Subj: **FW: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST-Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/8/2015 10:29:30 A.M. Pacific Standard 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: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/8/2015 2:06:53 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

I will let Miranda know. Thank you.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 3:02 PM
To: Autumn Lingle; Dave Kaplan
Subject: Re: FW: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Wed, Sept. 30th at 10:30am at Des Moines City Hall works. The other two don't.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/8/2015 1:22:43 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> Do any of the dates below work for you? All of the times offered work for Tony and Michael.
>
> Autumn
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Leskinen, Miranda [mailto:Miranda.Leskinen@kingcounty.gov]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 08, 2015 1:13 PM
> **To:** Autumn Lingle
> **Subject:** RE: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion
>
> No problem at all. He's a bit booked out but currently has availability on the following dates:
>
> Friday, September 25th between 1:30 and 4:00pm
> Wednesday, September 30th at 10:30 or 10:45am
> Friday, October 2nd between 11:30am and 3:00pm
>
> On a separate note, did you also receive my email from Friday about needing to cancel CM Upthegrove's council briefing Thursday night (in addition to the economic development discussion)? His entire evening calendar needs be cleared.
>
> Thanks again for your help.
> -Miranda
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Autumn Lingle [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:54 AM
> **To:** Leskinen, Miranda
> **Subject:** RE: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion
>
> That would be great. Thank you.

From: Leskinen, Miranda [mailto:Miranda.Leskinen@kingcounty.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:52 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Hi Autumn,

Just one staff member from our office for tomorrow's meeting. And you are correct about Thursday, but I'm happy to send over a list of rescheduling options for the economic development discussion if that would be helpful.

Thanks much,
Miranda

From: Autumn Lingle [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:41 AM
To: Leskinen, Miranda
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Hi Miranda,

Yes, it is ok for staff to attend. How many will be coming?

Also, I sent out an invite to Dave for this Thursday at 6pm to discuss Des Moines Economic Development. I think you called me and said he could not attend. Would you let me know if that's correct?

Thank you so much,

Autumn

From: Leskinen, Miranda [mailto:Miranda.Leskinen@kingcounty.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:37 AM
To: Autumn Lingle
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

Good morning Autumn,

Is it okay for staff to attend tomorrow? CM Upthegrove has committee at the same time and unfortunately won't be able to attend even part of the meeting.

Thanks so much and hope you had a nice holiday weekend.
-Miranda

-----Original Appointment-----
From: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov [mailto:ALingle@desmoineswa.gov] **On Behalf Of** Michael Matthias
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 8:53 AM
To: 'Gregory, Rep. Carol'; Dave Kaplan; 'Keiser, Sen. Karen'; 'Kochmar, Rep. Linda'; 'Miloscia, Sen. Mark'; 'Matt Pina'; 'Gregerson, Rep. Mia'; Pat Bosmans; 'Orwall, Rep. Tina'; Tony Piasecki; Quinn, Adrienne; Ken Taylor (ktaylor@valleycities.org); Upthegrove, Dave; 'Tammy Campbell - Federal Way Public Schools'; ' (KMcBroom@fwps.org)'; Dan Brewer; 'mdavidson@fwps.org'; 'smclean@fwps.org'

Cc: 'Heinecke, Tara Jo'; Vollendroff, Jim; 'Tinsley, Lisa'; Vic Pennington; Muhm, Jeff
Subject: 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

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.

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

The meeting location has changed. It will now be held at the City of Des Moines Police Department, 21900 11th Ave S, Des Moines, WA.

Subj: **RE: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST-Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/8/2015 7:41:02 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: jeremy4desmoines@gmail.com
To: BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov, desmnsdave@aol.com, mmpina@comcast.net, JNutting@desmoineswa.gov, momeof2c@msn.com, desmnsluisa@gmail.com, shecklers@comcast.net, VPennington@desmoineswa.gov

Bonnie, I have searched and have nothing that hasn't come through the city server.

Thank you.
Jeremy

From: Bonnie Wilkins [mailto:BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 11:29 AM
To: Kaplan Home; 'Matt'; Jeremy Nutting; MMusser Home; LBangs Home; Sheckler Home; Vic Pennington
Subject: FW: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST-Woodmont Recovery Center

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: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST-Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/8/2015 9:16:20 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov
To: BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov, desmnsdave@aol.com, mmpina@comcast.net, JNutting@desmoineswa.gov, momeof2c@msn.com, desmnsluisa@gmail.com, shecklers@comcast.net

All on the city server.

