a link to a book entitled "Resource Book - Washington State Residential Treatment Facility." The Department of Health published this book in 2006 (this is the most current version) and I hope you will find some of this information useful:

http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/Documents/Pubs/973001.pdf

In your e-mail you noted the expression "essential public facilities." As you are probably thus aware, RCW 36.70A.200 is the statute on point regarding the siting of such facilities:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70a.200

Chapter 36.70A of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) deals directly on point with the Growth Management Act; likewise, Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-196-550, entitled "Essential public facilities," addresses the type of facility you note below. Here is a link to that WAC:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=365-196-550

Title 365 of the WAC falls under the direction of the Washington State Department of Commerce; their website has an entire section devoted specifically to the Growth Management Act.

http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Services/localgovernment/GrowthManagement/Pages/default.aspx

The Department of Commerce has points of contact by region; for the Western Region they have appointed Jeffrey S. Wilson, AICP, Senior Managing Director, who can be reached at Jeff.Wilson@Commerce.wa.gov or 360-725-3055. I would suggest contacting his office for some of the information you seek.

I am sorry I cannot provide further information, but the Growth Management Act and the laws and rules – and the hearings processes therein – are outside the area of expertise of the Department of Health and I would rather ensure you are provided the proper guidance from the appropriate agency.

I hope you find this information helpful.

Respectfully,

- Joby

Joby Winans | Director of Communications | Washington Department of Health | (360) 236-4077 | joby.winans@doh.wa.gov
Washington Department of Health: working with others to protect and improve the health of all people in Washington State.

From: Jack Mayne [mailto:jgmayne@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 2:14 PM
To: Winans, Joby (DOH)
Cc: Allen, Marqise D (DOH)
Subject: Question re siting of essential public facilities
Importance: High

No state or county official wants to answer this, so I am trying your department.

I need an authoritative source on Essential public facilities statutes. A Des Moines hearing examiner has approved a large facility in the southern part of the city, closely adjacent to Federal Way and Kent. The mayor did handle the matter badly, but now a large group of people are demanding the facility be denied and forbidden from moving to the city and it not be allowed to build its project.

Attached are two of my latest stories on the subject to answer any questions. I am available at the numbers and addresses herewith.

I want to talk with a person who can tell me if there truly is no path for the citizens of the community? Did the hearing examiner and city act legally. What action can the protestors legally and appropriately take.

This matter, as you can imagine, is full of invective and scare mongering. I am trying to present facts to at least keep the pitchforks away.

http://waterlandblog.com/2015/08/24/letter-to-the-editor-we-screwed-up/

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Subj: **RE: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities**
Date: 9/3/2015 9:23:02 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Hello Mayor Kaplan,

Thank you for your response and your continued efforts toward seeing that this facility is not located in the proposed location.

Best Regards,

-Kevin Hay

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 8:16 PM
To: Kevin Hay
Cc: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Subject: Re: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities

Mr. Hay,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

First, let me say thank you for the polite tone of your email. It stands in stark contrast with most of those I've received thus far. That is greatly appreciated.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. The City Council has had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 1:00:38 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com writes:

> Hi Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I am a resident of Des Moines with a Kindergartener ready to attend Woodmont Elementry – No doubt you can guess my concern. I am very concerned about the choice to locate a large drug rehab, methadone clinic and mental health service facility 1000 feet away from my child's elementary school.
>
> I acknowledge the importance of this facility to our state. I am not opposed it being located in Des Moines, but this is certainly is not the correct location within our city for this facility.

Please consider the following:

As planned, the facility spans from Pacific Highway to 16th ave with access to the facility on both 16th and Pacific Highway.

Methadone access is planned for the 16th ave side of the facility

Woodmont Elementary is located on 16th ave.

Please, please, please visit this site in person in the morning on a school day – See the children arriving and walking to school - Imagine this environment with the addition of a dozens of former heroin addicts waiting outside the clinic as our kids walk to school. This is a dangerous situation by design – you are actively involved in the design of this very risky situation.

This choice will have consequences – the consequences will occur to our children. This cannot be the correct choice

As an aside, we understand our city does not have resources for extra police force to keep this dangerous disaster under control.

Please Help,

Kevin Hay
253-508-4075

Subj: **(no subject)**
Date: 9/3/2015 9:09:43 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: jgmayne@gmail.com

Woodmont Recovery Campus Project Overview

Description of Project

Applicant: Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation (Valley Cities)

Proposed Project: The proposed project will provide a Medical and Mental Health Recovery Campus located in the Woodmont Neighborhood along Pacific Highway S (refer to Figure 1). The campus will consist of five (5) buildings: a Detox Facility of 25,340 square feet (SF), with 40 total beds; an Evaluation & Treatment Facility of 19,665 SF, with 24 total beds; a 34,160 SF main office building with 19,160 SF of medical office space and 15,000 SF of administrative office space; a Dispensary Clinic of 7,200 SF; and the Commons meeting facility of 8,340 SF providing space for clean and sober recovering addicts space for AA meetings and other supportive services to assist in the recovery process.

Property Description and Zoning: The project is located on two parcels (refer to Figure 2). The primary parcel (PIN 2822049045) is a 313,631 SF vacant property located at 26915 Pacific Highway South (Property A). The secondary property (2822049012) is located at 26852 16th Avenue South and currently has a single family home on the site (Property B).

At the time of application, Property A was zoned C-C Community Commercial and Property B was zoned RS 7,200 Residential Single Family. The proposed use is classified as "Hospitals (mental and alcoholic)" which is a permitted use in the C-C zone subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The use is also classified as an "essential public facility" pursuant to state law.

Essential Public Facilities: Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.200, essential public facilities are "those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020."

RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." The Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.040) requires that counties and cities planning under the Revised Code of Washington include a process for the identification and siting of "essential public facilities". The Conditional Use Permit is the process by which the City of Des Moines evaluates and permits essential public facilities.

A conditional use permit is processed as a Type III land use action as set forth in Chapter 18.20 DMMC with the decision made by the Hearing Examiner.

Review Timeline

Application Date: December 2, 2014

Notice of Complete Application Issued: December 12, 2014

Mitigated SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance Issued: February 2, 2015. Provided for a 15 day comment period followed by 10 day appeal period.

- Mailed notice to properties within 600 feet of the site (expanded from 300 feet).
- Provided notice to public review agencies that included Federal Way Public Schools (FWPS).
- Also provided notice to the principal of Woodmont Elementary School.
- City was contacted by the Federal Way Superintendent Sally Mclean and the Washington State Assistant Superintendent Dan Newell; however, no formal comments on the Mitigated DNS were received from either FWPS or the Superintendent Newell.
- Five comments were received during the public comment period. The City provided a response dated March 3, 2015.
- The SEPA appeal period was extended to April 16, 2015 following comments received from the City of Kent regarding potential traffic impacts and requests for additional analysis. A revised Traffic Impact Analysis was completed by Heath and Associates and submitted to the City on March 2, 2015 for distribution.
- No appeals to the MDNS were received.

Public Hearing before Hearing Examiner: April 3, 2015. Seventeen (17) individuals presented testimony.

Hearing Examiner Decision: April 18, 2015, the Hearing Examiner issued a decision of approval subject to eleven conditions (see pages 13-15 of the HE decision). Several conditions of note are:

1. Valley Cities shall enter into a separate agreement with the City of Des Moines to mitigate the impacts on public services. This agreement shall be approved by Valley Cities and the City a minimum of five (5) months prior to the City issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. Included in this agreement shall be a "return to the city of origin" language. Valley Cities shall not receive a Certificate of Occupancy or final inspections from the City until the agreement has been approved by both parties.

9. All mitigation measures associated with the Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance are incorporated into the CUP approval.

10. No expansion of the facility (such as adding additional beds) or change in patient profiles (such as treating sex offenders) shall occur without formal revision of the CUP.

11. Within two months following one year after the mental health treatment facility has been operational, the City shall reopen this hearing to determine whether the conditions above mitigate the impacts of the proposal such that the use is not unreasonably incompatible with permitted land uses in surrounding areas. Traffic concerns and the potential need for signalization on Pacific Highway should also be addressed at that time.

Design Review Application: In progress.

Subj: **Re: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities**
Date: 9/3/2015 9:06:45 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
CC: desmnsdave@aol.com, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Dave, what do you suggest?

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 8:49 AM, Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Dave has already addressed this issue in some of his earlier email responses. Dave do you want to forward one of those to Jack?

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 8:29 AM, "Tony Piasecki" <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Anything we can do to help clarify the situation?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jack Mayne <jgmayne@gmail.com>
Date: September 2, 2015 at 3:32:31 PM PDT
To: Scott Schaefer <editor@b-townblog.com>
Subject: Fwd: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

It continues to be a fact that no one, at any state agency, or King County agency, wants to give us a definitive answer on siting of Essential Public Facilities. I will follow some of these sources, then write a story that, as of now, will says everybody is confused and no one wants to be the person making the decision, so, in effect, "good luck Des Moines and see ya!"

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Winans, Joby (DOH)" <Joby.Winans@doh.wa.gov>
Date: September 2, 2015 3:17:08 PM PDT
To: "jgmayne@gmail.com" <jgmayne@gmail.com>
Subject: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

Mr. Mayne,

Thank you for your e-mail below. While I appreciate that it appears you have been sent around through various agencies, I am afraid I will have to do the same, so as to ensure you properly receive

the information you request.

While the Department of Health plays a role in the licensure of various types of treatment facilities, the placement of those facilities is outside of our purview. Below is a link to a book entitled "Resource Book - Washington State Residential Treatment Facility." The Department of Health published this book in 2006 (this is the most current version) and I hope you will find some of this information useful:

http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/Documents/Pubs/973001.pdf

In your e-mail you noted the expression "essential public facilities." As you are probably thus aware, RCW 36.70A.200 is the statute on point regarding the siting of such facilities:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70a.200

Chapter 36.70A of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) deals directly on point with the Growth Management Act; likewise, Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-196-550, entitled "Essential public facilities," addresses the type of facility you note below. Here is a link to that WAC:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=365-196-550

Title 365 of the WAC falls under the direction of the Washington State Department of Commerce; their website has an entire section devoted specifically to the Growth Management Act.

http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Services/localgovernment/GrowthManagement/Pages/default.aspx

The Department of Commerce has points of contact by region; for the Western Region they have appointed Jeffrey S. Wilson, AICP, Senior Managing Director, who can be reached at Jeff.Wilson@Commerce.wa.gov or 360-725-3055. I would suggest contacting his office for some of the information you seek.

I am sorry I cannot provide further information, but the Growth Management Act and the laws and rules – and the hearings processes therein – are outside the area of expertise of the Department of Health and I would rather ensure you are provided the proper guidance from the appropriate agency.

I hope you find this information helpful.

Respectfully,

- Joby

Joby Winans | Director of Communications | Washington Department of Health | (360) 236-4077 | joby.winans@doh.wa.gov
Washington Department of Health: working with others to protect and improve the health of all people in Washington State.

From: Jack Mayne [mailto:jgmayne@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 2:14 PM
To: Winans, Joby (DOH)
Cc: Allen, Marqise D (DOH)
Subject: Question re siting of essential public facilities
Importance: High

No state or county official wants to answer this, so I am trying your department.

I need an authoritative source on Essential public facilities statutes. A Des Moines hearing examiner has approved a large facility in the southern part of the city, closely adjacent to Federal Way and Kent. The mayor did handle the matter badly, but now a large group of people are demanding the facility be denied and forbidden from moving to the city and it not be allowed to build its project.

Attached are two of my latest stories on the subject to answer any questions. I am available at the numbers and addresses herewith.

I want to talk with a person who can tell me if there truly is no path for the citizens of the community? Did the hearing examiner and city act legally. What action can the protestors legally and appropriately take.

This matter, as you can imagine, is full of invective and scare mongering. I am trying to present facts to at least keep the pitchforks away.

http://waterlandblog.com/2015/08/24/letter-to-the-editor-we-screwed-up/

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Subj: **RE: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities**
Date: 9/3/2015 8:53:38 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, desmnsdave@aol.com

I would be happy to respond but I don't know what the question is. Is he asking us what went into the siting decision – that is how many others sites did they look at before choosing Des Moines, etc?? That info would have to come from Valley Cities -

From: Michael Matthias
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 8:50 AM
To: Tony Piasecki; Kaplan Home
Cc: Pat Bosmans
Subject: Re: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

Dave has already addressed this issue in some of his earlier email responses. Dave do you want to forward one of those to Jack?

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 8:29 AM, "Tony Piasecki" <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

> Anything we can do to help clarify the situation?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> > **From:** Jack Mayne <jgmayne@gmail.com>
> > **Date:** September 2, 2015 at 3:32:31 PM PDT
> > **To:** Scott Schaefer <editor@b-townblog.com>
> > **Subject: Fwd: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities**
> >
> > It continues to be a fact that no one, at any state agency, or King County agency, wants to give us a definitive answer on siting of Essential Public Facilities. I will follow some of these sources, then write a story that, as of now, will says everybody is confused and no one wants to be the person making the decision, so, in effect, "good luck Des Moines and see ya!"
> >
> > Jack Mayne
> > Senior Writer
> >
> > B-Town Blog,
> > SeaTac Blog,
> > Waterland Blog,
> > Normandy Park Blog,
> > White Center Blog
> >
> > jgmayne@gmail.com
> > Home/Office 206.274.6069
> > Mobile: 206.369.6328

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Winans, Joby (DOH)" <Joby.Winans@doh.wa.gov>
Date: September 2, 2015 3:17:08 PM PDT
To: "jgmayne@gmail.com" <jgmayne@gmail.com>
Subject: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

Mr. Mayne,

Thank you for your e-mail below. While I appreciate that it appears you have been sent around through various agencies, I am afraid I will have to do the same, so as to ensure you properly receive the information you request.

While the Department of Health plays a role in the licensure of various types of treatment facilities, the placement of those facilities is outside of our purview. Below is a link to a book entitled "Resource Book - Washington State Residential Treatment Facility." The Department of Health published this book in 2006 (this is the most current version) and I hope you will find some of this information useful:

http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/Documents/Pubs/973001.pdf

In your e-mail you noted the expression "essential public facilities." As you are probably thus aware, RCW 36.70A.200 is the statute on point regarding the siting of such facilities:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70a.200

Chapter 36.70A of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) deals directly on point with the Growth Management Act; likewise, Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-196-550, entitled "Essential public facilities," addresses the type of facility you note below. Here is a link to that WAC:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=365-196-550

Title 365 of the WAC falls under the direction of the Washington State Department of Commerce; their website has an entire section devoted specifically to the Growth Management Act.

http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Services/localgovernment/GrowthManagement/Pages/default.aspx

The Department of Commerce has points of contact by region; for the Western Region they have appointed Jeffrey S. Wilson, AICP, Senior Managing Director, who can be reached at Jeff.Wilson@Commerce.wa.gov or 360-725-3055. I would suggest contacting his office for some of the information you seek.

I am sorry I cannot provide further information, but the Growth Management Act and the laws and

rules – and the hearings processes therein – are outside the area of expertise of the Department of Health and I would rather ensure you are provided the proper guidance from the appropriate agency.

I hope you find this information helpful.

Respectfully,

- Joby

Joby Winans | Director of Communications | Washington Department of Health | (360) 236-4077 | joby.winans@doh.wa.gov
Washington Department of Health: working with others to protect and improve the health of all people in Washington State.

From: Jack Mayne [mailto:jgmayne@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 2:14 PM
To: Winans, Joby (DOH)
Cc: Allen, Marqise D (DOH)
Subject: Question re siting of essential public facilities
Importance: High

No state or county official wants to answer this, so I am trying your department.

I need an authoritative source on Essential public facilities statutes. A Des Moines hearing examiner has approved a large facility in the southern part of the city, closely adjacent to Federal Way and Kent. The mayor did handle the matter badly, but now a large group of people are demanding the facility be denied and forbidden from moving to the city and it not be allowed to build its project.

Attached are two of my latest stories on the subject to answer any questions. I am available at the numbers and addresses herewith.

I want to talk with a person who can tell me if there truly is no path for the citizens of the community? Did the hearing examiner and city act legally. What action can the protestors legally and appropriately take.

This matter, as you can imagine, is full of invective and scare mongering. I am trying to present facts to at least keep the pitchforks away.

http://waterlandblog.com/2015/08/24/letter-to-the-editor-we-screwed-up/

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Subj: **Re: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities**
Date: 9/3/2015 8:49:36 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, desmnsdave@aol.com
CC: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Dave has already addressed this issue in some of his earlier email responses. Dave do you want to forward one of those to Jack?

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 8:29 AM, "Tony Piasecki" <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Anything we can do to help clarify the situation?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jack Mayne <jgmayne@gmail.com>
Date: September 2, 2015 at 3:32:31 PM PDT
To: Scott Schaefer <editor@b-townblog.com>
Subject: Fwd: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

It continues to be a fact that no one, at any state agency, or King County agency, wants to give us a definitive answer on siting of Essential Public Facilities. I will follow some of these sources, then write a story that, as of now, will says everybody is confused and no one wants to be the person making the decision, so, in effect, "good luck Des Moines and see ya!"

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Winans, Joby (DOH)" <Joby.Winans@doh.wa.gov>
Date: September 2, 2015 3:17:08 PM PDT
To: "jgmayne@gmail.com" <jgmayne@gmail.com>
Subject: Response to question re siting of essential public facilities

Mr. Mayne,

Thank you for your e-mail below. While I appreciate that it appears you have been sent around

through various agencies, I am afraid I will have to do the same, so as to ensure you properly receive the information you request.