Vic Pennington
Councilmember

City of Des Moines
21630 11th Ave So
Des Moines, WA 98198
Office 206.913.3162
FAX 206.870.6540
vpennington@desmoineswa.gov

From: Bonnie Wilkins
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 11:29 AM
To: Kaplan Home; 'Matt'; Jeremy Nutting; MMusser Home; LBangs Home; Sheckler Home; Vic Pennington
Subject: FW: FORMAL DOCUMENT REQUEST-Woodmont Recovery Center

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: *Woodmont Rehab***
Date: 9/8/2015 10:19:58 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov
To: istephslaughter@gmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Hello Stephanie,

Thank you for your e-mail concerning the Woodmont Recover Center and I apologies for the slow response to your e-mail as I was waiting for additional information regarding the Drug Free Zone.

I not only share your concerns regarding the impacts to the children and the school, but for all who use this main corridor through our city.

Your concern regarding the notification: The city staff did abide by the legal requirements for notification for this type of project. I do agree with you about a citywide notification and at the last city council meeting (August 20th) I asked for an ordinance change requiring citywide notification for all "Essential Public Facilities." This was passed by a vote of the council and city staff is drafting the changes to the notification ordinance. This ordinance amendment will also require notification to be given to the City Council upon city staff receiving inquires or an application to build an "Essential Public Facilities."

These types of recovery faculties are needed in South King County. However I do not feel this is the appropriate location for this type of facility, it is my desire this facility is moved and I have expressed my desire and frustration as such. I know that relocation options are being explored in conjunction with county and state representatives to resolve this issue. However in the event the facility is not moved, I will request that Valley Cities mitigate its impacts, including the removal of the methadone dispensary. These mitigations are accomplished by entering into a Good Neighbor Agreement. I asked about the strength of this type of agreement and was informed by the Des Moines City Attorney the Good Neighbor Agreement is a legally binding agreement that was mandated by the hearing examiner and that failure to comply with this agreement by Valley Cities can result in the cancelation of their Certification of Occupancy.

I believe that it is very important that members of our community be included in crafting the Good Neighbor Agreement. At this time I am not aware of how the selection process will work or the number of citizen representatives needed to serve on this committee. If you or one of your neighbors has questions or an interest in being considered to serve, please contact Assistant City Manager Michael Matthias mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov as he is collecting the contact information of people who have expressed an interest in this committee.

The City Attorney was asked by Mayor Pro Tem Matt Pina to provide clarification to the school Drug Free Zone as it relates to the location of this type of facility. This is the response from the City Attorney's office.

"RCW 69.50.435 creates a sentencing enhancement for those who are convicted of selling or manufacturing illegal drugs within 1000 feet of a school, park, school bus stop, etc. This enhancement does not apply to the authorized sale or manufacturing of drugs. RCW 69.50.302

establishes a registration system for the legal manufacturing and distribution of drugs. Presumably the Woodmont facility would be properly registered and therefore would not be subject to the 1000' rule. Of note, the Safeway at 272nd is likely within the 1000 feet radius of the elementary school as well. This pharmacy dispenses Schedule II narcotics."

Stephanie, I share your concern and I'm sure frustration, I want you to know that I will work to do everything possible within the law for the best possible solution on this issue.

I hope I have answered your questions.

Sincerely,

Vic Pennington
Councilmember

City of Des Moines
21630 11th Ave So
Des Moines, WA 98198
Office 206.913.3162
FAX 206.870.6540
vpennington@desmoineswa.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: istephslaughter@gmail.com [mailto:istephslaughter@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 10:54 PM
To: Vic Pennington
Subject: Woodmont Rehab

Hi Vic

My neighbor possibly neighbors were wondering if you might have time to meet with us to discuss our concerns regarding this Woodmont treatment and rehab facility scheduled to break ground in the Fall. Our concern is for the safety of the children. I am very concerned about the impact that this facility is going to have on the school. The parents and grandparents in my community Landmarque are very upset about the location. My neighbor Alan has two daughters that will be going into grade school in the next couple of years, my neighbor Oscar has a step-granddaughter coming over from Vietnam that will be attending that school. It's just not right that citywide notification was not sent out about this facility. The residents are not arguing the fact that a mental health facility like this is needed. The issue we have is the location. Not to mention the fact that school zones (1000 ft) are DRUG FREE zones.

We would like the opportunity to meet with you to get your opinion/position on the location of this facility. We would also like to get your perspective on the odds of this facility being relocated to a less controversial location.

I look forward to your response.

Stephanie Slaughter

Sent from my iPhone

Subj: **FW: Woodmont Rehab**
Date: 9/9/2015 7:10:21 A.M. Pacific Standard 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: **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: **Fwd: Woodmont response**
Date: 9/9/2015 8:21:26 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: jgmayne@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

I thought you would have gotten a copy of this and maybe you have, but just in case, herewith the message he sent out yesterday and that I got from Upthegrove last night:

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: "Upthegrove, Dave" <Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>
Date: September 8, 2015 10:41:56 PM PDT
To: "jgmayne@gmail.com" <jgmayne@gmail.com>
Subject: Woodmont response

Jack- As requested, here is the response I am sending to constituents who contact me. I sent it out at the end of the day today.

Dave Up

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Upthegrove, Dave" <Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>
Date: September 8, 2015 at 5:14:55 PM PDT
To:
Subject: FW:

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

=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/10/2015 4:01:38 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

What meeting is this?

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/10/2015 4:08:19 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> The meeting location has changed. It will now be held at the City of Des Moines Police Department, 21900 11th Ave S, Des Moines, WA.

Subj: **RE: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion**
Date: 9/10/2015 4:26:56 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Screw up – tried to send an email from the calendar.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com [mailto:DesMnsDave@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 5:02 PM
To: Michael Matthias
Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Center discussion

What meeting is this?

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/10/2015 4:08:19 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> The meeting location has changed. It will now be held at the City of Des Moines Police Department, 21900 11th Ave S, Des Moines, WA.

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Rehab question and answer session 9/16/2015**
Date: 9/11/2015 2:23:31 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: ALingle@desmoineswa.gov

Okay.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/11/2015 2:32:27 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov writes:

> Dave,
>
> The meeting will have to be **6:30-8:30pm**. There is a martial arts at the Field House until 6pm.
>
> Autumn

Subj: **Woodmont Recovery Campus meeting**
Date: 9/14/2015 9:46:28 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

Dave,

I spoke to Matt about the meeting regarding Woodmont. Call me when you have chance.

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: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
Date: 9/14/2015 4:49:26 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: tina.orwall@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

So what is the plan for this meeting?

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Soderlind, Mary" <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
Date: September 14, 2015, 5:47:21 PM PDT
To: Tina Orwall <tina.orwall@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session

It is, and I added it to your calendar.

From: Tina Orwall [mailto:tina.orwall@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 5:27 PM
To: Soderlind, Mary <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session

Can you confirm this meeting is occurring

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: City of Des Moines <woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov>
Date: September 14, 2015 at 3:16:02 PM PDT
To: tina.orwall@gmail.com
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session
Reply-To: woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Des Moines City Council will hold a special meeting Wednesday, September 16, 2015 p.m., from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in the Des Moines Field House Gymnasium, 1000 S 220th Street, Des Moines, WA. The purpose of the special meeting will be to hold a Woodmont Recovery Center question and answer session with the City Council.

The Council meeting for the Woodmont Recovery Center Q & A Session is re-instated for Wednesday, September 16, 6:30pm-8:30pm at the Des Moines Field House, 1000 S. 220th , Des Moines, WA.

We apologize for any inconvenience.

Sincerely,

City of Des Moines
www.desmoineswa.gov
206.878.4595

Forward this email

This email was sent to tina.orwall@gmail.com by woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov | Update Profile/Email Address | Rapid removal with SafeUnsubscribe™ | About our service provider.

City of Des Moines | 21630 11th Ave S | Des Moines | WA | 98198

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
Date: 9/14/2015 7:35:45 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@gmail.com

They wanted a Q&A session (demanded it) at the last City Council meeting. My hope was to get to the Good Neighbor Agreement process right away, but we have to do this first.

Let's chat in the next day or so.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/14/2015 5:49:26 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, tina.orwall@gmail.com writes:

So what is the plan for this meeting?

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Soderlind, Mary" <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
Date: September 14, 2015, 5:47:21 PM PDT
To: Tina Orwall <tina.orwall@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session

It is, and I added it to your calendar.

From: Tina Orwall [mailto:tina.orwall@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 5:27 PM
To: Soderlind, Mary <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session

Can you confirm this meeting is occurring

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: City of Des Moines <woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov>
Date: September 14, 2015 at 3:16:02 PM PDT
To: tina.orwall@gmail.com
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session
Reply-To: woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Des Moines City Council will hold a special meeting Wednesday, September 16, 2015 p.m., from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in the Des Moines Field House Gymnasium, 1000 S 220th Street, Des Moines, WA. The purpose of the special meeting will be to hold a Woodmont Recovery Center question and answer session with the City Council.

The Council meeting for the Woodmont Recovery Center Q & A Session is re-instated for Wednesday, September 16, 6:30pm-8:30pm at the Des Moines Field House, 1000 S. 220th , Des Moines, WA.

We apologize for any inconvenience.