While the Department of Health plays a role in the licensure of various types of treatment facilities, the placement of those facilities is outside of our purview. Below is a link to a book entitled "Resource Book - Washington State Residential Treatment Facility." The Department of Health published this book in 2006 (this is the most current version) and I hope you will find some of this information useful:

http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/Documents/Pubs/973001.pdf

In your e-mail you noted the expression "essential public facilities." As you are probably thus aware, RCW 36.70A.200 is the statute on point regarding the siting of such facilities:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70a.200

Chapter 36.70A of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) deals directly on point with the Growth Management Act; likewise, Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-196-550, entitled "Essential public facilities," addresses the type of facility you note below. Here is a link to that WAC:

http://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=365-196-550

Title 365 of the WAC falls under the direction of the Washington State Department of Commerce; their website has an entire section devoted specifically to the Growth Management Act.

http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Services/localgovernment/GrowthManagement/Pages/default.aspx

The Department of Commerce has points of contact by region; for the Western Region they have appointed Jeffrey S. Wilson, AICP, Senior Managing Director, who can be reached at Jeff.Wilson@Commerce.wa.gov or 360-725-3055. I would suggest contacting his office for some of the information you seek.

I am sorry I cannot provide further information, but the Growth Management Act and the laws and rules – and the hearings processes therein – are outside the area of expertise of the Department of Health and I would rather ensure you are provided the proper guidance from the appropriate agency.

I hope you find this information helpful.

Respectfully,

- Joby

Joby Winans | Director of Communications | Washington Department of Health | (360) 236-4077 | joby.winans@doh.wa.gov
Washington Department of Health: working with others to protect and improve the health of all people in Washington State.

From: Jack Mayne [mailto:jgmayne@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 2:14 PM
To: Winans, Joby (DOH)
Cc: Allen, Marqise D (DOH)
Subject: Question re siting of essential public facilities
Importance: High

No state or county official wants to answer this, so I am trying your department.

I need an authoritative source on Essential public facilities statutes. A Des Moines hearing examiner has approved a large facility in the southern part of the city, closely adjacent to Federal Way and Kent. The mayor did handle the matter badly, but now a large group of people are demanding the facility be denied and forbidden from moving to the city and it not be allowed to build its project.

Attached are two of my latest stories on the subject to answer any questions. I am available at the numbers and addresses herewith.

I want to talk with a person who can tell me if there truly is no path for the citizens of the community? Did the hearing examiner and city act legally. What action can the protestors legally and appropriately take.

This matter, as you can imagine, is full of invective and scare mongering. I am trying to present facts to at least keep the pitchforks away.

http://waterlandblog.com/2015/08/24/letter-to-the-editor-we-screwed-up/

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Subj: **Re: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
Date: 9/3/2015 8:49:06 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Thanks Dave. Good advice.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 3, 2015, at 7:45 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

> Luisa,
>
> I've not responded to her email to me yet, though she didn't ask me for a meeting.
>
> My suggestion is to call her up and chat with her. Listen to what her concerns are, take good notes, and tell her you'll share those with the administration and Mayor so they'll have them in mind when they meet with Valley Cities regarding the project.
>
> Don't commit to anything except that, and I think you should do fine.
>
> If she asks if you will help fight for the community, tell her that Valley Cities has the legal right to build that facility, and as an elected official you have to uphold the law, but that you're committed to working to see if we can get enough pressure on Valley Cities to move it or get rid of the methadone dispensary.
>
> You should tell her that all of the Councilmembers have heard the concerns of the community, and the City is exploring the options available to either move or mitigate the facility ... including getting Valley Cities to not build the methadone dispensary.
>
> Dave K.
>
> In a message dated 9/3/2015 7:12:25 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:
>
> > Dave
> > With such controversy around this issue I am reluctant to meet without you or Matt
> > Your thoughts before I answer her
> > Luisa
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > Begin forwarded message:
> >
> > > **Resent-From:** <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> > > **From:** Kristin Steinmetz <steinmetz5@comcast.net>
> > > **Date:** September 2, 2015 at 10:28:18 PM PDT
> > > **To:** "lbangs@desmoineswa.gov" <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> > > **Subject: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
> > >
> > > Good evening,
> > >
> > > I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines and I am very concerned about the location of the proposed rehabilitation center and other treatment services.
> > >
> > > I am writing to request an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this topic and the potential implications to our city.
> > >
> > > I look forward to hearing from you.

Kristin Steinmetz
917 S 258th Pl
Des Moines, WA 98198
206-293-0576

=

Subj: **Re: Letter to Dave Kaplan**
Date: 9/3/2015 8:11:34 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: castrolnj@hotmail.com
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Dave, so why don't we leave it at that you say? This is a serious community changing Tragedy that is taking place, I will oppose this with everything I have as my daughters safety is at risk as is the safety of everyone's child in our city, NO I will not leave it at that, you will hear from me every single day till the very end Dave, we bought our home here and are raising our daughter here, to have Severely Mentally Disturbed Homeless Drug Addicts coming to our neighborhood is unacceptable!

Dave, this was on last nights news, I challenge you to watch it, it's the future of our city.
Des Moines Sails With Pride?

http://q13fox.com/2015/09/02/everett-mom-on-a-crusade-to-clean-up-entire-community-of-used-needles

The Castronover's
John,Laura and Gaby

John,

I understand and appreciate the concerns you have regarding this facility. I do!

What I'm sick and tired of is your unfounded, endless accusations and conspiracy theories. I have NEVER threatened you, so stop with that false accusations. And yes, I'm entitled to my opinion too.

I've stated numerous times that I didn't want this facility, even though they are legally allowed to build it. I'm sworn as an elected official to uphold the law. What don't you understand?

I have no idea what you mean about "choose to continue to have no communication with the citizens over this matter." We've had a community meeting (over 250 attendees) where everyone's concerns have been registered. Community members weighed in at the following Council meeting. We're working with electeds to identify options before coming back to the community. And I've been answering phone calls and emails from people expressing their concerns about the facility. So what are you talking about?

You act as if I've not heard the concerns, when I have. You seem to think we (the Council) have unlimited power to change things, when we don't. We're working to identify the options to either get this facility moved or further mitigated. There are no guarantees. Why? Because Valley Cities can legally build that facility, and only some political leverage may get them to move or make changes to the services they offer there.

Nothing I say or do is ever going to be acceptable to you, so why don't we leave it at that.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/2/2015 11:49:35 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, castrolnj@hotmail.com writes:

> Dave, my email to you speaks for itself, you Dave Kaplan and our entire city government here in Des Moines have lost all confidence and credibility with many of us who you represent over this Clinic, how it was handled nothing less then a travesty that the citizens of Des Moines will never forget, understand we are extremely frustrated over this whole mess.
>
> You can stay sick and tired all you want send me nasty threatening emails C.C the Governor if you wish, the fact of the matter is our city will have severely mentally disturbed drug addicts walking our streets coming and going from this clinic loitering in our neighborhoods as our children walk to and from school and play in front of their homes coming in contact with these people, as you may recall at your "Mayors" meeting we heard from two professional
> You choose to continue to have no communication with the citizens over this matter is crazy other then your standard spin you have gotten so at ease with " this never came before council " " state law won't let us " " our hands are tied " well untie them! When someone's kid comes up missing is that going to be your statement to the media?
> Look Dave we are extremely frustrated we are fighting for our kids here O.K, again if that makes you sick and tired and mad so what!, what did you expect? myself and everyone else will fight for our kids safety till the very end because you and no one else at city hall will! Good Day Mayor
>
> John,Laura and our 11 yr old daughter Gaby
>
> Sent from
> my iPad

Subj: **Re: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
Date: 9/3/2015 7:45:43 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
CC: desmnsdave@aol.com

Luisa,

I've not responded to her email to me yet, though she didn't ask me for a meeting.

My suggestion is to call her up and chat with her. Listen to what her concerns are, take good notes, and tell her you'll share those with the administration and Mayor so they'll have them in mind when they meet with Valley Cities regarding the project.

Don't commit to anything except that, and I think you should do fine.

If she asks if you will help fight for the community, tell her that Valley Cities has the legal right to build that facility, and as an elected official you have to uphold the law, but that you're committed to working to see if we can get enough pressure on Valley Cities to move it or get rid of the methadone dispensary.

You should tell her that all of the Councilmembers have heard the concerns of the community, and the City is exploring the options available to either move or mitigate the facility ... including getting Valley Cities to not build the methadone dispensary.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/3/2015 7:12:25 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:

> Dave
> With such controversy around this issue I am reluctant to meet without you or Matt
> Your thoughts before I answer her
> Luisa
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> > **Resent-From:** <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> > **From:** Kristin Steinmetz <steinmetz5@comcast.net>
> > **Date:** September 2, 2015 at 10:28:18 PM PDT
> > **To:** "lbangs@desmoineswa.gov" <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> > **Subject: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
> >
> > Good evening,
> >
> > I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines and I am very concerned about the location of the proposed rehabilitation center and other treatment services.
> >
> > I am writing to request an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this topic and the potential implications to our city.
> >
> > I look forward to hearing from you.
> >
> > Kristin Steinmetz
> > 917 S 258th Pl
> > Des Moines, WA 98198
> > 206-293-0576
>
> =

Subj: **Fwd: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
Date: 9/3/2015 7:12:25 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Dave
With such controversy around this issue I am reluctant to meet without you or Matt
Your thoughts before I answer her
Luisa

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **Resent-From:** <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> **From:** Kristin Steinmetz <steinmetz5@comcast.net>
> **Date:** September 2, 2015 at 10:28:18 PM PDT
> **To:** "lbangs@desmoineswa.gov" <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Subject: Proposed Rehabilitation Center**
>
> Good evening,
>
> I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines and I am very concerned about the location of the proposed rehabilitation center and other treatment services.
>
> I am writing to request an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this topic and the potential implications to our city.
>
> I look forward to hearing from you.
>
> Kristin Steinmetz
> 917 S 258th Pl
> Des Moines, WA 98198
> 206-293-0576

=

Subj: **Re: Letter to Dave Kaplan**
Date: 9/2/2015 12:54:51 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: castrolnj@hotmail.com, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

John,

I understand and appreciate the concerns you have regarding this facility. I do!

What I'm sick and tired of is your unfounded, endless accusations and conspiracy theories. I have NEVER threatened you, so stop with that false accusations. And yes, I'm entitled to my opinion too.

I've stated numerous times that I didn't want this facility, even though they are legally allowed to build it. I'm sworn as an elected official to uphold the law. What don't you understand?

I have no idea what you mean about "choose to continue to have no communication with the citizens over this matter." We've had a community meeting (over 250 attendees) where everyone's concerns have been registered. Community members weighed in at the following Council meeting. We're working with electeds to identify options before coming back to the community. And I've been answering phone calls and emails from people expressing their concerns about the facility. So what are you talking about?

You act as if I've not heard the concerns, when I have. You seem to think we (the Council) have unlimited power to change things, when we don't. We're working to identify the options to either get this facility moved or further mitigated. There are no guarantees. Why? Because Valley Cities can legally build that facility, and only some political leverage may get them to move or make changes to the services they offer there.

Nothing I say or do is ever going to be acceptable to you, so why don't we leave it at that.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/2/2015 11:49:35 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, castrolnj@hotmail.com writes:

> Dave, my email to you speaks for itself, you Dave Kaplan and our entire city government here in Des Moines have lost all confidence and credibility with many of us who you represent over this Clinic, how it was handled nothing less then a travesty that the citizens of Des Moines will never forget, understand we are extremely frustrated over this v
>
> You can stay sick and tired all you want send me nasty threatening emails C.C the Governor if you wish, the fact of the matter is our city will have severely mentally disturbed drug addicts walking our streets coming and going from this clinic loitering in our neighborhoods as our children walk to and from school and play in front of their homes coming in contact with these people, as you may recall at y
> You choose to continue to have no communication with the citizens over this matter is crazy other then your standard spin you have gotten so at ease with " this never came before council " " state law won't let us " " our hands are tied " well untie them! When someone's kid comes up missing is that going to be your statement to the media?
> Look Dave we are extremely frustrated we are fighting for our kids here O.K, again if

that makes you sick and tired and mad so what!, what did you expect? myself and everyone else will fight for our kids safety till the very end because you and no one else at city hall will! Good Day Mayor

John,Laura and our 11 yr old daughter Gaby

Sent from
my iPad

Subj: **Letter to Dave Kaplan**
Date: 9/2/2015 11:49:35 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: castrolnj@hotmail.com
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Dave, my email to you speaks for itself, you Dave Kaplan and our entire city government here in Des Moines have lost all confidence and credibility with many of us who you represent over this Clinic, how it was handled nothing less then a travesty that the citizens of Des Moines will never forget, understand we are extremely frustrated over this who

You can stay sick and tired all you want send me nasty threatening emails C.C the Governor if you wish, the fact of the matter is our city will have severely mentally disturbed drug addicts walking our streets coming and going from this clinic loitering in our neighborhoods as our children walk to and from school and play in front of their homes coming in contact with these people, as you may recall at your
You choose to continue to have no communication with the citizens over this matter is crazy other then your standard spin you have gotten so at ease with " this never came before council " " state law won't let us " " our hands are tied " well untie them! When someone's kid comes up missing is that going to be your statement to the media?
Look Dave we are extremely frustrated we are fighting for our kids here O.K, again if that makes you sick and tired and mad so what!, what did you expect? myself and everyone else will fight for our kids safety till the very end because you and no one else at city hall will! Good Day Mayor

John,Laura and our 11 yr old daughter Gaby

Sent from
my iPad

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Center August 28 discussion notes**
Date: 9/2/2015 11:39:04 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mmpina@comcast.net, TCampbell@fwps.org, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Adrienne.Quinn@kingcounty.gov, VPennington@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Good morning,

Attached are notes from the August 28 Woodmont Recovery Center discussion.

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **RE: Woodmont Recovery**
Date: 9/2/2015 9:10:39 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

No, I don't but I'll ask Jim. She is correct that Valley has no experience in this area. Fortunately they did hire someone who does have a background from Navos.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2015 6:08 AM
To: Orwall, Rep. Tina
Subject: Fwd: Woodmont Recovery

FYI. Do you know this person?

Dave K.

From: steinmetz5@comcast.net
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/1/2015 9:19:01 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Recovery

I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines. I do not support the plan to build what is being called the Woodmont Recovery Center.

First-I do not believe this is an appropriate location. I am offended that Valley Cities started there were only two viable locations in all of S. King County. That seems ridiculous.

Secondly-I donor believe our city is prepared to support this project. I have been the clinical director of inpatient psychiatric units for both private non-profit as well as DSHS. While Valley Cities is a strong organization they do not have experience running an knot unit. They will call police for support.

Lastly, j understand current funding only supports the E&T. However once that is in, it appears there will be no stopping the rest.

Kristin Steinmetz
206-293-0576
Sent from my iPhone=

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/2/2015 9:09:33 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov, Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov, mmpina@comcast.net, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, Adrienne.Quinn@kingcounty.gov, ktaylor@valleycities.org, dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, TCampbell@fwps.org, KMcBroom@fwps.org, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TaraJo.Heinecke@leg.wa.gov, Jim.Vollendroff@kingcounty.gov, Lisa.Tinsley@leg.wa.gov

When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

This is now a confirmed meeting. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/2/2015 8:40:02 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: jnjderosa@earthlink.net
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov, tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Mayor Dave,

Thanks for the quick response to my questions. While your clarification regarding when you knew about the proposed facility makes sense, I would suggest that you make the same distinction when speaking to the media and your constituents. Saying that '...this never came to the City Council' to many of us means lack of any knowledge by any council members of this project.

The fact that Ken Taylor was not totally transparent in his plans for the project is of concern. I believe Taylor's lack of details from the start of this project prove that the leadership at Valley Cities cannot be trusted. While I know that you continue to mention the 'good neighbor' policy that will be put in place if the facility is built, this will be all for naught if we are unable to enter into this agreement without full disclosure from Valley Cities.

I can sense your frustration in the email that many in our community are placing blame on you and the other council members. While it is hard to take the pounding, as an elected official we expect good leadership and transparency. The fact that this facility is coming to light recently, thanks to our concerned neighbors, does not bode well for the leadership in our community (at all levels).

Bottom line on this is our concern for the kids. We have seen far too many times lately where parents have dropped their kids off at school, never to see them alive again. Each time we hear, 'what could have been done to avoid this?', 'were there any indications that this would happen?' With this facility being built, without the methadone clinic or especially if it is built, when something does happen, the blood will be on our hands. I don't want that and I am sure none of the city council members do. You have the opportunity now to ensure that this WILL NOT be built next to an elementary school.

Jennie DeRosa

-----Original Message-----
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
Sent: Sep 1, 2015 8:09 PM
To: jnjderosa@earthlink.net, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov, tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
Cc: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center

Ms. DeRosa,

Thank you for your email regarding the Woodmont Rehab Campus.

I have never stated that I didn't know about Valley City's purchase of the property for a rehab center. As you noted from my emails, I found out about it last November 6, 2014 when Mr. Taylor of Valley Cities, as a courtesy, told me that they had purchased the property. My emails to staff were to find out more about the project, and whether the City Council was going to have an opportunity to do weigh in or do anything about it. The answer was "no." The zoning allowed for that facility, and the Conditional Use Permit (required for an "essential public facility") was going to go to the Hearing Examiner. Further, being an "essential public facility" as defined in state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

What I didn't know about was the methadone dispensary. Mr. Taylor never mentioned that to me in our discussion. He apparently failed to mention it to other local elected

officials as well. I found out about it when a constituent (Tracey Entler) emailed me to ask about the project, and I had to ask staff to find out the details. I learned of the methadone clinic in February 2015. I didn't know about it before then.