Sincerely,

City of Des Moines
www.desmoineswa.gov
206.878.4595

Forward this email

This email was sent to tina.orwall@gmail.com by woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov | Update Profile/Email Address | Rapid removal with SafeUnsubscribe™ | About our service provider.

City of Des Moines | 21630 11th Ave S | Des Moines | WA | 98198

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
Date: 9/14/2015 7:57:54 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: tina.orwall@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Can we talk tomorrow?

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 14, 2015, at 8:35 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

> They wanted a Q&A session (demanded it) at the last City Council meeting. My hope was to get to the Good Neighbor Agreement process right away, but we have to do this first.
>
> Let's chat in the next day or so.
>
> Dave K.

In a message dated 9/14/2015 5:49:26 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, tina.orwall@gmail.com writes:

> So what is the plan for this meeting?
>
> Sent from my iPad
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** "Soderlind, Mary" <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
> **Date:** September 14, 2015, 5:47:21 PM PDT
> **To:** Tina Orwall <tina.orwall@gmail.com>
> **Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
>
> It is, and I added it to your calendar.
>
> **From:** Tina Orwall [mailto:tina.orwall@gmail.com]
> **Sent:** Monday, September 14, 2015 5:27 PM
> **To:** Soderlind, Mary <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
> **Subject:** Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session
>
> Can you confirm this meeting is occurring
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** City of Des Moines <woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov>
> **Date:** September 14, 2015 at 3:16:02 PM PDT
> **To:** tina.orwall@gmail.com
> **Subject: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
> **Reply-To:** woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov
>
> <image001.jpg>

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Des Moines City Council will hold a special meeting Wednesday, September 16, 2015 p.m., from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in the Des Moines Field House Gymnasium, 1000 S 220th Street, Des Moines, WA. The purpose of the special meeting will be to hold a Woodmont Recovery Center question and answer session with the City Council.

<image002.jpg>

The Council meeting for the Woodmont Recovery Center Q & A Session is re-instated for Wednesday, September 16, 6:30pm-8:30pm at the Des Moines Field House, 1000 S. 220th , Des Moines, WA.

<image

We apologize for any inconvenience.

Sincerely,

City of Des Moines

www.desmoineswa.gov
206.878.4595

|<image003.jpg>|

Forward this email

|<~WRD000.jpg>|

This email was sent to tina.orwall@gmail.com by woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov | Update Profile/Email Address | Rapid removal with SafeUnsubscribe™ | About our service provider.

|<image002.jpg>|

|<image

|<~WRD000.jpg>|

City of Des Moines | 21630 11th Ave S | Des Moines | WA | 98198

Subj: **FW: Woodmont Rehab Fiasco**
Date: 9/14/2015 9:02:50 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Hello All,

Here is some information that was passed along to me, as well as a number of question that should be addressed.

Thanks,

Vic Pennington
Councilmember

City of Des Moines
21630 11th Ave So
Des Moines, WA 98198
Office 206.913.3162
FAX 206.870.6540
vpennington@desmoineswa.gov

From: Doreen Harper [mailto:crfancygirl@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2015 8:37 PM
To: Vic Pennington; mmusser@phillipsre.com
Cc: Candace Urquhart
Subject: Woodmont Rehab Fiasco

Hello Vic and Melissa,

It was nice speaking with you the other night. I have to admit that given the situation we (the Woodmont citizens of Des Moines) are in, finding faith and trust in our leaders has been difficult, and probably will be for some time unfortunately. I think most of us are willing to give it a try, but we need to see serious changes in our leadership for any faith to be restored.

My husband and I own two houses on three acres directly across from Woodmont Elementary. We were one house away from being notified about this facility and we are directly in front of the school. I found out on July 18, 2015. For someone to think that a facility like this would not have a negative impact on every person living within five miles of it should be questioned as having any leadership capabilities at all. The fact that Federal Way parents whose children attend Woodmont never would have been notified if it weren't for Facebook. And then there's Kent.. those poor souls probably have no idea to this day!

Three of us spent 2 days walking and knocking at doors to let them know about the community meeting. A large majority of them were learning of the rehab facility for the first time when they answered our knock at their door. We reached more people in two days than the city did in one mailing. That was obvious to see because of the turnout at the community meeting vs. the public hearing that was supposedly well publicized.

I have some questions I would like to get answered. Hopefully you can answer them but if not,

please let me know who can. If anything, you might find the answers interesting also...

1. At what point is it decided to use bulk mailing vs. stamps? and who is in charge of physically stuffing the envelopes, addressing them and getting them sent out? What is the cost difference between bulk and stamps?

2. If standard notice is 300', but they opted for 600' to make sure the neighbors 'knew', they obviously had some innate concern about the facility. However, their actions were merely half-hearted efforts and their goal was to just do the basics to inform the community. Why was this project not mentioned in the City Currents when the proposal was first brought to the city? Why was it not on the Waterland Blog? Why was the public notice put in the Seattle Times and not the community paper, Federal Way Mirror? I know the answer, but I'd like to hear what the city planner has to say and I'd like for him to take responsibility and held accountable.

3. We are all in agreement that this facility should not be located here. That is a given. I personally have sacrificed many parts of my life to change the outcome of this situation. If Valley Cities moves in, you will see a mass exodus out... beginning with the Harpers. Our neighbors have already sold and moved. This was the last straw and it broke their back. From what I understand, a nice family is moving in and they have kids... young ones. I fear for them. My question is how does the city or Valley Cities plan on compensating the property owners surrounding the complex with their reduction in property values? It's conservatively projected to be between 10 and 17% if I remember the stat correctly. Regardless, their should be annual compensation for the reduction in property values.

I have more questions, but I agreed to send you some documents in our conversation last night, so I'll get to that.
Here is a link to VC's tax records and their Annual Reports. Still waiting to see when their 2014's will be posted. Guessing their is strategy behind that too. Below that are three attachments regarding the October 1 deadline for the $5 million dollars via Karen Keiser's lobbying efforts. One of the documents didn't export well. Sorry about that. I'm sure you could locate an official copy.

I am curious how the city can allow a business to take a stake hold in our community on a commercial property and not prove financial viability or longevity? That's just bad business on the city's part. Let alone causing the businesses that are here to leave along with the homeowners and endangering children. What were they thinking?

I would like to see the people that approved this to be held accountable with their jobs. They are obviously not qualified to represent the best interests of the people who live here and appear to have alternative agendas other than the health, safety and well-being of our city.

I look forward to hearing from you and moving forward on solutions as a team.
Sincerely,
Doreen Harper
26625/26615 16th Ave. South

990 & Other Information - Valley Cities

990 & Other Information - Valley Cities
Home > About > 990 & Other Information 990 & Other Information Tax

Form 990 2013 990 2012 990 2011 990 Annual Reports 2014 Annual Rep
ort 2013 Annual Report 2012 Annual Report 2011 Annual Report

View on **www.valleycities.org** Preview by Yahoo

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
Date: *9/15/2015 4:48:41 A.M. Pacific Standard Time*
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@gmail.com

I'm available after noon.

Dave K.

In a message dated 9/14/2015 8:57:54 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, tina.orwall@gmail.com writes:

> Can we talk tomorrow?
>
> Sent from my iPad
>
> On Sep 14, 2015, at 8:35 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:
>
>> They wanted a Q&A session (demanded it) at the last City Council meeting. My hope was to get to the Good Neighbor Agreement process right away, but we have to do this first.
>>
>> Let's chat in the next day or so.
>>
>> Dave K.
>>
>> In a message dated 9/14/2015 5:49:26 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, tina.orwall@gmail.com writes:
>>
>>> So what is the plan for this meeting?
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPad
>>>
>>> Begin forwarded message:
>>>
>>> **From:** "Soderlind, Mary" <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
>>> **Date:** September 14, 2015, 5:47:21 PM PDT
>>> **To:** Tina Orwall <tina.orwall@gmail.com>
>>> **Subject: RE: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
>>>
>>> It is, and I added it to your calendar.
>>>
>>> **From:** Tina Orwall [mailto:tina.orwall@gmail.com]
>>> **Sent:** Monday, September 14, 2015 5:27 PM
>>> **To:** Soderlind, Mary <Mary.Soderlind@leg.wa.gov>
>>> **Subject:** Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session
>>>
>>> Can you confirm this meeting is occurring
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> Begin forwarded message:
>>>
>>>> **From:** City of Des Moines <woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov>
>>>> **Date:** September 14, 2015 at 3:16:02 PM PDT
>>>> **To:** tina.orwall@gmail.com
>>>> **Subject: Woodmont Recovery Q&A Session**
>>>> **Reply-To:** woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov
>>>>
>>>> <image001.jpg>

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

<image002.jpg>

Notice is hereby given that the Des Moines City Council will hold a special meeting Wednesday, September 16, 2015 p.m., from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in the Des Moines Field House Gymnasium, 1000 S 220th Street, Des Moines, WA. The purpose of the special meeting will be to hold a Woodmont Recovery Center question and answer session with the City Council.

<image0(

The Council meeting for the Woodmont Recovery Center Q & A Session is re-instated for Wednesday, September 16, 6:30pm-8:30pm at the Des Moines Field House, 1000 S. 220th , Des Moines, WA.