Apparently, while the sale of the property didn't conclude until May 2015, it was predicated on the Hearing Examiner allowing the Conditional Use Permit (CUP.) The Hearing Examiner did allow the CUP in April, with a number of conditions on the construction and operations of the facility. Part of that includes a Good Neighbor Agreement with the City of Des Moines to mitigate any potential impacts. In addition, as one of the conditions, the Hearing Examiner required that the hearing on the CUP be reopened 14 months after the facility has been in operation. This is to ensure that the conditions are adequate to mitigate any impacts from the facility, and to allow for MORE conditions if the ones set (including those in the Good Neighbor Agreement) are not adequate. That is nearly unheard of in land use decisions, and demonstrates that the Hearing Examiner heard the concerns of the 15 community members who weighed in on the project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) haven't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this project don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 7:13:09 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, jnjderosa@earthlink.net writes:

Mayor Kaplan,
I need your help in understanding a statement that you made at the last city council meeting, along with one made recently at a recent media interview. You stated that you and the council knew nothing about the purchase of the land by Valley Cities for the purpose of the rehab center. But your emails say something different. To refresh your memory, on page 48 of the document posted on the Des Moines website (http://www.desmoineswa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/2184) dated November 6, 2014, you requested information on the conditional use permit, specifically the type of hearing (quasi-judicial or not) for the land in question for the Woodmont Recovery Campus. The email trail shows many interactions between you and others within the city government so it couldn't have been a missed correspondence. This was well before the purchase of the land. For reference, please see page 75 within above mentioned link for the email from November 18, 2014 which is about the CUP application required for purchase of the land.

Please help me understand why you and Tony Piasecki chose to not inform your fellow council members of this activity. Along with this, please help my understand why you have continued to mention that you knew nothing about this.

Concerned about leadership in Des Moines citizen,
Jennie DeRosa
253-740-6229

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery**
Date: 9/2/2015 6:08:23 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov

FYI. Do you know this person?

Dave K.

From: steinmetz5@comcast.net
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/1/2015 9:19:01 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Recovery

I am a 16 year resident of Des Moines. I do not support the plan to build what is being called the Woodmont Recovery Center.

First-I do not believe this is an appropriate location. I am offended that Valley Cities started there were only two viable locations in all of S. King County. That seems ridiculous.

Secondly-I donor believe our city is prepared to support this project. I have been the clinical director of inpatient psychiatric units for both private non-profit as well as DSHS. While Valley Cities is a strong organization they do not have experience running an knot unit. They will call police for support.

Lastly, j understand current funding only supports the E&T. However once that is in, it appears there will be no stopping the rest.

Kristin Steinmetz
206-293-0576
Sent from my iPhone=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/2/2015 6:07:14 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Yes, let's invite Vic.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/2/2015 1:42:40 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Up to you Dave if you want to invite anyone in Matts place
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> > **From:** Matt <mmpina@comcast.net>
> > **Date:** September 1, 2015 at 9:56:00 PM PDT
> > **To:** Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov>
> > **Cc:** Dave Kaplan <dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov>
> > **Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
> >
> > Michael,
> > I will not be in town Sept 9 to 12. Please invite Vic Pennington in my place.
> > Thanks,
> > Matt
> >
> > *Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID*
> >
> > Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
> >
> > When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
> > Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room
> >
> > Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.
> >
> > *~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*
> >
> > This is a tentative date and time. Please hold and we will confirm shortly. Thank you.

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/2/2015 1:42:40 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Up to you Dave if you want to invite anyone in Matts place

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Matt <mmpina@comcast.net>
Date: September 1, 2015 at 9:56:00 PM PDT
To: Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov>
Cc: Dave Kaplan <dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Michael,
I will not be in town Sept 9 to 12. Please invite Vic Pennington in my place.
Thanks,
Matt

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

This is a tentative date and time. Please hold and we will confirm shortly. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/1/2015 9:56:12 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: mmpina@comcast.net
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
CC: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Michael,
I will not be in town Sept 9 to 12. Please invite Vic Pennington in my place.
Thanks,
Matt

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

This is a tentative date and time. Please hold and we will confirm shortly. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Valley Cities**
Date: 9/1/2015 9:01:43 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: thebentlers@yahoo.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Mr. Bentler,

I have a full-time job. Being a City Councilmember is a part-time job on top of that, and being Mayor has added additional time and responsibilities and meetings to my schedule on top of that. I can't track every project that NEVER comes to the Council for consideration. Sorry, but I don't know every detail about every application submitted to the City for every project that NEVER comes to the City Council. It's just not possible.

As I said, we are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that ... even with leveraging the County and State to try and get it moved or mitigated.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 8:53:11 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, thebentlers@yahoo.com writes:

> Mayor,
>
> These non-profit programs rely on tax payer money for funding, whether it is through the city, county or state, they need government to exist, don't tell me you had zero leverage. With that said, I know how influential you are in the county and state and for you, Dave Upthegrove and others to sit back and do nothing is unacceptable. Now in the 11th hour grassroots have to go at it alone.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Tony Bentler
>
> On Tuesday, September 1, 2015 7:49 PM, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Mr. Bentler,
>
> Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.
>
> This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are

lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 6:44:21 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, thebentlers@yahoo.com writes:

> Dear Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I'm emailing you to express my complete disappointment in how you dealt with the Valley Cities upcoming development of the land so close to an **elementary school**. A leader of a community should have compiled a consensus of how voters felt about a methadone clinic being built in that location and a leader should have got the word out, yet you stood quiet. Why would you do this???? Perhaps you wanted this or people within that community persuaded you to step aside and not oppose in hopes of favors or campaign contributions.
>
> Your lack of leadership will be the primary factor for me to never vote for you again, along with many others within the Woodmont community. Not to worry if you lose, I'm sure you will land on your feet because the people that you sided with have a job waiting for you at many times your current salary.
>
> Your clearly did not have the COMMUNITIES BACK!
>
> Regards,
>
> Tony Bentler
> 818 S. 272nd St.
> Des Moines, WA

Subj: **Re: Valley Cities**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:53:11 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: thebentlers@yahoo.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Mayor,

These non-profit programs rely on tax payer money for funding, whether it is through the city, county or state, they need government to exist, don't tell me you had zero leverage. With that said, I know how influential you are in the county and state and for you, Dave Upthegrove and others to sit back and do nothing is unacceptable. Now in the 11th hour grassroots have to go at it alone.

Thanks,

Tony Bentler

On Tuesday, September 1, 2015 7:49 PM, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

Mr. Bentler,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 6:44:21 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, thebentlers@yahoo.com writes:

> Dear Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I'm emailing you to express my complete disappointment in how you dealt with the Valley Cities upcoming development of the land so close to an **elementary school**. A leader of a community should have compiled a consensus of how voters felt about a methadone clinic being built in that location and a leader should have got the word out, yet you stood quiet. Why would you do this???? Perhaps you wanted this or people within that community persuaded you to step aside and not oppose in hopes of favors or campaign contributions.
>
> Your lack of leadership will be the primary factor for me to never vote for you again, along with many others within the Woodmont community. Not to worry if you lose, I'm sure you will land on your feet because the people that you sided with have a job waiting for you at many times your current salary.
>
> Your clearly did not have the COMMUNITIES BACK!
>
> Regards,
>
> Tony Bentler
> 818 S. 272nd St.

Des Moines, WA

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Drug Rehab - Valley Cities**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:16:09 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Mr. Hay,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

First, let me say thank you for the polite tone of your email. It stands in stark contrast with most of those I've received thus far. That is greatly appreciated.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. The City Council has had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17

people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 1:00:38 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Kevin.Hay@Grakon.com writes:

> Hi Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I am a resident of Des Moines with a Kindergartener ready to attend Woodmont Elementry – No doubt you can guess my concern. I am very concerned about the choice to locate a large drug rehab, methadone clinic and mental health service facility 1000 feet away from my child's elementary school.
>
> I acknowledge the importance of this facility to our state. I am not opposed it being located in Des Moines, but this is certainly is not the correct location within our city for this facility.
>
> Please consider the following:
>
> - As planned, the facility spans from Pacific Highway to 16th ave with access to the facility on both 16th and Pacific Highway.
> - Methadone access is planned for the 16th ave side of the facility
> - Woodmont Elementary is located on 16th ave.

Please, please, please visit this site in person in the morning on a school day – See the children arriving and walking to school - Imagine this environment with the addition of a dozens of former heroin addicts waiting outside the clinic as our kids walk to school. This is a dangerous situation by design – you are actively involved in the design of this very risky situation.

This choice will have consequences – the consequences will occur to our children. This cannot be the correct choice

As an aside, we understand our city does not have resources for extra police force to keep this dangerous disaster under control.

Please Help,

Kevin Hay

253-508-4075

Subj: **Re: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:09:54 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: jnjderosa@earthlink.net
Reply-to: nobody@earthlink.net
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

I apologize for this automatic reply to your email.

To control spam, I now allow incoming messages only from senders I have approved beforehand.

If you would like to be added to my list of approved senders, please fill out the short request form (see link below). Once I approve you, I will receive your original message in my inbox. You do not need to resend your message. I apologize for this one-time inconvenience.

Click the link below to fill out the request:

https://webmail.pas.earthlink.net/wam/addme?a=jnjderosa@earthlink.net&id=11e5-5120-0e3be9b0-a258-00144fe24cf8

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:09:41 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: jnjderosa@earthlink.net, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov, tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Ms. DeRosa,

Thank you for your email regarding the Woodmont Rehab Campus.

I have never stated that I didn't know about Valley City's purchase of the property for a rehab center. As you noted from my emails, I found out about it last November 6, 2014 when Mr. Taylor of Valley Cities, as a courtesy, told me that they had purchased the property. My emails to staff were to find out more about the project, and whether the City Council was going to have an opportunity to do weigh in or do anything about it. The answer was "no." The zoning allowed for that facility, and the Conditional Use Permit (required for an "essential public facility") was going to go to the Hearing Examiner. Further, being an "essential public facility" as defined in state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

What I didn't know about was the methadone dispensary. Mr. Taylor never mentioned that to me in our discussion. He apparently failed to mention it to other local elected officials as well. I found out about it when a constituent (Tracey Entler) emailed me to ask about the project, and I had to ask staff to find out the details. I learned of the methadone clinic in February 2015. I didn't know about it before then.

Apparently, while the sale of the property didn't conclude until May 2015, it was predicated on the Hearing Examiner allowing the Conditional Use Permit (CUP.) The Hearing Examiner did allow the CUP in April, with a number of conditions on the construction and operations of the facility. Part of that includes a Good Neighbor Agreement with the City of Des Moines to mitigate any potential impacts. In addition, as one of the conditions, the Hearing Examiner required that the hearing on the CUP be reopened 14 months after the facility has been in operation. This is to ensure that the conditions are adequate to mitigate any impacts from the facility, and to allow for MORE conditions if the ones set (including those in the Good Neighbor Agreement) are not adequate. That is nearly unheard of in land use decisions, and demonstrates that the Hearing Examiner heard the concerns of the 15 community members who weighed in on the project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) haven't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and

this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) wanted this project don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 7:13:09 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, jnjderosa@earthlink.net writes:

> Mayor Kaplan,
> I need your help in understanding a statement that you made at the last city council meeting, along with one made recently at a recent media interview. You stated that you and the council knew nothing about the purchase of the land by Valley Cities for the purpose of the rehab center. But your emails say something different. To refresh your memory, on page 48 of the document posted on the Des Moines website (http://www.desmoineswa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/2184) dated November 6, 2014, you requested information on the conditional use permit, specifically the type of hearing (quasi-judicial or not) for the land in question for the Woodmont Recovery Campus. The email trail shows many interactions between you and others within the city government so it couldn't have been a missed correspondence. This was well before the purchase of the land. For reference, please see page 75 within above mentioned link for the email from November 18, 2014 which is about the CUP application required for purchase of the land.
>
> Please help me understand why you and Tony Piasecki chose to not inform your fellow council members of this activity. Along with this, please help my understand why you have continued to mention that you knew nothing about this.
>
> Concerned about leadership in Des Moines citizen,
> Jennie DeRosa
> 253-740-6229

Subj: **Re: Valley Cities**
Date: 9/1/2015 7:49:48 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: thebentlers@yahoo.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Mr. Bentler,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over.

The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 6:44:21 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, thebentlers@yahoo.com writes:

> Dear Mayor Kaplan,
>
> I'm emailing you to express my complete disappointment in how you dealt with the Valley Cities upcoming development of the land so close to an **elementary school**. A leader of a community should have compiled a consensus of how voters felt about a methadone clinic being built in that location and a leader should have got the word out, yet you stood quiet. Why would you do this???? Perhaps you wanted this or people within that community persuaded you to step aside and not oppose in hopes of favors or campaign contributions.
>
> Your lack of leadership will be the primary factor for me to never vote for you again, along with many others within the Woodmont community. Not to worry if you lose, I'm sure you will land on your feet because the people that you sided with have a job waiting for you at many times your current salary.
>
> Your clearly did not have the COMMUNITIES BACK!
>
> Regards,
>
> Tony Bentler
> 818 S. 272nd St.
> Des Moines, WA

Subj: **FW: Accepted: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion @ Wed Sep 9, 2015 10:30am - 12:30pm (ktaylor@valleycities.org)**
Date: 9/1/2015 4:30:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Fyi, Kent Taylor has accepted.

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Google Calendar [mailto:calendar-notification@google.com] **On Behalf Of** Ken Taylor
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 3:58 PM
To: Michael Matthias
Subject: Accepted: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion @ Wed Sep 9, 2015 10:30am - 12:30pm (ktaylor@valleycities.org)
When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room

Ken Taylor has accepted this invitation.

Woodmont Recovery Center discussion
When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

This is a tentative date and time. Please hold and we will confirm shortly. Thank you.

When	Wed Sep 9, 2015 10:30am – 12:30pm Pacific Time
Where	City of Des Moines, south conference room (map)
Calendar	ktaylor@valleycities.org
Who	• Michael Matthias - organizer • Ken Taylor - creator • 'Keiser, Sen. Karen' • 'Miloscia, Sen. Mark' • Pat Bosmans • 'Orwall, Rep. Tina' • Dave Kaplan • ' (KMcBroom@fwps.org)' • 'Matt Pina' • 'Gregerson, Rep. Mia' • 'Kochmar, Rep. Linda'

- Tony Piasecki
- 'Dave Upthegrove'
- 'Gregory, Rep. Carol'
- 'Tammy Campbell - Federal Way Public Schools'
- 'Adrienne.Quinn@kingcounty.gov'

Invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://www.google.com/calendar/ and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to modify your RSVP response. Learn More.

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential. If you are NOT the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately with a copy to it@valleycities.org and destroy this message.
Please be aware that email communication can be intercepted in transmission or misdirected. Your use of email to communicate protected health information to us indicates that you acknowledge and accept the possible risks associated with such communication. Please consider communicating any sensitive information by telephone, fax or mail. If you do not wish to have your information sent by email, please contact the sender immediately.
VALLEY|CITIES' SHARED VALUES | Kindness | Respect | Caring | Helpful | Integrity | Teamwork

Subj: **RE: Preliminary notes from Woodmont Meeting**
Date: 9/1/2015 4:27:32 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

You want these sent to only the elected who attended the meeting or to everyone in the room?

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:21 PM
To: Michael Matthias
Cc: Dave Kaplan
Subject: Re: Preliminary notes from Woodmont Meeting

Now let's try it with the notes attached.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/28/2015 4:48:59 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Sorry, I'm fried! This is the first cut of what I had from the meeting.
>
> Think I got most of the main points but not all of the supporting discussion.
>
> *Michael Matthias*
> *Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director*
> *City of Des Moines, WA*
> *206.870.6554*
> *mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov*

Subj: **Re: Preliminary notes from Woodmont Meeting**
Date: 9/1/2015 2:21:32 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Now let's try it with the notes attached.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/28/2015 4:48:59 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Sorry, I'm fried! This is the first cut of what I had from the meeting.
>
> Think I got most of the main points but not all of the supporting discussion.
>
> *Michael Matthias*
> *Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director*
> *City of Des Moines, WA*
> *206.870.6554*
> *mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov*

WOODMONT - 8/28/2015 MEETING NOTES

Is it possible to close 16th Street from ingress/egress serving the center except for necessary EMS access?

Possible to move the dispensary offsite. (Earlier discussion depending on the type and quality of medication being dispensed could it be called a "pharmacy"?).

Possible to locate administration building adjacent to neighborhood providing a buffer to the neighborhood.

Locked, secure facility (outline of security and safety protocols for each building and the grounds.)

Same with fence on 16th, move into property and buffer with landscaping to the neighborhood. Higher fence? Wrought iron?

SRO or equivalent, temporary, for school site.

Possible to fence the school playground, at Valley City expense?

Provide community services at library (Adrienne)

Role Dan Satterberg could possibly play

Locate Methadone at SCORE or in a mobile facility

Discussion about investigating alternatives for site location including Port property

Prioritize services for patients from our area.

Walking audit for school, city, and Good Neighbor Committee members.

Lots of discussion as to Good Neighbor Agreement Committee (role and composition, basically limited to a working group – specific number not established).

General Woodmont area concerns to address: library; police patrols; block watches; counseling for library users (homeless, etc.)

Next Steps:

- Contact Ken Taylor regarding criteria assigned to real estate broker (Michael)
- Contact Port with this criteria (Michael)
- Set next meeting, invite Ken Taylor to attend
- Statistics on current crime in neighborhood
- Dan, Pat, Dave K and Michael to meet Monday morning regarding Design Review process

Subj: **Re: The damage you two are doing.**
Date: 9/1/2015 2:19:36 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: castrolnj@hotmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Dave I am just sharing my opinion nothing more nothing less, many in our community share this same opinion of the direction our city is going.
Good Day Dave.