We apologize for any inconvenience.

Sincerely,

City of Des Moines
www.desmoineswa.gov
206.878.4595

|<image003.jpg>|

Forward this email

|<~WRD000.jpg>|

This email was sent to tina.orwall@gmail.com by woodmontinfo@desmoineswa.gov | Update Profile/Email Address | Rapid removal with SafeUnsubscribe™ | About our service provider.

|<image002.jpg>|

|<image0(

|<~WRD000.jpg>|

City of Des Moines | 21630 11th Ave S | Des Moines | WA | 98198

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 9/18/2015 2:40:40 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: patgyoung@aol.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Thank you for your prompt reply and clarification of the circumstances regarding this project. I will continue to hope that there will be some changes to lessen the impacts to the area.

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 18, 2015, at 3:05 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

Ms. Young,

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 they'r 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.

Despite Valley Cities' legal right to build on that property, we are working to see if we can get it moved. Hopefully we'll know something soon on that possibility. If we can't get it moved, we will do what we can to mitigate the scope and impacts of the project.

Please know that we have heard the concerns of the community, and we're doing what we can to address this ... without becoming subject to legal challenges by the property owner (Valley Cities.)

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 9/18/2015 12:02:21 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Patgyoung@aol.com writes:

> City Council Members:
> I would like to express my deep concerns about the Woodmont Recovery Campus. As residents of the City of Des Moines we are already plagued by drug problems of all kinds and even now we need additional law enforcement personnel to handle these issues. The south end of King County has long been a dumping ground for facilities not tolerated by the residents of other portions of the county. The decision to place this facility so close to a school and library where children are present on a daily basis is irresponsible and dangerous. This decision was not in the best interests of your constituency and will be remembered at the ballot box.
> Patricia Young

Subj: **Re: Valley Cities Woodmont Recovery Center GNA Committee**
Date: 9/22/2015 12:09:16 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: taddoviak@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
CC: citycoucil@desmoineswa.gov, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov

That's a lot of people. I look forward to hearing who is on the committee whether I am on it or not. It's great that the community is involved.

As far as working with legislators to get it moved, are there any in particular that it would be helpful to be sending letters to? The citizen's group that wants it moved believes that working with the legislature is the best course of action as well. If you can give us any guidance on where we could focus our efforts to help the Council, we're here to help.

Thanks again,

Tad

On Tue, Sep 22, 2015 at 12:59 PM, <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

> Hi Tad,
>
> Good to hear from you. I have your name on the list from August 18th.
>
> There are over 50 people who indicated they wanted to participate, so we'll wind up having to narrow that down.
>
> We'll be in contact to let you know within the next week or two. Right now we're just working with legislators to see if we can get it moved.
>
> Dave Kaplan
> Mayor & Councilmember
> City of Des Moines, WA
>
> In a message dated 9/22/2015 11:02:53 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, taddoviak@gmail.com writes:
>
> > Mayor Kaplan:
> >
> > I am contacting you as I am interested in serving on the Good Neighbor Agreement Committee for the Valley Cities Woodmont Recovery Center. I have served on my church council in the past and spent a few years as a shop steward for the union I belonged to as well. I am interested in ensuring that Valley Cities and the City of Des Moines can come to a good agreement to help mitigate the new facility and keep the community safe. Let me know if you require any further information from me regarding the Committee.
> >
> > Thanks for your time and all your work on this. I do appreciate it.
> >
> > Tad Doviak
> > 206-569-8694
> > 25747 19th Ave S
> > Des Moines, WA 98198

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center Project**
Date: 9/22/2015 12:52:50 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: dkvv@sbcglobal.net
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Mr. Kaplan,
Thank you for your thoughtful and informative reply. I appreciate what you are doing on our community's behalf.
Sincerely,
Donna Korner

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

Ms. Korner,

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 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.

Despite Valley Cities' legal right to build on that property, we are working to see if we can get it moved. Hopefully we'll know something soon on that possibility. If we can't get it moved, we will do what we can to mitigate the scope and impacts of the project.

Please know that we have heard the concerns of the community, and we're doing what we can to address this ... without becoming subject to legal challenges by the property owner (Valley Cities.)