John Castronover

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 1, 2015, at 2:07 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

> Sorry, but I'M not causing anything, and I'm getting tired of your false accusations. I did not have any decision-making regarding this project. NONE. Your implication that I do is a flat out lie, and I'm getting sick and tired of it. Please stop.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Dave Kaplan
> Mayor & Councilmember
> City of Des Moines, WA
>
> In a message dated 9/1/2015 12:38:03 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, castrolnj@hotmail.com writes:
>
> Sent from my iPad

Subj: **Re: Preliminary notes from Woodmont Meeting**
Date: 9/1/2015 2:18:49 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Michael,

Here's the revised notes. We should share this with the politician committee members.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/28/2015 4:48:59 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Sorry, I'm fried! This is the first cut of what I had from the meeting.
>
> Think I got most of the main points but not all of the supporting discussion.
>
> *Michael Matthias*
> *Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director*
> *City of Des Moines, WA*
> *206.870.6554*
> *mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov*

Subj: **RE: FW: Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/1/2015 2:08:14 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

No response from Ken, as of yet.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:08 PM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: Re: FW: Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Yes. Is Ken Taylor able to attend?

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/1/2015 2:00:21 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> I assume you are ok with Kyla attending for Mia?
>
> Autumn
>
> **From:** Shkerich, Kyla [mailto:Kyla.Shkerich@leg.wa.gov]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 1:52 PM
> **To:** Autumn Lingle
> **Subject:** RE: Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion
>
> Hi Autumn,
>
> I just wanted to let that Mia has prior commitments on the 9th and is unable to attend the meeting. If she request, is it possible for me to go in her place just to take notes? Let me know if you think that would be possible.
>
> Thanks Autumn!
>
> Kyla
>
> **From:** Autumn Lingle [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov]
> **Sent:** Monday, August 31, 2015 2:42 PM
> **To:** Adrienne Quinn - King County Dept of Com and Human Services (Business Fax) <IMCEAFAX-Adrienne+20Quinn+40+2B1+20206+20296+205260@desmoineswa.gov>; Gregory, Rep. Carol <Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov>; Dave Kaplan <DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov>; Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov) <dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>; Keiser, Sen. Karen <Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov>; Ken Taylor (Kctaylor081@gmail.com) <Kctaylor081@gmail.com>; Kochmar, Rep. Linda <Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov>; Miloscia, Sen. Mark <Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov>; Matt Pina <mmpina@comcast.net>; Gregerson, Rep. Mia <Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov>; Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov>; Bosmans, Patricia <pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov>; Tammy Campbell - Federal Way Public Schools (TCampbell@fwps.org) <TCampbell@fwps.org>; Orwall, Rep.

Tina <Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov>; Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Good afternoon,

Please advise as to your availability the week of September 8-11. The City of Des Moines would like to meet to discuss the Woodmont Recovery Center.

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **Re: The damage you two are doing.**
Date: 9/1/2015 2:07:37 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: castrolnj@hotmail.com, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Sorry, but I'M not causing anything, and I'm getting tired of your false accusations. I did not have any decision-making regarding this project. NONE. Your implication that I do is a flat out lie, and I'm getting sick and tired of it. Please stop.

Thank you.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 12:38:03 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, castrolnj@hotmail.com writes:

Sent from my iPad

Subj: **Re: Please Help Us**
Date: 9/1/2015 2:06:43 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: castrolnj@hotmail.com, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Sorry, but you're wrong. I've not lied about ANYTHING. I didn't know there was going to be a methadone dispensary on the property until I received an email from Tracey Entler in February asking about it, and I had to get the information from staff to find out the details of the project. I've NEVER lied in regard to anything having to do with this project. Saying otherwise is just not true.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 9/1/2015 1:05:57 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, castrolnj@hotmail.com writes:

> Understand many in our community neither trust or believe a word of what you two now have to say, little by little the truth is coming out, you two have been dishonest and untruthful with what you have been keeping from the citizens of Des Moines.
> Ken Taylor is no different then the two of you, here his own words contradict what he has been saying to the media.
> Shame on all three of you.
>
> John Castronover
>
> Sent from my iPad

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/1/2015 11:41:46 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov, Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov, mmpina@comcast.net, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, Adrienne.Quinn@kingcounty.gov, ktaylor@valleycities.org, dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, TCampbell@fwps.org, KMcBroom@fwps.org

When: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 10:30 AM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: City of Des Moines, south conference room

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

This is a tentative date and time. Please hold and we will confirm shortly. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Rehab Center**
Date: 9/1/2015 9:20:39 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: jim.boyd@comcast.net
CC: citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Mr. Boyd,

Thank you for your email concerning the Woodmont Recover Center. I understand and share your frustration over this project.

This is not a City of Des Moines project; this is a Valley Cities Counseling project. We did not seek out or "decide" or ask for this project to come to the City. There's no "city plan" regarding this facility. We (the Council) hasn't "sold out" anyone, because we've had NO SAY regarding this project. If someone is claiming that, then they are lying. It's untrue.

From the start, I have said I did not want this facility in Des Moines. I do not want yet another piece of commercial property to be given over to another non-profit entity. We need property tax and sales tax revenue to support City services (especially police services), and this facility does not further that goal of enhancing our revenues. Anyone claiming that I (or my fellow Councilmembers) they don't know what the hell they're talking about.

This project never came to the City Council. Unless someone is asking for a change or variance to what our zoning code allows, the City Council never sees a project. Valley Cities has not asked for any changes to the zoning code, so it hasn't come to the City Council. The Des Moines City Council has made no decision regarding this project, because it never came to us.

The zoning for this parcel, which dates back to when the area annexed into the City, has always allowed for this use in this zone. The City Council made no changes to allow for this project. It was allowed under the existing rules, despite my and my fellow Councilmembers not wanting it.

Under state law, the Growth Management Act defines this type of facility as an "essential public facility." Also under state law, RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) states that "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation [zoning] may preclude the siting of essential public facilities." In other words, even if it had come to the City Council, we could not change the rules to prevent it from happening.

City staff received a complete application from Valley Cities back in December 2014. In February 2015 staff issued a Mitigated SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Property owners within 600' of the project were notified of the Determination (300' is the legal standard, but staff expanded it to include more people because of the size of the project.) No appeals were filed, though comments were received by the public.

Essential Public Facilities require the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, which defines how a facility is to be constructed and to mitigate any potential impacts from its operation. The Hearing Examiner held a hearing on April 3, 2015 and received testimony from 17 people. The Hearing Examiner issued his report on April 15, 2015. In it he requires a separate "good neighbor agreement" with the City to address potential impacts, including a provision for returning involuntary patients to their city of origin when their treatment is over. The Hearing Examiner also did something unusual by requiring that, within 2 months of having been up and operating for a year, the hearing is being reopened to determine whether the conditions that are set are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts, or whether additional conditions would be added.

We are exploring options on the potential to get Valley Cities to move the facility, drop the methadone dispensary, and mitigate its impacts. But the law is on the side of Valley Cities, and we will need their agreement to successfully accomplish that.

In the event that we're unable to get the facility moved (and I doubt that we will be, but we're exploring the possibility), we will have members of the community participate on a Good Neighbor Agreement Committee to help address the concerns.

Again, I share your frustration over this project. We're doing what we can.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 8/31/2015 6:03:42 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, jim.boyd@comcast.net writes:

Mayor Kaplan,

I have been a home owner in Des Moines for 40 plus years. My wife went to elementary school here and graduated from Mt. Rainier. I have, up to now, been a fairly strong proponent of the Des Moines City Council and the direction they have taken for the City.

NO LONGER ! Through the back door we have discovered the City's plan to place a drug rehab center in Woodmont (why that name? Call it the Kaplan Drug placement center - don't taint our community name with your decision to bring in drugs and drug dealers to our neighborhood !). I can not politically correctly verbalize my disgust with the Mayor and City Council for selling out our community for this project without including public input. We will muster all of our resources to stop this project. We will also use all of the resources available to us - and they are considerable - to make sure that no incumbents are re-elected to the Des Moines City Council for selling out our community.

We know that these facilities are needed and serve a public need. We have better locations - even in Des Moines. What about all of the vacant land by the new SCORE facility ? Why put it by our elementary school, library, and shopping center ?

Jim Boyd
Member and Pasr President of the Woodmont Country Club
27055 8th Ave S
Des Moines

Subj: **RE: Woodmont Recovery Campus**
Date: 9/1/2015 9:05:42 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

King 5 is covering it -

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 8:23 AM
To: Dan Brewer; Michael Matthias; Dave Kaplan; Pat Bosmans
Cc: Denise Lathrop; Laura Techico; Nikole Coleman
Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Campus

I think at or near Woodmont Elementary School.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/1/2015 7:15:30 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Just an fyi..... I heard on the news this morning that there is some kind of a protest scheduled for today about the proposed facility. However, there was no indication about the location or the time of the protest.

Subj: **Re: Rehab Center**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:55:49 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Okay thanks Dave

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 1, 2015, at 8:24 AM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

> Yes, I received it from him as well. I'll respond to him some time today. Was giving it the 24 hour cool-down before I respond to him.
>
> Dave K.
>
> In a message dated 9/1/2015 7:46:15 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:
>
> > FYI
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > Begin forwarded message:
> >
> > **Resent-From:** <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> > **From:** <jim.boyd@comcast.net>
> > **Date:** August 31, 2015 at 9:09:23 PM PDT
> > **To:** <LBangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> > **Subject: Rehab Center**
> >
> > Luisa Bangs,
> >
> > I have been a home owner in Des Moines for 40 plus years. My wife went to elementary school here and graduated from Mt. Rainier. I have, up to now, been a fairly strong proponent of the Des Moines City Council and the direction they have taken for the City.
> >
> > NO LONGER ! Through the back door we have discovered the City's plan to place a drug rehab center in Woodmont (why that name? Call it the Kaplan Drug placement center - don't taint our community name with your decision to bring in drugs and drug dealers to our neighborhood !). I can not politically correctly verbalize my disgust with the Mayor and City Council for selling out our community for this project without including public input. We will muster all of our resources to stop this project. We will also use all of the resources available to us - and they are considerable - to make sure that no incumbents are re-elected to the Des Moines City Council for selling out our community.
> >
> > We know that these facilities are needed and serve

a public need. We have better locations - even in Des Moines. What about all of the vacant land by the new SCORE facility ? Why put it by our elementary school, library, and shopping center ?

Jim Boyd
Member and Past President of the Woodmont Country Club
27055 8th Ave S
Des Moines

=

Subj: **Re: Rehab Center**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:24:29 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: desmnsluisa@gmail.com

Yes, I received it from him as well. I'll respond to him some time today. Was giving it the 24 hour cool-down before I respond to him.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/1/2015 7:46:15 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:

> FYI
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **Resent-From:** <lbangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> **From:** <jim.boyd@comcast.net>
> **Date:** August 31, 2015 at 9:09:23 PM PDT
> **To:** <LBangs@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Subject: Rehab Center**
>
> Luisa Bangs,
>
> I have been a home owner in Des Moines for 40 plus years. My wife went to elementary school here and graduated from Mt. Rainier. I have, up to now, been a fairly strong proponent of the Des Moines City Council and the direction they have taken for the City.
>
> NO LONGER ! Through the back door we have discovered the City's plan to place a drug rehab center in Woodmont (why that name? Call it the Kaplan Drug placement center - don't taint our community name with your decision to bring in drugs and drug dealers to our neighborhood !). I can not politically correctly verbalize my disgust with the Mayor and City Council for selling out our community for this project without including public input. We will muster all of our resources to stop this project. We will also use all of the resources available to us - and they are considerable - to make sure that no incumbents are re-elected to the Des Moines City Council for selling out our community.
>
> We know that these facilities are needed and serve a public need. We have better locations - even in Des Moines. What about all of the vacant land by the new SCORE facility ? Why put it by our elementary school, library, and shopping center ?
>
> Jim Boyd
> Member and Past President of the Woodmont Country Club

27055 8th Ave S
Des Moines

=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Campus**
Date: 9/1/2015 8:23:16 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov, LTechico@desmoineswa.gov, NColeman@desmoineswa.gov

I think at or near Woodmont Elementary School.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/1/2015 7:15:30 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Just an fyi..... I heard on the news this morning that there is some kind of a protest scheduled for today about the proposed facility. However, there was no indication about the location or the time of the protest.

Subj: **Re: Proposed Valley Cities site**
Date: 8/31/2015 9:26:28 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: marymeun@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

Dave,

I just saw this email. I wanted to let you know that I signed up for the GNA at the Woodmont Community Meeting on Aug 18. I was told by another representative that they will also put my name on the list. So, yes, I would like to serve on that committee if it comes down to it and my name should already be on the list. Can you tell me how the committee will be selected or formed? Is there already a guideline for forming this committee?

Sincerely,
Mary Eun

On Thu, Aug 27, 2015 at 1:40 PM, <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

Mary,

I finally have an opportunity to respond to your email, rather than just the Facebook conversation we had.

I appreciate the concerns you've raised, and the suggestions regarding 16th Avenue S. and elimination of the methadone dispensary. We'll discuss those with Valley Cities, as we contemplate our options on trying to either move or mitigate the facility.

Assuming we can't get the facility moved, the Good Neighbor Agreement can address these issues as well. Would you like to serve on that committee? Please let us know.

Thanks again.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 8/25/2015 8:15:03 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, marymeun@gmail.com writes:

> Dave,
>
> My name is Mary Eun and I live with my family in the Woodmont neighborhood in Des Moines. I'm writing you because I would like you to know my specific concerns with the proposed Valley Cities site.
>
> I have two items that I oppose with the facility.
>
> First, the 8 acre site fronts both Pacific Highway and 16th Ave S. On the very next block is Woodmont K-8 school. I see kids walking on that sidewalk to Woodmont K-8. If we can help the kids by not having them walk by the volatile and crazy, then we should. While I'd like to see a 10' wall between the Valley Cities campus and 16th, I'm only asking for no access to 16th Ave S from that campus.
>
> Second, I don't want a methadone clinic as part of the Valley Cities campus. I don't want a daily flow of agitated people whose brains have been altered and who obviously have poor judgment to be hanging out at the Redondo square stores, parking lot, or general area. I recognize that we already have a problem in the Redondo shopping center area. I've observed drug deals in the Safeway parking lot. I've observed prostitution on Pacific Hwy. I'm afraid that bringing in a daily flow of people who are agitated and crazy creates a risk that many people will avoid by not shopping there. I'm afraid that more stores there will close, creating another blight.

So, why am I writing you when you've basically said there's not much you can do at this point? I am hopeful that you can help avoid these 2 things from happening, and if you can't help us avoid them, then to mitigate their effects. Please know that if you need me to voice this to any one or any group, I will gladly do so.

Sincerely,
Mary Eun
806 S 273rd Ct
Des Moines, WA 98198

Subj: **RE: Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 8/31/2015 4:05:57 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov, IMCEAFAX-Adrienne+20Quinn+40+2B1+20206+20296+205260@desmoineswa.gov, Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov, Kctaylor081@gmail.com, Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov, mmpina@comcast.net, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, TCampbell@fwps.org, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: karenkeiser@comcast.net

Hi Autumn-

Senator Keiser will be out of the country on a long overdue vacation from Sept. 1 thru 19, 2015.

In the event the meeting cannot wait until her return, I will sit in on the meeting on her behalf. My schedule is pretty flexible the week of Sept. 8-11.

Truly,

Tara Jo Heinecke, Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator Karen Keiser
E-Mail: theinecke@leg.wa.gov
Office: 360-786-7664

From: Autumn Lingle [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 2:42 PM
To: Adrienne Quinn - King County Dept of Com and Human Services (Business Fax) <IMCEAFAX-Adrienne+20Quinn+40+2B1+20206+20296+205260@desmoineswa.gov>; Gregory, Rep. Carol <Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov>; Dave Kaplan <DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov>; Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov) <dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>; Keiser, Sen. Karen <Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov>; Ken Taylor (Kctaylor081@gmail.com) <Kctaylor081@gmail.com>; Kochmar, Rep. Linda <Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov>; Miloscia, Sen. Mark <Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov>; Matt Pina <mmpina@comcast.net>; Gregerson, Rep. Mia <Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov>; Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov>; Bosmans, Patricia <pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov>; Tammy Campbell - Federal Way Public Schools (TCampbell@fwps.org) <TCampbell@fwps.org>; Orwall, Rep. Tina <Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov>; Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Good afternoon,

Please advise as to your availability the week of September 8-11. The City of Des Moines would like to meet to discuss the Woodmont Recovery Center.

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Campus - Design Review Status**
Date: 8/31/2015 3:41:01 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov

Dave:

Below is some information following up on our conversation this morning. Please let me know if you have any questions or need other information.

Summary

The following bullet points are a quick summary of the target dates related to the upcoming Design Review Decision for the Woodmont Recovery Campus. Additional explanation and detail is provided below.

- The Draft Design Review Decision must be issued for public comment no later than September 17, 2015.
- We are going to provide a 15 day comment period, meaning that comments from the public will be due back to the City by close of business on October 2, 2015.
- The Final Design Review Decision must be issued no later than October 16, 2015.
- Any Appeals of the Final Design Review Decision would need to be filed with the City within 14 days of the Final Design Review Decision.

Additional information

The Design Review Application was submitted on April 22, 2015. From the submittal date, we have 120 days to issue a final decision. The "120 day clock" does not include any time that the applicant takes to respond to Design Review Comments. Comments on the Woodmont Design Review application were provided to the applicant on June 1, 2015, and the applicant resubmitted materials to the City on August 3, 2015. Therefore, the City has approximately 50 days remaining to issue a final decision on the design review application. Within the remaining timeframe, per Condition 5 of the Hearing Examiner's Decision (see below), the City has to provide an opportunity for "parties of record" and the public to comment on the Draft Design Review Decision; for City staff to review and respond to comments received; and for City staff to issue a final decision.

> 5. Parties of record shall be notified of the design review process and be provided an appropriate opportunity to comment on design review. Discussion of appropriate fe height along residential boundaries should specifically be addressed during the desi review process.

The Design Review Decision is a Type I Land Use Action (Administrative) with no legal requirement for public notice (DMMC 18.20.130(7)) or public comment (DMMC 18.20.070). A Type I Land Use decision is appealable to the Hearing Examiner for an open record public hearing (DMMC 18.20.150).

In order to meet the intent of the HE decision, we are planning to provide for a 15-day comment period (similar to that provided for our SEPA review under DMMC 16.05.240).

Once we issue our final decision, in accordance with DMMC 18.235.120 an appeal can be filed within 14 days of the Design Review Decision:

18.235.120 Appeals.
A person or persons aggrieved by an action of the Planning, Building and Public Works Department under this chapter may file an appeal pursuant to chapters 18.20 and 18.240 DMMC with the Hearing Examiner within 14 days of the Department decision in accordance with the Hearing Examiner code. The filing of an appeal shall be considered a Type I appeal and shall suspend the issuance of a building permit until final action is taken on the appeal. [Ord. 1591 § 579, 2014.]

Noticing of the Draft Design Review Decision
We could use some guidance on noticing of the Draft Design Review Decision. We do not intend to issue this city wide.

In addition to the parties of record from the 4/3/15 public hearing, we will plan to expand our noticing to include those who gave us contact information at the 8/18/15 meeting held at Woodmont Elementary School, and to those that have expressed interest in participating on the Committee for the Good Neighbor Agreement. We will also place the draft decision on the City's web page, and notify the Waterland Blog, and the Highline Times. We do not intend to post notice of the draft decision in the Seattle Times as there is no requirement under this process for the City to do so.

Please let me know if you feel this is adequate notice for the design review process.

Daniel J. Brewer, P.E., P.T.O.E.
Planning, Building, and Public Works Director
21650 11th Avenue South
Des Moines, WA 98198
(206) 870-6581

Subj: **Meeting dates for Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 8/31/2015 2:42:12 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: IMCEAFAX-Adrienne+20Quinn+40+2B1+20206+20296+205260@desmoineswa.gov, Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov, Kctaylor081@gmail.com, linda.kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov, mmpina@comcast.net, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, TCampbell@fwps.org, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Good afternoon,

Please advise as to your availability the week of September 8-11. The City of Des Moines would like to meet to discuss the Woodmont Recovery Center.

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **Meeting summary additional item**
Date: 8/31/2015 9:24:32 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Walking audits.

Michael Matthias
Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director
City of Des Moines, WA
206.870.6554
mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Subj: **Re: FW: Woodmont Rehab**
Date: 8/31/2015 8:43:07 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov

Yes, she's already emailed us these photos. Glad to see she's being thorough.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/31/2015 7:21:17 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> Fyi,
>
> Autumn
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Gabrielle Castronover [mailto:castrolnj@hotmail.com]
> Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2015 10:04 AM
> To: Autumn Lingle
> Subject: Woodmont Rehab
>
> Two reasons as to why we are fighting the location of the clinic.

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Rehab**
Date: 8/29/2015 11:29:11 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: desmnsluisa@gmail.com

That works. I would echo the words you said before: that we're trying to see what options are available to move or mitigate this project.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/29/2015 11:22:59 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:

> My response. Is it okay?
> Ms. Castronover
> Thank you for your message. The City is reviewing options that are available to us to see what we can do to mitigate the issues on this controversial project
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> > On Aug 29, 2015, at 9:37 AM, Gabrielle Castronover <castrolnj@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >
> > Two of the reasons why we are fighting the location of the clinic
> > <image.jpeg>
> >
> >
> > Sent from my iPad

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Rehab**
Date: 8/29/2015 11:22:59 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: desmnsdave@aol.com
CC: lbangs@desmoineswa.gov

My response. Is it okay?
Ms. Castronover
Thank you for your message. The City is reviewing options that are available to us to see what we can do to mitigate the issues on this controversial project

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 29, 2015, at 9:37 AM, Gabrielle Castronover <castrolnj@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> Two of the reasons why we are fighting the location of the clinic
> <image.jpeg>
>
>
> Sent from my iPad

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center mailing list**
Date: 8/28/2015 10:08:27 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Looks good, Autumn.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/28/2015 3:36:58 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> Attached is the current email list for the Woodmont Recovery Center. Please let me know if you wish to add or subtract participants.
>
> Autumn

Subj: **Preliminary notes from Woodmont Meeting**
Date: 8/28/2015 4:48:59 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Sorry, I'm fried! This is the first cut of what I had from the meeting.

Think I got most of the main points but not all of the supporting discussion.

Michael Matthias
Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director
City of Des Moines, WA
206.870.6554
mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

WOODMONT - 8/28/2015 MEETING NOTES

Is it possible to close 16th Street from ingress/egress serving the center except for necessary EMS access?

Possible to move the dispensary offsite. (Earlier discussion depending on the type and quality of medication being dispensed could it be called a "pharmacy"?).

Possible to locate administration building adjacent to neighborhood providing a buffer to the neighborhood.

Same with fence on 16th, move into property and buffer with landscaping to the neighborhood.

SRO or equivalent, temporary, for school site. Possible to fence school?

Provide community services at library (Adrienne)

Role Dan Satterberg could possibly play

Locate Methadone at SCORE or in a mobile facility

Discussion about investigating alternatives for site location including Port property

Lots of discussion as to Good Neighbor Agreement Committee (role and composition, basically limited to a working group – specific number not established).

Next Steps:

- Contact Ken Taylor regarding criteria assigned to real estate broker (Michael)
- Contact Port with this criteria (Michael)
- Set next meeting, invite Ken Taylor to attend
- Statistics on current crime in neighborhood
- Dan, Pat, Dave K and Michael to meet Monday morning regarding Design Review process

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Center mailing list**
Date: 8/28/2015 3:36:58 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Dave,

Attached is the current email list for the Woodmont Recovery Center. Please let me know if you wish to add or subtract participants.

Autumn

Name: Woodmont Recovery Center

Name	E-mail
Adrienne Quinn - King County Dept of Com and Human Services (Business Fax)	Adrienne Quinn@+1 206 296 5260
Carol Gregory - State of Washington (Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov)	Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov
Dave Kaplan	DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)	dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov
Karen Keiser (Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov)	Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov
Linda Kochmar (linda.kochmar@leg.wa.gov)	linda.kochmar@leg.wa.gov
Mark Miloscia - State of Washington (Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov)	Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov
Matt Pina	mmpina@comcast.net
Mia Gregerson - State of Washington (Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov)	Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov
Michael Matthias	MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
Pat Bosmans	pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
Tammy Campbell - Federal Way Public Schools (TCampbell@fwps.org)	TCampbell@fwps.org
Tina Orwall - State of Washington (Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov)	Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov
Tony Piasecki	TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Subj: **Woodmont DR**
Date: 8/28/2015 2:52:41 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Subj: **Re: Draft Doc**
Date: 8/27/2015 4:12:53 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
CC: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

Denise, add the time frame (the date) that was applicable for when an appeal of the Hearing Examiner's decision had to be filed. Thanks!

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/27/2015 4:08:54 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> I had a couple of minor tweaks to the language in the following sections:
>
> First bullet under Public Hearing before Hearing Examiner:
> - Notice of the Public Hearing and 15-day comment period was provided on 3/17/15 pursuant to Chapter 18.20 DMMC.
>
> Last paragraph under Hearing Examiner Decision:
> The Hearing Examiner decision was sent to the parties of record. The decision is appealable to King County Superior Court and no appeals were filed.
>
> **Denise E. Lathrop, AICP**
> **Community Development Manager**
> *City of Des Moines Planning, Building and Public Works Department*
> *21630 11th Avenue S, Suite D*
> *Des Moines, WA 98198-6398*
> *Phone: 206-870-6563*
> *Fax: 206-870-6544*
>
> *IT TAKES A PLACE TO CREATE A COMMUNITY, AND A COMMUNITY TO CREATE A PLACE*
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Michael Matthias
> **Sent:** Thursday, August 27, 2015 3:52 PM
> **To:** Denise Lathrop <DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov>; Dave Kaplan <DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov>; Dan Brewer <DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Cc:** Pat Bosmans <pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Subject:** RE: Draft Doc
>
> Thanks Denise, looks good. Forwarding to Dave –
>
> Dave any estimate of the number of people at the community meeting to fill in the blank?
>
> *Michael Matthias*
> *Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director*
> *City of Des Moines, WA*
> *206.870.6554*
> *mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov*

From: Denise Lathrop
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2015 3:45 PM
To: Michael Matthias
Cc: Pat Bosmans
Subject: Draft Doc

Michael:

Attached is an updated version of the project overview for tomorrow's meeting. I didn't know how many people attended the 8/18 meeting so someone should add that number where I've highlighted. Also, attached are two figures that we reference.

<< File: 082815 Mayor's Meeting with Legislators.docx >> << File: Figure 1 Vicinity Map.pdf >> << File: Figure 2 Aerial of Site.pdf >>

Denise E. Lathrop, AICP
Community Development Manager
City of Des Moines Planning, Building and Public Works Department
21630 11th Avenue S, Suite D
Des Moines, WA 98198-6398
Phone: 206-870-6563
Fax: 206-870-6544

IT TAKES A PLACE TO CREATE A COMMUNITY, AND A COMMUNITY TO CREATE A PLACE

Subj: **Re: Proposed Valley Cities site**
Date: 8/27/2015 1:40:52 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: marymeun@gmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

Mary,

I finally have an opportunity to respond to your email, rather than just the Facebook conversation we had.

I appreciate the concerns you've raised, and the suggestions regarding 16th Avenue S. and elimination of the methadone dispensary. We'll discuss those with Valley Cities, as we contemplate our options on trying to either move or mitigate the facility.

Assuming we can't get the facility moved, the Good Neighbor Agreement can address these issues as well. Would you like to serve on that committee? Please let us know.

Thanks again.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 8/25/2015 8:15:03 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, marymeun@gmail.com writes:

> Dave,
>
> My name is Mary Eun and I live with my family in the Woodmont neighborhood in Des Moines. I'm writing you because I would like you to know my specific concerns with the proposed Valley Cities site.
>
> I have two items that I oppose with the facility.
>
> First, the 8 acre site fronts both Pacific Highway and 16th Ave S. On the very next block is Woodmont K-8 school. I see kids walking on that sidewalk to Woodmont K-8. If we can help the kids by not having them walk by the volatile and crazy, then we should. While I'd like to see a 10' wall between the Valley Cities campus and 16th, I'm only asking for no access to 16th Ave S from that campus.
>
> Second, I don't want a methadone clinic as part of the Valley Cities campus. I don't want a daily flow of agitated people whose brains have been altered and who obviously have poor judgment to be hanging out at the Redondo square stores, parking lot, or general area. I recognize that we already have a problem in the Redondo shopping center area. I've observed drug deals in the Safeway parking lot. I've observed prostitution on Pacific Hwy. I'm afraid that bringing in a daily flow of people who are agitated and crazy creates a risk that many people will avoid by not shopping there. I'm afraid that more stores there will close, creating another blight.
>
> So, why am I writing you when you've basically said there's not much you can do at this point? I am hopeful that you can help avoid these 2 things from happening, and if you can't help us avoid them, then to mitigate their effects. Please know that if you need me to voice this to any one or any group, I will gladly do so.
>
> Sincerely,
> Mary Eun
> 806 S 273rd Ct
> Des Moines, WA 98198

Subj: **Re: Proposed Valley Cities site**
Date: 8/27/2015 1:34:22 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: desmnsluisa@gmail.com, marymeun@gmail.com, CityCouncil@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

Mary,

Thank you for your email. You'd have to ask Valley Cities why they chose the site they did, and why they didn't look at that site. It's their project, not the City of Des Moines'.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 8/27/2015 1:25:58 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, desmnsluisa@gmail.com writes:

> Mary, I am cc'ing our City Council members and I am asking our City Manager to look into your question. Luisa
>
> On Wed, Aug 26, 2015 at 8:54 PM, Mary Eun <marymeun@gmail.com> wrote:
> > Luisa, thank you for responding. So far, you're the only one of our council to respond!
> >
> > Regarding this poor location, I think a better location is the 6 1/4 acres of the empty Top Foods site in Federal Way. It's a 60,000SF building, within walking distance of the transit center, and not next to a neighborhood. Can you find out why that place was passed over?
> >
> > Sincerely,
> > Mary Eun
> >
> > On Wed, Aug 26, 2015 at 2:40 PM, Luisa Bangs <desmnsluisa@gmail.com> wrote:
> > > Hello Mary, I have been out of town, just returning and just saw your e-mail.
> > > Thank you for expressing your concerns and I want you to know that the City is exploring options to move or mitigate the facility.
> > > Sincerely,
> > > Luisa
> > >
> > > On Tue, Aug 25, 2015 at 8:29 PM, Mary Eun <marymeun@gmail.com> wrote:
> > > > Luisa,
> > > >
> > > > My name is Mary Eun and I live with my family in the Woodmont neighborhood in Des Moines. I'm writing you because I would like you to know my specific concerns with the proposed Valley Cities site.
> > > >
> > > > I have two items that I oppose with the facility.
> > > >
> > > > First, the 8 acre site fronts both Pacific Highway and 16th Ave S. On the very next block is Woodmont K-8 school. I see kids walking on that sidewalk to Woodmont K-8. If we can help the kids by not having them walk by the volatile and crazy, then we should. While I'd like to see a 10' wall between the Valley Cities campus and 16th, I'm only asking for no access to 16th Ave S from that campus.
> > > >
> > > > Second, I don't want a methadone clinic as part of the Valley Cities campus. I don't want a daily flow of agitated people whose brains have been altered and who obviously have poor judgment to be hanging out at the Redondo square stores, parking lot, or general area. I recognize that we already have a problem in the Redondo shopping center area. I've observed drug deals in

the Safeway parking lot. I've observed prostitution on Pacific Hwy. I'm afraid that bringing in a daily flow of people who are agitated and crazy creates a risk that many people will avoid by not shopping there. I'm afraid that more stores there will close, creating another blight.

So, why am I writing you when the mayor's said there's not much he can do at this point? Because you are our council Public Safety committee member. I am hopeful that you can find a way to avoid these 2 things from happening, and if you can't help us avoid them, then to mitigate their effects. Please know that if you need me to voice this to any one or any group, I will gladly do so.

Sincerely,
Mary Eun
806 S 273rd Ct
Des Moines, WA 98198

Subj: **RE: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/27/2015 11:49:06 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you. We'll look forward to seeing you.

Best,

Michael Matthias
Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director
City of Des Moines, WA
206.870.6554
mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Kochmar, Rep. Linda [mailto:Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2015 11:27 AM
To: Michael Matthias
Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center

I can get there about 2:15pm.
Linda Kochmar

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 27, 2015, at 11:22 AM, "Michael Matthias" <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
>
> When: Friday, August 28, 2015 1:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
> Where: Des Moines City Hall,south conference room
>
> Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.
>
> *~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*
>
> -----Original Appointment-----
> From: Autumn Lingle On Behalf Of Michael Matthias
> Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2015 10:43 AM
> To: 'Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov'; 'tina.orwall@leg.wa.go'; 'dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov'; 'Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov'; 'barb.bumann@leg.wa.gov'; 'Jeff.Muhm@kingcounty.gov'; 'Mia Gregerson - State of Washington (Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov<mailto:Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov>)'; 'Mia Gregerson'; 'lkellis@ci.seatac.wa.us'; 'Kyla.Shkerich@leg.wa.gov'; Dave Kaplan; Matt Pina; Michael Matthias; 'TCampbell@fwps.org'
> Cc: 'tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov'; 'Karen Keiser'; Pat Bosmans
> Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center
> When: Friday, August 28, 2015 1:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
> Where: Des Moines City Hall, south conference room
>
>
>
>
> <meeting.ics>

Subj: **FW: Woodmont Recovery Campus**
Date: 8/27/2015 11:47:40 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Fyi

From: Denise Lathrop
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2015 11:46 AM
To: 'lisa.tinsley@leg.wa.gov'
Cc: Michael Matthias; Tony Piasecki; Dan Brewer
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Campus

Ms. Tinsley:

I received your voice message regarding the e-mails Senator Mark Miloscia's office has been receiving on the Woodmont Recovery Campus project. In addition to the permit files, we also have the Hearing Examiner Decision, SEPA Checklist and e-mail correspondence posted on our website at:

http://www.desmoineswa.gov/index.aspx?NID=466

At this point in our review processes, the comment and appeal periods have passed for the SEPA review, the public hearing before the Hearing Examiner and the Hearing Examiner decision.

Our Mayor sent an invite to Senator Miloscia for a meeting he is holding with elected officials tomorrow to discuss next steps for this project. I will follow-up with you next week with any further direction gained from the meeting.

Regards,

Denise E. Lathrop, AICP
Community Development Manager
City of Des Moines Planning, Building and Public Works Department
21630 11th Avenue S, Suite D
Des Moines, WA 98198-6398
Phone: 206-870-6563
Fax: 206-870-6544

IT TAKES A PLACE TO CREATE A COMMUNITY, AND A COMMUNITY TO CREATE A PLACE

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/26/2015 10:43:14 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.go, dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov, Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov, barb.bumann@leg.wa.gov, Jeff.Muhm@kingcounty.gov, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov, mgregerson@ci.seatac.wa.us, lkellis@ci.seatac.wa.us, Kyla.Shkerich@leg.wa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, TCampbell@fwps.org

When: Friday, August 28, 2015 1:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Des Moines City Hall,south conference room

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

Subj: **Re: Date correction**
Date: 8/26/2015 10:34:16 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov

Okay. Where will it be held?