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 9/22/2015 10:47:35 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, dkvv@sbcglobal.net writes:

> To Whom It May Concern;
> I am in a state of disbelief that this project in this location was even considered. I am all for addicts trying to get sober and for helping those who are sincere about getting clean. However, in what world does it even begin to make sense to place a drug rehab which dispenses methadone to drug addicts in a residential neighborhood next to a grade school and a library?! The possible bad repercussions are too numerous to list and frankly, arguments against this seem academic to any thinking person. I believe in helping people, but not at the risk of endangering children along with other community members.
> Surely, there are other locations which would not pose such an obvious danger to surrounding population.
>
> I, along with other members of my community are asking you to oppose and stop this project that would only serve to degrade our neighborhood and endanger our children. Please do your duty as our representatives and advocate for our best interest in this.
>
> Sincerely,
> Donna Korner

Subj: **Design Review Process, Woodmont.**
Date: 9/27/2015 10:53:37 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: castrolnj@hotmail.com
To: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov, bcarver@desmoineswa.gov
CC: mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Well now it seems to many of us that you all are the main players responsible for this entire Woodmont Mess, Nickole Coleman she took her nice little pay raise Bonus and left town.

In reading over your email transcripts that some have described as an episode of Reno 911, it is clear that many of you personally took and held the hand of Valley Cities and their architects, advised, directed, even provided information fast tracked them throughout the entire process.

" How Exciting "....." We Won't Bring This Up To Council " curious to know what the city's insurance attorney had to say at last council meeting, care to share?

Personally many in our city feel you all have been disgenuine with us in this entire mess and are personally to blame for the downfall and decline of our city, I agree.

So with all that said, I am asking each of you: Do for the citizens of Des Moines what you did for Valley Cities and their architects, advise us, hold our hands, help us to find the flaws that we need to question The Design Review Process, will you help us, each of you would be willing to do that for us now, wouldn't you?

John Castronover

Sent from my iPad=

Subj: **Fwd: Review Comments on Woodmont Recovery Campus Design**
Date: 9/28/2015 6:22:56 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: DLathrop@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mmatthias@desmoineswa.gov

FYI. Please consider these comments as submitted for the design review process. Thank you.

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

From: mcnewnickie@gmail.com
To: dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 9/27/2015 10:17:47 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Review Comments on Woodmont Recovery Campus Design

My husband and I did attend the meeting earlier in September regarding the Woodmont Recovery Campus. As was the consensus of nearly every participant at the meeting, we are not in favor of this building, due to the proximity of the grade school and the residential area. We would prefer to see this type of building in a more industrial part of King County, where the safety of other citizens are taken into account as much as the well being of those who are seeking out treatment.

After reviewing the design, a few items stand out that really need to be addressed:

1). There are 6 Foot High Wood Fences along all the residential areas. As we discussed in the meeting, visibility, while in a residential and school zone area, is key. In the event that a child is abducted, or some sort of crime occurs directly relating to the Woodmont Recovery Campus, transparency is KEY. Any fence needs to be transparent. And the fence needs to be tall enough that it is not easily scaled, i.e. 12 ft. vs. 6 ft. I would be interested in finding out if there is a plexi-glass type fence available, that is not easily climbed, and can not be cut through.

2). I don't see any perimeter lighting around the fence lines. There needs to be a LOT of lighting, keeping in mind the residential area needs to be protected from the lighting as well. Numerous motion detector lights on all sides of the campus should be installed.

3). City of Des Moines Police should also be a part of this plan, (not paid by Des Moines residents) at all entrances to each of the buildings and to each possible entrance of site. This needs to be a 24 hour service. In addition to the police officers on site, a minimum of 2 additional officers round the clock should be allowed, to offer assistance to Des Moines citizens outside of this campus, as the attraction to the campus by many who are having a hard time controlling their impulses, while they are still going through treatment, will be in the area.

4). Surveillance Camera Security should also be a part of this plan at all the entrances of the buildings, and the entrances to the property.

5). Local Businesses that are just mere feet away from this facility will also be affected by the potential clients of the Woodmont Recovery Campus. In order to protect these businesses who have much invested in the area, there should be 24 Hour City of Des Moines visible police protection, to keep the customers of those businesses from being approached and harassed while they are trying to shop, get gas, get food, etc.

Again, I think this is a very poor choice for location. It is such a poor choice it makes a person wonder if there is something else going on behind the scenes that we have not been made aware of. Please do all that can be done, to move this campus to another safer location.

Thank you,

Nickie and Rod McNew
Residents of Des Moines, WA=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 10/1/2015 11:46:51 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: robertpirolo@centurylink.net
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

On 9/30/2015 3:44 PM, DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

Dear Ms. Piolo,

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 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.

Despite Valley Cities' legal right to build on that property, we are working to see if we can get it

moved. Hopefully we'll know something soon on that possibility. If we can't get it moved, we will do what we can to mitigate the scope and impacts of the project.

Please know that we have heard the concerns of the community, and we're doing what we can to address this ... without becoming subject to legal challenges by the property owner (Valley Cities.)