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/26/2015 10:33:21 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

I will send the invite now to everyone.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2015 10:33 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: Re: Date correction

Okay. Does that work for Michael?

You should email Matt Pina to ask as well. If he can't, that's okay. Nothing back from FW Superintendent Campbell or Dave Upthegrove or Mia Gregerson?

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/26/2015 10:12:47 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

Dave,

Make that **Friday, August 28, afternoon**. I am asking Tina Orwall and Karen Keiser to tentatively hold that time.

Autumn

Subj: **RE: Date correction**
Date: 8/26/2015 10:33:21 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

I will send the invite now to everyone.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2015 10:33 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: Re: Date correction

Okay. Does that work for Michael?

You should email Matt Pina to ask as well. If he can't, that's okay. Nothing back from FW Superintendent Campbell or Dave Upthegrove or Mia Gregerson?

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/26/2015 10:12:47 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

ave,

ake that **Friday, August 28, afternoon**. I am asking Tina Orwall and Karen Keiser to tentatively hold that time.

Autumn

Subj: **Re: Date correction**
Date: 8/26/2015 10:32:34 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov

Okay. Does that work for Michael?

You should email Matt Pina to ask as well. If he can't, that's okay. Nothing back from FW Superintendent Campbell or Dave Upthegrove or Mia Gregerson?

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/26/2015 10:12:47 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> Make that **Friday, August 28, afternoon**. I am asking Tina Orwall and Karen Keiser to tentatively hold that time.
>
> Autumn

Subj: **Fwd: Good Neighbor Agreement with Valley Cities**
Date: 8/25/2015 9:51:25 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Let's also add Doreen to the Good Neighbor Agreement committee.

Again, this isn't going to meet until we've sorted through a few things first with trying to see if we can get the facility relocated or its service make up changed.

Dave K.

From: crfancygirl@yahoo.com
To: citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 8/25/2015 7:50:22 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Good Neighbor Agreement with Valley Cities

Dear City Council,

I would like to be included in the meetings and discussions regarding the Valley Cities Rehab complex along with the Good Neighbor Agreement. Email is my best form of contact.

Thank you,
Doreen Harper
Woodmont Resident

Subj: **Re: Good Neighbor Agreement Board**
Date: 8/25/2015 9:48:35 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: apandjesus@gmail.com
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Hi April,

Glad you're able and willing to participate. I'll have staff add you to the list. Is this the best email address for you?

Dave Kaplan

In a message dated 8/25/2015 3:33:36 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, apandjesus@gmail.com writes:

> Good afternoon,
>
> I would like to be on the Good Neighbor Agreement Board, in regards to Woodmont Rehab Center. I have been a resident of Des Moines for 27 years, as well as, having a current student at Woodmont K-8.
>
> Thanks for your time,
>
> April Chavarria

Subj: **Good Neighbor Agreement Board**
Date: 8/25/2015 3:33:36 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: apandjesus@gmail.com
To: citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov

Good afternoon,

I would like to be on the Good Neighbor Agreement Board, in regards to Woodmont Rehab Center. I have been a resident of Des Moines for 27 years, as well as, having a current student at Woodmont K-8.

Thanks for your time,

April Chavarria

Subj: **FW: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/25/2015 2:36:50 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Dave,

Below are the only responses that I've received.

Autumn
-

Miranda in our office will get back to you with a time that works for Councilmember Upthegrove.

Take care,

Jeff Muhm
Chief of Staff to
Councilmember Dave Upthegrove
Metropolitan King County Council, District 5
206-477-0951

From: Soderlind, Mary [mailto:Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 9:45 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Center

Thanks! Here's her current availability (in red):

- Wed, August 26 2:30p-4:30pm - Available
- Thurs, August 27 between 9:00am-12noon or between 1pm-4:30pm – Not available on 27th
- Fri, August 28 between 1:00pm-4:30pm - Available
- Wed, Sept 2, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm – Available 9 – 11 AM
- Thurs, Sept 3, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm – Available 1 – 4:30 PM (Possibly available 9 – 11 AM)

Best,
Mary

From: Autumn Lingle [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 8:53 AM
To: Soderlind, Mary <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Center

Hi Mary,

Yes, both he and Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina will be attending.

Autumn

From: Soderlind, Mary [mailto:Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 8:31 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Center

Hi Autumn,

Do you know if Mayor Kaplan also be at this meeting? Rep. Orwall would like to know.

Thanks,
Mary

Mary Soderlind
Legislative Assistant to Rep. Tina L. Orwall, M.S.W.
mary.soderlind@leg.wa.gov
206-824-5097

From: Autumn Lingle [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 2:46 PM
To: 'Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)' <dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>; Keiser, Sen. Karen <Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov>; Orwall, Rep. Tina <Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov>
Cc: 'david.corrado@kingcounty.gov' <david.corrado@kingcounty.gov>; Heinecke, Tara Jo <TaraJo.Heinecke@leg.wa.gov>; Soderlind, Mary <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center

Good afternoon everyone,

City of Des Moines Assistant City Manager Michael Matthias would like to meet with all of you for about 2 hours regarding the Valley Cities Recovery Center in the Woodmont neighborhood of Des Moines. The meeting will be held at Des Moines City Hall.

Please let me know if you are available at any of the times below:

Wed, August 26 2:30p-4:30pm
Thurs, August 27 between 9:00am-12noon or between 1pm-4:30pm
Fri, August 28 between 1:00pm-4:30pm
Wed, Sept 2, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm
Thurs, Sept 3, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm

Thank you,

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198

206 870 6552

Subj: **Updates to the Futures**
Date: 8/25/2015 1:25:14 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov
To: AMerges@desmoineswa.gov, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov, BSellers@desmoineswa.gov, BBohl@desmoineswa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov, BCarver@desmoineswa.gov, CPollock@desmoineswa.gov, CPauk@desmoineswa.gov, DSouthwick@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov, DMason@desmoineswa.gov, GDelgado@desmoineswa.gov, GFredricks@desmoineswa.gov, JJohnson@desmoineswa.gov, JNutting@desmoineswa.gov, JDusenbury@desmoineswa.gov, LMadsen@desmoineswa.gov, LReinhold@desmoineswa.gov, LBangs@desmoineswa.gov, mmpina@comcast.net, MMurphy@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, momeof2c@msn.com, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, PThorell@desmoineswa.gov, pvolin@desmoineswa.gov, robbieback@hotmail.com, SRomano@desmoineswa.gov, SWilkins@desmoineswa.gov, TGeorge@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, penningtonvl@hotmail.com, VSheckler@desmoineswa.gov

The following changes were made to the Futures:

September 10th Finance & Economic Development Committee meeting – removed "Development Updates" and added "Roof Top Structures" to the agenda
September 10th Regular Council meeting – removed "Safeway Condemnation" and added "Draft Resolution Setting a Public Hearing for the Wesley Homes Master Plan" and "Consultant Contract Award with BHC for On-Call Services" to the agenda
September 24th Regular Council meeting – moved "Draft Ordinance No. 15-030; Temporary Homeless Encampments" to November 5th
October 1st Public Safety & Transportation Committee meeting – added "Woodmont Recovery Campus-Project Update," "CTP Update," and "Pavement Management Program" to the agenda
October 1st Council Study session – converted meeting to Regular meeting and added "Draft Resolution, Wesley Homes Master Plan" to the agenda
October 8th Regular Council meeting – moved "Wesley Homes Master Plan" to October 1st

Have a great week!
Bonnie

Subj: **Re: Council futures**
Date: 8/25/2015 12:15:34 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: vicpdmcc@gmail.com
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
CC: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

Looks good.
Thanks,

Vic P

On Aug 25, 2015, at 09:44, Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Hi Vic,

Are you ok with these adds to the agenda for the PS&T on October 1.

Michael Matthias
Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director
City of Des Moines, WA
206.870.6554
mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

From: Dan Brewer
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 1:58 PM
To: Michael Matthias
Cc: Brandon Carver; Bonnie Wilkins
Subject: Council futures

I'm proposing that we add the following items to the PS&T agenda for October 1st:

- Woodmont Recovery Campus - Project update
- CTP Update
- Pavement Management Program

Can you please confirm with the Mayor and Committee Chair Pennington.

Thanks!

=

Subj: **Re: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/25/2015 10:47:42 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/25/2015 10:45:07 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Yes, her assistant did contact me and I will include her.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, August 25, 2015 10:42 AM
> **To:** Autumn Lingle
> **Subject:** Re: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center
>
> Autumn,
>
> Please make sure that Federal Way Schools Superintendent Tammy Campbell is also included for this meeting. I asked her to contact you yesterday to make sure that you had her added to the distribution for this meeting. Thanks!
>
> Dave K.
>
> In a message dated 8/25/2015 9:44:24 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:
>
> > Dave,
> >
> > Michael asked that I forward my initial email to you. I did not include you or Matt, as I am waiting for a more conclusive date, then I will send an official invite to everyone.

Autumn

From: Autumn Lingle
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 2:46 PM
To: 'Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)'; 'Karen Keiser (Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov)'; 'Tina Orwall (tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov)'
Cc: 'david.corrado@kingcounty.gov'; 'TaraJo.Heinecke@leg.wa.gov'; 'Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov'
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center

Good afternoon everyone,

City of Des Moines Assistant City Manager Michael Matthias would like to meet with all of you for about 2 hours regarding the Valley Cities Recovery Center in the Woodmont neighborhood of Des Moines. The meeting will be held at Des Moines City Hall.

Please let me know if you are available at any of the times below:

- Wed, August 26 2:30p-4:30pm
- Thurs, August 27 between 9:00am-12noon or between 1pm-4:30pm
- Fri, August 28 between 1:00pm-4:30pm
- Wed, Sept 2, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm
- Thurs, Sept 3, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm

Thank you,

Autumn Lingle

City of Des Moines

City Manager's Office

Executive Assistant/HR Technician

21630 11th Ave S, Ste A

Des Moines, WA 98198

206 870 6552

Subj: **RE: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/25/2015 10:45:07 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Yes, her assistant did contact me and I will include her.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 10:42 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: Re: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center

Autumn,

Please make sure that Federal Way Schools Superintendent Tammy Campbell is also included for this meeting. I asked her to contact you yesterday to make sure that you had her added to the distribution for this meeting. Thanks!

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/25/2015 9:44:24 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

Dave,

Michael asked that I forward my initial email to you. I did not include you or Matt, as I am waiting for a more conclusive date, then I will send an official invite to everyone.

Autumn

From: Autumn Lingle
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 2:46 PM
To: 'Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)'; 'Karen Keiser (Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov)'; 'Tina Orwall (tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov)'
Cc: 'david.corrado@kingcounty.gov'; 'TaraJo.Heinecke@leg.wa.gov'; 'Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov'
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center

Good afternoon everyone,

City of Des Moines Assistant City Manager Michael Matthias would like to meet with all of you for about 2 hours regarding the Valley Cities Recovery Center in the Woodmont neighborhood of Des Moines. The meeting will be held at Des Moines City Hall.

Please let me know if you are available at any of the times below:

Wed, August 26 2:30p-4:30pm
Thurs, August 27 between 9:00am-12noon or between 1pm-4:30pm
Fri, August 28 between 1:00pm-4:30pm
Wed, Sept 2, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm
Thurs, Sept 3, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm

Thank you,

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **Re: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/25/2015 10:42:13 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov

Autumn,

Please make sure that Federal Way Schools Superintendent Tammy Campbell is also included for this meeting. I asked her to contact you yesterday to make sure that you had her added to the distribution for this meeting. Thanks!

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/25/2015 9:44:24 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> Michael asked that I forward my initial email to you. I did not include you or Matt, as I am waiting for a more conclusive date, then I will send an official invite to everyone.
>
> Autumn
>
> ---
> **From:** Autumn Lingle
> **Sent:** Monday, August 24, 2015 2:46 PM
> **To:** 'Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)'; 'Karen Keiser (Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov)'; 'Tina Orwall (tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov)'
> **Cc:** 'david.corrado@kingcounty.gov'; 'TaraJo.Heinecke@leg.wa.gov'; 'Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov'
> **Subject:** Woodmont Recovery Center
>
> Good afternoon everyone,
>
> City of Des Moines Assistant City Manager Michael Matthias would like to meet with all of you for about 2 hours regarding the Valley Cities Recovery Center in the Woodmont neighborhood of Des Moines. The meeting will be held at Des Moines City Hall.
>
> Please let me know if you are available at any of the times below:
>
> - Wed, August 26 2:30p-4:30pm
> - Thurs, August 27 between 9:00am-12noon or between 1pm-4:30pm
> - Fri, August 28 between 1:00pm-4:30pm
> - Wed, Sept 2, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm
> - Thurs, Sept 3, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm
>
> Thank you,
>
> *Autumn Lingle*
> *City of Des Moines*
> *City Manager's Office*
> *Executive Assistant/HR Technician*

21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **FW: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/25/2015 9:44:24 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Dave,

Michael asked that I forward my initial email to you. I did not include you or Matt, as I am waiting for a more conclusive date, then I will send an official invite to everyone.

Autumn

From: Autumn Lingle
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 2:46 PM
To: 'Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)'; 'Karen Keiser (Karen.Keiser@leg.wa.gov)'; 'Tina Orwall (tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov)'
Cc: 'david.corrado@kingcounty.gov'; 'TaraJo.Heinecke@leg.wa.gov'; 'Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov'
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center

Good afternoon everyone,

City of Des Moines Assistant City Manager Michael Matthias would like to meet with all of you for about 2 hours regarding the Valley Cities Recovery Center in the Woodmont neighborhood of Des Moines. The meeting will be held at Des Moines City Hall.

Please let me know if you are available at any of the times below:

- Wed, August 26 2:30p-4:30pm
- Thurs, August 27 between 9:00am-12noon or between 1pm-4:30pm
- Fri, August 28 between 1:00pm-4:30pm
- Wed, Sept 2, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm
- Thurs, Sept 3, between 9:00am-12:00noon or 1:00pm – 4:30pm

Thank you,

Autumn Lingle
City of Des Moines
City Manager's Office
Executive Assistant/HR Technician
21630 11th Ave S, Ste A
Des Moines, WA 98198
206 870 6552

Subj: **FW: Council futures**
Date: 8/25/2015 9:44:20 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov

Hi Vic,

Are you ok with these adds to the agenda for the PS&T on October 1.

Michael Matthias
Asst. City Manager / Economic Development Director
City of Des Moines, WA
206.870.6554
mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

From: Dan Brewer
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 1:58 PM
To: Michael Matthias
Cc: Brandon Carver; Bonnie Wilkins
Subject: Council futures

I'm proposing that we add the following items to the PS&T agenda for October 1st:

- Woodmont Recovery Campus - Project update
- CTP Update
- Pavement Management Program

Can you please confirm with the Mayor and Committee Chair Pennington.

Thanks!

Subj: **Good Neighbor Agreement with Valley Cities**
Date: 8/25/2015 7:50:22 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: crfancygirl@yahoo.com
To: citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov

Dear City Council,

I would like to be included in the meetings and discussions regarding the Valley Cities Rehab complex along with the Good Neighbor Agreement. Email is my best form of contact.

Thank you,
Doreen Harper
Woodmont Resident

Subj: **Re: (no subject)**
Date: 8/22/2015 7:36:14 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: jamie.theresa.griswold@gmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Theresa,

Thank you for your heartfelt email. I understand your concerns, and that of the neighborhood. We'll do what we can do.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 8/21/2015 12:34:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, jamie.theresa.griswold@gmail.com writes:

> Dear Mayor Kaplan,
>
> Thank you for reading my email.
>
> I am a Federal Way resident and a Woodmont parent. I attended not only the public meeting Tuesday August 18th, but also the city council meeting last night. I found out about this campus 2 weeks ago on social media. I am still trying to digest all of this . . . and am learning as I go.
>
> I have two small children that attend Woodmont K-8 and I can honestly say I am beyond livid that my children and their classmates were not notified during the early process. I feel so much could have been done to relocate this campus had more people known earlier. We all know there is a huge drug and crime problem in both King and Pierce county. The campus is beautiful and it will help those that actually want treatment. Bottom line is that it is in an inappropriate location. Just taking out the methadone piece isn't good enough. If methadone truly helps the mentally ill it should be a part of this campus. The location is the problem.
>
> I wanted to send an email out because I can not speak with out tears rolling down my face or feeling ill. This campus so desperately needs to be relocated. I came to the city council meeting last night because I wanted to hear what other city members had to say. Mr. Pennington started me in tears. I truly believe the council is listening and you DO care about the relocation. Being able to admit that the city messed is huge. I also believe you were deceived by Valley Cities. Hearing you confirm your team is doing what ever they can to relocate is encouraging. Having this campus relocated is exactly what I am hopeful and will work for. Please tell me this really isn't a done deal. You have an amazing community that wants your help and is willing to help you fight!
>
> Please tell me how we can help fight for relocation.
>
> With respect,
> Theresa Griswold
> Woodmont parent
> Federal Way resident

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/22/2015 6:48:21 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mpina@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov, pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 8/22/2015 6:35:13 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center

Now I know who "Rorie" is. Mia mentioned him. Thanks.

Of course we're going to try and get this moved or mitigated further.

He's wrong, however. When the law allows a permitted use, when notification exceeds the legal requirements for who is included, when the school district and all service providers to that area were included in the notification and failed to offer concerns or suggestions, and when citizens within the notification area weigh in to the hearing examiner with the exact same concerns as those expressed by who were outside the notification area, their voices have been heard. There is no "negligence." Unfortunately the case would come first before that is proven out in court, but it won't wind up with the result they wish to achieve.

Regarding inclusion of me in a lawsuit, those would be quickly dismissed. No elected official can effectively be sued in the legal conduct of their role as an elected official. Since I was not a party to the decision on the siting of the facility or approval of the PUD, I would be dismissed as a party to a suit.

The permitting of this facility is an administrative matter, not a political one. It did not come to the City Council. All I've admitted is that, strictly for good public policy and political reasons, notice should have gone out to wider audience. My comments are strictly related to notification. In regard to the City's administrative decision on the proposal, I didn't say we screwed up, just that I don't believe it belongs here ... even if it is allowed legally.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/21/2015 11:53:59 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, mpina@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> FYI
>
> *Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID*
>
> -------- Original Message --------
> Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center
> From: "Zajac, Rorie" <Rorie.Zajac@morganstanley.com>
> To: Vic Pennington <VPennington@desmoineswa.gov>
> CC: Matt Pina <mpina@desmoineswa.gov>,Luisa Bangs <LBangs@desmoineswa.gov>,Jeremy Nutting <JNutting@desmoineswa.gov>
>
> Vic,

I attended both the Mayor's meeting and city council meeting last night and was pleased with the comments you made. I understand Mayor Kaplan's comments that Des Moines was handcuffed by State law but I urge the Des Moines City Council to take a dramatic and drastic stance on freezing any construction on the Valley Cities property. Rather than face a lawsuit from Valley Cities or the State, Des Moines chose to sit and watch the city examiner approve the CUP. Kaplan, and the council has now has left themselves vulnerable to lawsuit by the residents of Woodmont. There is civic liability here. Kaplan has admitted negligence in both print and on video. I know that I plan to pursue legal recourse if Valley Cities opens their campus. I would much rather have Des Moines fight or help pay to relocate Valley Cities and increase my property taxes. I will share in helping to fix Des Moines' mistake because I fear that allowing the campus to open will be much more costly to me and others: fiscally, emotionally and in safety. I love Des Moines, I want to live here for a long time. I am the emerging resident you want. If this happens, I will most likely leave.

In a better scenario, the rehab campus negatively effects the value of several homes nearby, in our scenario, the campus effects EVERY SINGLE HOME that feeds into the Woodmont Elementary School. I would never send my children to that elementary school and neither will others. This action will render our primary education worthless. I would not be surprised if enrollment at Woodmont Elementary falls to levels where the school ultimately closes. Primary education is an essential service, far more essential than Valley Cities.

I am stunned by the failure of our city.

Please fight and challenge the law.

I would much rather be a civic leader that stands up and fights when the law is clearly not protecting my residents than acquiesce even when I know what is happening is wrong.

Even if Des Moines loses, we have to fight.

Thank you,

Rorie Zajac

Woodmont Beach

27022 10th Ave S

Des Moines, WA 98198

206-734-6484

Rorie E. Zajac, CFP®, ADPA®

Assistant Vice President

Financial Advisor

Morgan Stanley Wealth Management

601 Union Street, Suite 5200 | Seattle . WA . 98101

t. 206.344.2455 | f. 206.628.4425 | toll free 800.426.7127 | rorie.zajac@ms.com

The CFP®, and CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER™ marks are financial planning credentials awarded by Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards Inc.

NMLS ID 1369851

Important Notice to Recipients:

Please do not use e-mail to request, authorize or effect the purchase or sale of any security or commodity. Unfortunately, we cannot execute such instructions provided in e-mail. Thank you.

The sender of this e-mail is an employee of Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC ("Morgan Stanley"). If you have received this communication in error, please destroy all electronic and paper copies and notify the sender immediately. Erroneous transmission is not intended to waive confidentiality or privilege. Morgan Stanley reserves the right, to the extent permitted under applicable law, to monitor electronic communications. This message is subject to terms available at the following link: http://www.morganstanley.com/disclaimers/mssbemail.html. If you cannot access this link, please notify us by reply message and we will send the contents to you. By messaging with Morgan Stanley you consent to the foregoing.

Subj: **(no subject)**
Date: 8/21/2015 12:34:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: jamie.theresa.griswold@gmail.com
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Dear Mayor Kaplan,

Thank you for reading my email.

I am a Federal Way resident and a Woodmont parent. I attended not only the public meeting Tuesday August 18th, but also the city council meeting last night. I found out about this campus 2 weeks ago on social media. I am still trying to digest all of this . . . and am learning as I go.

I have two small children that attend Woodmont K-8 and I can honestly say I am beyond livid that my children and their classmates were not notified during the early process. I feel so much could have been done to relocate this campus had more people known earlier. We all know there is a huge drug and crime problem in both King and Pierce county. The campus is beautiful and it will help those that actually want treatment. Bottom line is that it is in an inappropriate location. Just taking out the methadone piece isn't good enough. If methadone truly helps the mentally ill it should be a part of this campus. The location is the problem.

I wanted to send an email out because I can not speak with out tears rolling down my face or feeling ill. This campus so desperately needs to be relocated. I came to the city council meeting last night because I wanted to hear what other city members had to say. Mr. Pennington started me in tears. I truly believe the council is listening and you DO care about the relocation. Being able to admit that the city messed is huge. I also believe you were deceived by Valley Cities. Hearing you confirm your team is doing what ever they can to relocate is encouraging. Having this campus relocated is exactly what I am hopeful and will work for. Please tell me this really isn't a done deal. You have an amazing community that wants your help and is willing to help you fight!

Please tell me how we can help fight for relocation.

With respect,
Theresa Griswold
Woodmont parent
Federal Way resident

Subj: **Re: Follow Up**
Date: 8/20/2015 10:55:26 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: apandjesus@gmail.com, gdelgado@desmoineswa.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you for your kind words (and those of your daughter.) Both greatly appreciated.

Let me give some thought on that. I'm sure the Chief would be happy to have you participate on our Police Services Advisory Committee. I know there are other ways to get people involved, that we haven't done a good job of consolidating and putting in one place. I'll talk with the City Manager about that.

Also, thank you again for being the point person on arranging the Woodmont community meeting. If it had been a number of the others, I'm not sure how the meeting would have turned out. As it is now, there's a possibility for some positive outcomes (and some important lessons learned by the City) as a result of the meeting. It won't likely be the last meeting we have either.

Thanks again April.

Dave Kaplan

In a message dated 8/19/2015 10:58:05 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, apandjesus@gmail.com writes:

> Good morning gentlemen,
>
> Thank you again for the meeting last night. I am sorry people were so hostile, I understand emotions and passion, but I also believe in respect! I am not use to such environments (and the reason I will NEVER be in politics, God Bless you both!) I however, would like to work on building our community up, I know I have talked to you both about volunteering/community boards and I truly would like to follow up on that.
>
> As always thanks for your time,
>
> April Chavarria
>
> Dave- my daughter says you're awesome and that is high rating from a teen ☺

Subj: **aerial map of the site**
Date: 8/19/2015 4:32:35 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov

Tina,

Attached it the aerial map of the site. Note that the school is immediately north of the boundary line of the two cul de sacs in the top left of the photo.

Thank you for all you do.

Dave K.

0
100
200
400
Scale In Feet
Aerial – LUA2014-0038
File: Aerial – LUA2014-0038.pdf
Map Generated: Mar 23, 2015
©2015 City of Des Moines GIS
Subject Parcels
Des Moines City Limits
16TH PL S
17TH PL S
18TH PL S
S 268TH ST
17TH AVE S
Property A
Property B
16TH AVE S
PACIFIC HWY S
S 272ND ST

Subj: **Re: Meeting Tomorrow at 4 or 4:30**
Date: 8/19/2015 5:08:32 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
CC: desmnsdave@aol.com, mpina@desmoineswa.gov

Sounds good.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 19, 2015, at 4:43 PM, Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

> C u then
> Michael
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Aug 19, 2015, at 4:29 PM, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Let's do it then. 4:15pm at city hall.
>>
>> Dave K.
>>
>> In a message dated 8/19/2015 4:24:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, mpina@desmoineswa.gov writes:
>>
>>> I can be there at 4:15.
>>> Matt
>>>
>>> *Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID*
>>>
>>> Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
>>>
>>> Dave would like us four to get together tomorrow before the executive session to discuss last night's community meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus and what our next steps should be. Would you be available at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. to meet? Let me know. Thanks
>>>
>>> Tony Piasecki
>>> Des Moines City Manager
>>>
>>> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Meeting Tomorrow at 4 or 4:30**
Date: 8/19/2015 4:43:19 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com
CC: mpina@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

C u then
Michael

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 19, 2015, at 4:29 PM, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

Let's do it then. 4:15pm at city hall.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/19/2015 4:24:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, mpina@desmoineswa.gov writes:

I can be there at 4:15.
Matt

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Dave would like us four to get together tomorrow before the executive session to discuss last night's community meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus and what our next steps should be. Would you be available at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. to meet? Let me know. Thanks

Tony Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Meeting Tomorrow at 4 or 4:30**
Date: 8/19/2015 4:29:00 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mpina@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Let's do it then. 4:15pm at city hall.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/19/2015 4:24:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, mpina@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> I can be there at 4:15.
> Matt
>
> *Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID*
>
> Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
>
> Dave would like us four to get together tomorrow before the executive session to discuss last night's community meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus and what our next steps should be. Would you be available at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. to meet? Let me know. Thanks
>
> Tony Piasecki
> Des Moines City Manager
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **example good neighbor agreement**
Date: 8/19/2015 4:28:31 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Tony,

Here's the link to the document, but I'm attaching it as well.

Good Neighbor Agreement for the Crisis Solutions Center on our website:
http://www.desc.org/documents/good%20neighbor%20handouts/crisis_solutions_center_good_neighbor_agreement_10-03-2011.pdf

We also posted minutes from the Neighborhood Advisory Committee meetings. The group disbanded last year.
http://www.desc.org/crisis_solutions_good_neighbor.html

Dave K.

Subj: **Re: Meeting Tomorrow at 4 or 4:30**
Date: 8/19/2015 4:24:04 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: mpina@desmoineswa.gov
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: desmnsdave@aol.com, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

I can be there at 4:15.
Matt

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Dave would like us four to get together tomorrow before the executive session to discuss last night's community meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus and what our next steps should be. Would you be available at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. to meet? Let me know. Thanks

Tony Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: question**
Date: 8/19/2015 3:55:16 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, jgmayne@gmail.com, nalpakdlk@aol.com
CC: editor@b-townblog.com, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

April Chavarria kicked off the meeting, and Candace Urquhart gave her speech after that.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/19/2015 11:45:45 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Jack,
>
> I do not have the name of the first speaker. I think Dave does.
>
> As far as vesting, here is the language from the Des Moines Municipal Code:
>
> 18.20.110 Acceptance for vesting.
> (1) An application for a proposed land use action shall not serve to vest any development rights until the Planning, Building and Public Works Director determines the application is complete as specified by this code.
>
> (2) Applications found to include material errors shall be deemed withdrawn and subsequent submittals shall be treated as a new application and shall require a new application fee.
>
> (3) Applicant-generated requests for revision(s), i.e., those requests which are not made in response to staff review or public appeal, that result in a substantial change to the proposed land use action, as determined by the Planning, Building and Public Works Director, shall be treated as a new application as of the date of receipt of the revision by the Planning, Building and Public Works Department and shall require a new application fee. [Ord. 1591 § 61, 2014.]
>
> The Essential Public Facilities state law is contained in RCW 36.70A.200. The specific part I quoted last night was RCW 36.70A.200(2)(5) "No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities."
>
> Tony Piasecki
> Des Moines City Manager
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jack Mayne [mailto:jgmayne@gmail.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2015 11:36 AM
> To: Dave Kaplan <nalpakdlk@aol.com>; Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
> Cc: Scott Schaefer <editor@b-townblog.com>
> Subject: question
> Importance: High
>
> Anyone know the names of the first woman speaker who made a coherent argument and asked for a delay for more studies? How many people in the room? Also, I need the citation of the law/reg that

requires the city to site these facilities.

Sorry to bug you folks, but I am trying to put together a fair and balanced (no, I do not work for Fox) story on the meeting last night. The recording is sometimes difficult to hear and understand because of the acoustics of a gym multipurpose room.

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328

Subj: **Re: Meeting Tomorrow at 4 or 4:30**
Date: 8/19/2015 3:49:28 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: desmnsdave@aol.com, mpina@desmoineswa.gov

Free from 4-5 tomorrow whatever time works -
Michael

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 19, 2015, at 3:34 PM, "Tony Piasecki" <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Dave would like us four to get together tomorrow before the executive session to discuss last night's community meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus and what our next steps should be. Would you be available at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. to meet? Let me know. Thanks

Tony Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **Meeting Tomorrow at 4 or 4:30**
Date: 8/19/2015 3:34:13 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Dave would like us four to get together tomorrow before the executive session to discuss last night's community meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus and what our next steps should be. Would you be available at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m. to meet? Let me know. Thanks

Tony Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **Follow Up**
Date: 8/19/2015 10:58:05 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: apandjesus@gmail.com
To: gdelgado@desmoineswa.gov, DesMnsDave@aol.com

Good morning gentlemen,

Thank you again for the meeting last night. I am sorry people were so hostile, I understand emotions and passion, but I also believe in respect! I am not use to such environments (and the reason I will NEVER be in politics, God Bless you both!) I however, would like to work on building our community up, I know I have talked to you both about volunteering/community boards and I truly would like to follow up on that.

As always thanks for your time,

April Chavarria

Dave- my daughter says you're awesome and that is high rating from a teen ☺

Subj: **Re: Des Moines Meeting tonight**
Date: 8/18/2015 11:31:54 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: dham@kirotv.com

I think that the fact that people didn't know about it until just a few days ago (let alone the nature of the project), and that the City didn't communicate this project to a broad enough audience initially, really got people fired up. I don't blame them for that.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/18/2015 11:29:59 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, dham@kirotv.com writes:

> Yeah of course... I was surprised how heated it got
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Aug 18, 2015, at 23:29, "DesMnsDave@aol.com" <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Just a chance for the community to speak ... and vent (as you saw.)
>>
>> Sorry I didn't give you a heads up on this one. The meeting came about like a flash in the pan, and I have my actual job to worry about as well.
>>
>> Dave K.
>>
>> In a message dated 8/18/2015 7:07:36 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, dham@kirotv.com writes:
>>
>>> Hey Mayor – I'm heading to tonight's meeting at the school. I was wondering if there will be anything new decided tonight or if it's just a chance for the community to speak?
>>>
>>> David Ham
>>>
>>> KIRO 7 Reporter
>>>
>>> 206.718.9617 Call/Text
>>>
>>> Online 24/7 at kirotv.com
>>>
>>> *Download KIRO 7 free apps*
>>>
>>> *Follow@HamKIRO7 on Twitter, Instagram, Facebook*

Subj: **Re: FW: my comment**
Date: 8/18/2015 11:30:16 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: luisa_bangs@hotmail.com

Thanks Luisa. Good thing you didn't show up tonight. It was ugly.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/18/2015 9:13:12 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, luisa_bangs@hotmail.com writes:

> Hi Dave, here are my comments for the meeting Thursday
>
> ---
>
> From: luisa_bangs@hotmail.com
> To: luisa_bangs@hotmail.com
> Subject: RE: my comment
> Date: Tue, 18 Aug 2015 21:10:45 -0700
>
> ---
>
> Having lived in DM for 15 years, seeing the deterioration of the downtown core, I believe that responsibly approving building height increases in specified areas of the downtown core west of MVD will stimulate economic synergy that a majority of the City's residents have been concerned about.
>
> I have a view, like many of those who are concerned about the impact on their views. The Council has to responsibly weigh all the concerns of it's' city, those that have written their concerns and those who have verbalized them. However, the Council in representing "the City" must try to balance decisions, as tough as that is, between no development and responsible development that can bring more retail and to us so that we shop in Des Moines, versus outside of our City.
>
> This building height issue is not popular with those who live overlooking the marina view area, but neither are vacant buildings, losing a grocery store and looking like certain parts of King County that many of us would not venture to go into.
>
> Therefore, I am voting to approve Draft Ordinance No. 15-127 amending DMMC 18.115.060 and DMMC 18.115.080 as read.
>
> =

Subj: **Re: Confirm Please**
Date: 8/18/2015 4:16:24 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: pvolin@desmoineswa.gov

The meeting starts at 7:30pm and is scheduled to end at 9:00pm, though I think we can go to 9:30pm without too much trouble. The blog is likely just people trying to get others there early.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/18/2015 3:25:36 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, pvolin@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Hello Mayor,
>
> Would you confirm for me please the times of your meeting tonight?? The blog says is it 7-9:30 and the agenda I am looking at says 7:30-9:30 – I am making up sign-in sheets for you and want to make sure I have the correct time.
>
> Thank you -
>
> Peggy Volin
> City of Des Moines/Planning, Building & Public Works
> pvolin@desmoineswa.gov

Subj: **Town Hall Mtg @ Woodmont**
Date: 8/18/2015 2:59:29 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: message.center@smtp.schooldude.com
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Hi Mayor Kaplan,

Your event has been processed by Woodmont as follows:

FS Schedule ID: 26428
Event Title: Town Hall Meeting
Event Start Date/Time: 8/18/2015 7:30PM
Event End Date/Time: 8/18/2015 9:30PM
Organization: City of Des Moines
Location: Woodmont Elementary
Building:
Area(Building|Rooms): Gym (Elementary) (Gym)

Please note that you will be invoiced for the use of the facilities after the event. An estimate of the cost at this time will be $15.00 for the PA System.

We have notified our Security Department of the event. Should they deem it necessary for a security assignment for the event, you will be invoiced for the assignment at the rate of $42.00 per hour.

Also, please note that your insurance will be expiring soon with the District. For any future events, please submit a renewal so that we can update our files.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thank you.

Denise Matt
Facility Use Administrator
253-945-2065
dematt@fwps.org

Subj: **Your requested schedule is activated.(Event:Town Hall Meeting)**
Date: 8/18/2015 2:51:06 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: message.center@smtp.schooldude.com
To: skiyohar@fwps.org, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov

(Please do not reply to this message. It is a system generated message to notify you of a new schedule request.)

The facility schedule request listed below is approved and activated.

FS Schedule ID: 26428
Event Title: Town Hall Meeting
Event Time: 7:30PM
Event Date: 8/18/2015
Event Setup Time: 6:30PM
Event Breakdown Time: 10:00PM
Status: Approved
Schedule State: Activated
Organization: City of Des Moines
Location: Woodmont Elementary
Building:
Area(Buildings|Rooms): Gym (Elementary)(Gym)
Events:

Date : 8/18/2015
Start Time : 7:30 PM
End Time : 9:30 PM
Location : Woodmont Elementary
Building :
Area :
Room(s) : Gym

Subj: **Methadone clinic**
Date: 8/18/2015 10:36:34 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: patrinearson@gmail.com
To: citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov

Council members, I live in Hawaii so I can't vote for or against any of of you, but being a native Washingtonian I still pay attention to what is going on in my home state.
I hope you will not bow to the public pressure and disallow the planned methadone/recovery clinic planned for your community. I'm not, nor ever have been, an addict trying to recover, but I've had loved ones that are. They need all the help and support they can get. Addiction in not a moral issue, but a medical issue. It is a sickness, a disease. Some will abuse the privilege of the clinic and use it as a way to keep from getting sick until their next fix, but many others will use the facility to stay the course on their long and hard road to recovery.
Please show your neighbors that your city has the compassion and the the forward, cutting edge thinking to help these people that are seeking help in their time of need.
Thank you and aloha,
Patrick Rinearson

Sent from my iPhone=

Subj: **Re: Federal Way School Superintendent**
Date: 8/18/2015 8:28:26 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you. See you around 11:30am

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/18/2015 8:27:31 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> I'll have a sign-in sheet put together. I'm working with Dan on the handouts. I'll get copies to you this morning.
>
> Tony Piasecki
>
> Des Moines City Manager
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.
>
> **From:** DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, August 18, 2015 8:25 AM
> **To:** Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: Federal Way School Superintendent
>
> Thank you.
>
> We need some sort of a sign-in sheet. Not for the masses, but one for people who are willing to serve on a Good Neighbor Agreement Advisory Committee. We'll need those names of the willing (add email and phone contact information) to work on the agreement over the next year.

Please remind me what handouts will we have for tonight?

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/18/2015 8:19:07 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> I had a voice mail message on my phone this morning from Kerry (sp) of the Federal Way School District. She works in the Superintendent's office. She asked that you call her. Superintendent Campbell would like to speak to you sometime today about tonight's meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus. Kerry's phone number is 253-945-2013.
>
> Tony Piasecki
>
> Des Moines City Manager
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **RE: Federal Way School Superintendent**
Date: 8/18/2015 8:27:31 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

I'll have a sign-in sheet put together. I'm working with Dan on the handouts. I'll get copies to you this morning.

Tony Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 8:25 AM
To: Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Re: Federal Way School Superintendent

Thank you.

We need some sort of a sign-in sheet. Not for the masses, but one for people who are willing to serve on a Good Neighbor Agreement Advisory Committee. We'll need those names of the willing (add email and phone contact information) to work on the agreement over the next year.

Please remind me what handouts will we have for tonight?

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/18/2015 8:19:07 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> I had a voice mail message on my phone this morning from Kerry (sp) of the Federal Way School District. She works in the Superintendent's office. She asked that you call her. Superintendent Campbell would like to speak to you sometime today about tonight's meeting regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus. Kerry's phone number is 253-945-2013.
>
> Tony Piasecki
> Des Moines City Manager
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information contained in this electronic communication is personal, privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) to which it has been addressed. If you read this communication and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, other than delivery to the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Hearing tomorrow**
Date: 8/17/2015 8:11:39 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov

Thanks Mia.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/17/2015 5:41:40 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov writes:

> Dear Mayor Kaplan,
>
> Thank you for the invitation to attend the public hearing tomorrow evening.
>
> I wish I could attend but already have a commitment to travel to Pasco tomorrow and will not be back until Thursday.
>
> I read what Councilmember Upthegrove wrote and agree with this perspective on this matter.
>
> I wish you luck as you lead your city towards a decision that will make our community a better place to work, live and thrive.
>
> I really like this TED talk. I thought I would share it with you – in case you haven't seen it yet. I live with an alcoholic and it was an "ah ha" moment to think about addiction in a different way.
>
> http://www.ted.com/talks/johann_hari_everything_you_think_you_know_about_addiction_is_wrong
>
> Best regards,
>
> Mia

Representative Mia Gregerson

33rd Legislative District

Burien, Des Moines, Kent, Normandy Park, Renton, SeaTac, and Unincorporated King County

Local Government – Vice Chair, Labor – Vice Chair, and Transportation

JLOB 318

360-786-7868

Click here to sign-up for my e-newsletter

Subj: **Re: FW: Community Mtg re Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 8/17/2015 8:11:09 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Thanks Dave.

The project has been approved by staff. The Conditional Use Permit has been approved by staff. The zoning has their services as an allowed use. Notice went out to people within 600' of the project, rather than the usual and legally required 300'. All of the usual utility and service and public providers were contacted in advance of the hearing back in February/March. State law makes clear that no regulations can be passed to prevent an "essential public facility" from being built, so that's not even a consideration. There is no legal or financial impediment that I'm aware of.

Only those who are concerned and who just recently found out about the project (or are just now paying attention) are up in arms. That's why I called the meeting. There are those who flat out oppose the project, but it won't be stopped. I've been taking my political lumps for saying just that. The important part is making sure that there is community input into the "good neighbor agreement" required under the Conditional Use Permit.

I'm not sure what "outreach" Valley Cities did directly with the community before this, but it doesn't sound like a lot ... other than a courtesy contact back in November to let me know they had purchased the property and were going forward with it.

I agree with the need in South King County for these services, including any number of residents in Des Moines. I'm not one to let fear get in the way of good public policy, even if I'm disappointed that yet another large commercial property goes to yet another non-profit, non-tax paying entity. We have more than our fair share of those in Des Moines.

My hope is that many tomorrow night will at least understand that this project will be going forward, and that the best they can do is to participate in helping to mitigate the potential and actual impacts from its operation.

Thanks again for weighing in.

Warm Regards,

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 8/17/2015 4:45:57 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov writes:

> Mayor Kaplan,
>
> Thanks for including me. Unfortunately I have a previously scheduled event tomorrow night that conflicts with this meeting and I will be unable to attend. I have had the opportunity to be briefed on the plans for the Woodmont Recovery Center and I look forward to getting a report back from this community meeting.
>
> As a Des Moines resident, I do want to share my initial thoughts with the City Council:

People who live in South King County deserve equal access to public services, including medical services such as inpatient drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs. Our friends, neighbors and family members who struggle with addiction should not have to travel to Seattle to receive the care they need. I believe providing local access to treatment will result in less, not more, adverse community impacts. Helping people—not just fearing and demonizing people—who are struggling with addiction has the potential to reduce crime, improve public safety and quality of life, and most importantly save lives and restore families in our community. Strong families are the building blocks of healthy communities. I think we all know a friend, family or loved one who has struggled with drug or alcohol addiction. Valley Cities Counseling has an excellent reputation and strong track record of providing quality treatment services.

As the city permitting process moves forward, I encourage you to approach any decision points with compassion and thoughtfulness. Given public interest and questions about the recovery center, obviously community transparency and information will continue to be important, and I commend Valley Cities for the outreach they have done to date. Not allowing treatment services to be located in Des Moines will not make the problems and impacts of addiction leave our community. It just simply would mean that people in our community would have less opportunity for help. And we all would be worse off for it. I believe the public interest is best served by taking steps to ensure access to sorely needed drug and alcohol treatment services.

Sincerely,

Dave Upthegrove

King County Council

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: Dave.Upthegrove@metrokc.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov, karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov, mia.gregerson@leg.wa.gov, mark.miloscia@leg.wa.gov, linda.kochmar@leg.wa.gov, carol.gregory@leg.wa.gov
CC: mpina@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, gdelgado@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 8/13/2015 12:38:45 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Community Mtg re Woodmont Recovery Center

Dear Fellow Electeds,

Next Tuesday, August 18th there will be a community meeting at the Woodmont Library, from 7:30pm to 9:00pm, to discuss concerns regarding the Woodmont Recovery Center. I've posted the following (see below) to a few Facebook pages where constituents have expressed their concerns.

Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina and Councilmember Vic Pennington will be in attendance, as will a number of City staff.

Ken Taylor from Valley Cities will also be in attendance, to answer questions regarding operation of the facility.

Please RSVP to let me know if you're able to attend. Thank you.

Warm Regards,

Dave Kaplan

Mayor & Councilmember

City of Des Moines, WA

"Confirming the meeting next week regarding the Woodmont Recovery Center project.

The meeting will be held at the Woodmont Library from 7:30pm to 9:00pm on Tuesday, August 18th. (Unfortunately Woodmont Elementary School would not be available for a few weeks, and it's important that we discuss your concerns sooner than later.) There is a capacity limit of 45 people for the meeting room at the Library, so please take that into consideration.

Attending from the City will be myself, Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina, and Councilmember Vic Pennington (chair of the Public Safety & Transportation Committee,) City Manager Tony Piasecki, Police Chief

George Delgado (or one of his commanders,) and Dan Brewer (Planning, Building & Public Works.) King County Councilmember Dave Upthegrove, and our legislators from the 33rd and 30th Legislative district are being invited to attend as well. Valley Cities Executive Director Ken Taylor will be there to help answer questions about the operations of the facility.

We only have an hour and a half, so our presentations will be as brief as possible, and then we'll want your input regarding things to consider regarding the facility and "good neighbor agreement" that will be developed between the Woodmont Recovery Center and the City.

Looking forward to hearing from you next Tuesday."

Subj: **Re: Des Moines Resident on Woodmont Rehab Center**
Date: 8/15/2015 1:20:35 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ehooman@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, pennington@kcfd26.org

Thanks Ellie. April is who I have been working with on setting up the meeting next Tuesday.

Dave K.

In a message dated 8/15/2015 10:12:10 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ehooman@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Just a heads up that we sent this response out to a citizens request for information relating to the Valley Cities project yesterday. Since then Bonnie has posted the hearing examiner's notes and rulings to the City's website to make it easier for the public to view.
>
> Thanks,
> Ellie Hooman on behalf of Chief Delgado
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** George Delgado <GDelgado@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Date:** August 14, 2015 at 4:27:09 PM PDT
> **To:** "'apandjesus@gmail.com'" <apandjesus@gmail.com>
> **Subject: RE: Des Moines Resident on Woodmont Rehab Center**
>
> Hello April,
>
> I am very sorry it took so long to get back to you. As you can imagine it has been very hectic. Thank you for the kind words about the Officers of this Department. It is always good to hear from citizens that have good experiences in their encounters with our staff. I would love to help answer some of your questions as best I am able. Please keep in mind that some of these topics are going to be items that may be better addressed by outside organizations but I will do my best to answer what I can.
>
> 1. The new site is extremely close to Woodmont K-8, will there be extra safety protocol in place for the school OR does this fall to FW police as Woodmont is a FW school? This question also extends to the Woodmont library as many children go there…will there be extra patrols in the neighborhood? If there are security concerns for these public agencies, it would be their responsibility to increase security patrols or prepare safety plans at their respective sites.
>
> 2. How many cops are currently on staff, per shift? All but one of our 4 patrol teams have 4 Officers and a Sergeant assigned to them, but more often than not we run at 3 Officers and a Sergeant because of injuries, sick leave, vacation time, etc.
>
> There are rumors that Des Moines police are understaffed, is this true or just a case of gossip gone aerie. Again I would like to state that anytime I have had to deal with the Des Moines PD, I've been treated with nothing but respect and have

had all my concerns addressed. There are several ways to model police staffing levels. Under some of these models, yes we are running at a very low staffing level. To give you some perspective, we are at the lowest staffing numbers we have seen since 1995. At our largest, in 2009 the Des Moines Police Department employed 45 Commissioned Police Officers and 15 Civilian Support Staff members serving a population of 21, 450 residents. As of today, we employ 31 Commissioned Police Officers and 10 Civilian Support Staff members serving a population of 30,030 residents.

3. How will patients whom are leaving detox early be handled? Will they just be wondering the neighborhood or will there be transportation to another area? This is something that I cannot answer directly for you, but I can refer you to a member of the City staff in the planning and building department. If you contact Nikole Coleman-Porter at 206-870-6551 or ncoleman@desmoineswa.gov, you can request a copy of the hearing examiner's notes and rulings from when Valley Cities applied for their City building permit. I believe these notes will contain details that will help answer some of these safety plan questions for you.

4. Is there a way to have a community board to work with the police and Valley Cities. Allowing for open communication and hopefully positive relations between the city, Valley and us residences? Yes, absolutely. As long as there is willingness from all parties involved, we are always happy to meet with community groups to discuss how we can serve you more effectively. I will also be in attendance at the planned community meeting on April 18th at Woodmont Elementary School from 7:30pm to 9pm.

A side note here, there has been a lot of talk about our little section of Des Moines, being annexed into FW; I am not sure what this entails or the long haul results, I just thought it should be mentioned. There is no plan regarding any annexations in your area to my knowledge.

I want to assure you that we are highly dedicated to all of the neighborhoods in our community, and will do everything in our power to keep the citizens of Des Moines safe and secure. I continue to affirm my stance on keeping the Des Moines Police Department as open, transparent, and responsive to our citizens concerns as possible.

Sincerely,

George Delgado, Chief of Police

From: apandjesus@gmail.com [mailto:apandjesus@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 04, 2015 2:32 PM
To: George Delgado <GDelgado@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Des Moines Resident on Woodmont Rehab Center

Good afternoon, Mr. Delgado,

My name is April Chavarria, I live on 14th PLS and 262ND Street in

Des Moines. I first want to thank you and your men/and women for all they do for our community. I am writing today in regards to the new rehab Center on Pac HWY. I (as well as my neighbors,) have some concerns on the new site and the safety of our neighborhood.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->The new site is extremely close to Woodmont K-8, will there be extra safety protocol in place for the school OR does this fall to FW police as Woodmont is a FW school? This question also exdtends to the Woodmont library as many children go there...will there be extra patrols in the neighborhood?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->How many cops are currently on staff, per shift? There are rumors that Des Moines police are understaffed, is this true or just a case of gossip gone aerie. Again I would like to state that anytime I have had to deal with the Des Moines PD, I've been treated with nothing but respect and have had all my concerns addressed.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->How will patients whom are leaving detox early be handled? Will they just be wondering the neighborhood or will there be transportation to another area?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->Is there away to have a community board to work with the police and Valley Cities. Allowing for open communication and hopefully positive relations between the city, Valley and us residences?

A side note here, there has been a lot of talk about our little section of Des Moines, being annexed into FW; I am not sure what this entails or the long haul results, I just thought it should be mentioned.

Thank you for your time and service to our beautiful community,

April Chavarria

Sent from Windows Mail

XFINITY Connect

shecklers@comcast.ne

+ Font Size -

Re: Question on Rehap Center

From : BOB <shecklers@comcast.net>

Wed, Sep 02, 2015 05:01 PM

Subject : Re: Question on Rehap Center

To : Stan and Susan Scarvie <sscarvie@centurylink.net>

Stan,

You got the location correct. As far as the plane noise goes, buyer beware.

From: "STAN M SCARVIE Owner" <sscarvie@centurylink.net>
To: "Bob Sheckler / Vicki" <shecklers@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2015 3:18:21 PM
Subject: Question on Rehap Center

Hi Bob,

I hope you can help me out. I am trying to figure out exactly where the controversial Rehap. Center will be located. Will it be constructed on, or near, the site of the burned-out Rose's Restaurant?

On an unrelated subject, I recently drove right by the Blueberry Lane project while aircraft were landing on the Third Runway. Boy, those critters could not have been more that a couple hundred feet in altitude and they were seriously loud. Even with the Port's best noise package, I cannot see how it could block out that racket. Even if it does, I would be willing to bet that there will be real vibration problems in those homes.

I can't see why the developer chose to build homes rather than a commercial development at this location. But, it's their money, not mine.

Have fun.

Stan

XFINITY Connect **shecklers@comcast.ne**

+ Font Size -

Re: Question on Rehap Center

From : BOB <shecklers@comcast.net> Wed, Sep 02, 2015 05:01 PM

Subject : Re: Question on Rehap Center

To : Stan and Susan Scarvie <sscarvie@centurylink.net>

Stan,

You got the location correct. As far as the plane noise goes, buyer beware.

From: "STAN M SCARVIE Owner" <sscarvie@centurylink.net>
To: "Bob Sheckler / Vicki" <shecklers@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2015 3:18:21 PM
Subject: Question on Rehap Center

Hi Bob,

I hope you can help me out. I am trying to figure out exactly where the controversial Rehap. Center will be located. Will it be constructed on, or near, the site of the burned-out Rose's Restaurant?

On an unrelated subject, I recently drove right by the Blueberry Lane project while aircraft were landing on the Third Runway. Boy, those critters could not have been more that a couple hundred feet in altitude and they were seriously loud. Even with the Port's best noise package, I cannot see how it could block out that racket. Even if it does, I would be willing to bet that there will be real vibration problems in those homes.

I can't see why the developer chose to build homes rather than a commercial development at this location. But, it's their money, not mine.

Have fun.

Stan