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 9/30/2015 2:06:12 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, robertpirolo@centurylink.net writes:

> I am appalled at my Representatives who want a Methadone (Recovery) buildings near a library and grade school, as will as many homes.
> Why would you forsake our children for MONEY!! Look into the warehouse area, it is also available near 99.
>
> NOT IN MY BACKYARD
>
> Joyce Pirolo

Dear Dave, I have better understanding now. I have only two other questions for you. 1) When did you find about about this? 2) what did you do about it? Please be specific with a letter to you or one you sent to the planners.
Best Regards,
Joyce Pirolo

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Rehab Center**
Date: 10/4/2015 6:37:05 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: susanpmanns@gmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov

Dear Susan,

Thank you for your email follow-up on the Woodmont Recovery Center issue. I appreciate your kind words over the last several months.

Unfortunately, I'm going to have to discourage your efforts on what you propose. Some influential legislators and King County have been working diligently to see if there is a more appropriate site for the facility, where some of the real and perceived impacts would be lessened. I think the leadership at Valley Cities has come to recognize that they hadn't thought through everything, including a public process to help ease the transition into building in Woodmont. For that reason, I have to ask you to hold off.

Your heart is good and true, and there are people in our community who definitely need help closer to Des Moines than Seattle. But finding the right location is important to everyone, and that search is progressing.

One thing I do need to correct, I and my fellow Councilmembers didn't "decide" anything. Valley Cities submitted a complete application, for a facility which was allowed under the existing zoning code, and which is deemed under state law as an "essential public facility." City staff could not have said no to the project, and neither could the hearing examiner. But I had no say regarding this project ... from start to finish.

This issue has been a frustrating and troubling one from the very start. I can only hope that God's guidance helps steer the final result.

Thank you again.

Dave

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 10/3/2015 7:45:56 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, susanpmanns@gmail.com writes:

> Dear Dave,
>
> I have a friend that works at Valley Cities in the housing department. She is a woman of GOD and a mastered level social worker. We are banning together and getting a group together "for" the Woodmont facility and the choosen location. Please see the article I posted on the facebook today:
>
> https://www.facebook.com/groups/KidsBeforeAddicts/1508528536128104/?notif_t=group_comment
>
> Also, I have emailed Charlie Harger from Komo to see if he would do an article on the different perspective I have given in my article.
>
> I am on your side and believe you made a wise decision, sorry about the comment on not enough police presence but that part is the truth.
>
> Let me know if your interested in banning with our side of the spectrum. I am calling Dave Reichert and see if I can get his support. The prostitution problem is huge and he may want to support the facility for the woman that could get housing.

I will keep you posted.

Thank you,

Susan
Susan P Manns-Bates
Jeremiah 29:11-13

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Rehab Center**
Date: 10/4/2015 6:37:50 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: mpina@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov

FYI

Dave K.

From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: susanpmanns@gmail.com
CC: DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 10/4/2015 7:37:05 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Re: Woodmont Rehab Center

Dear Susan,

Thank you for your email follow-up on the Woodmont Recovery Center issue. I appreciate your kind words over the last several months.

Unfortunately, I'm going to have to discourage your efforts on what you propose. Some influential legislators and King County have been working diligently to see if there is a more appropriate site for the facility, where some of the real and perceived impacts would be lessened. I think the leadership at Valley Cities has come to recognize that they hadn't thought through everything, including a public process to help ease the transition into building in Woodmont. For that reason, I have to ask you to hold off.

Your heart is good and true, and there are people in our community who definitely need help closer to Des Moines than Seattle. But finding the right location is important to everyone, and that search is progressing.

One thing I do need to correct, I and my fellow Councilmembers didn't "decide" anything. Valley Cities submitted a complete application, for a facility which was allowed under the existing zoning code, and which is deemed under state law as an "essential public facility." City staff could not have said no to the project, and neither could the hearing examiner. But I had no say regarding this project ... from start to finish.

This issue has been a frustrating and troubling one from the very start. I can only hope that God's guidance helps steer the final result.

Thank you again.

Dave

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 10/3/2015 7:45:56 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, susanpmanns@gmail.com writes:

> Dear Dave,

I have a friend that works at Valley Cities in the housing department. She is a woman of GOD and a mastered level social worker. We are banning together and getting a group together "for" the Woodmont facility and the choosen location. Please see the article I posted on the facebook today:

https://www.facebook.com/groups/KidsBeforeAddicts/1508528536128104/?notif_t=group_comment

Also, I have emailed Charlie Harger from Komo to see if he would do an article on the different perspective I have given in my article.

I am on your side and believe you made a wise decision, sorry about the comment on not enough police presence but that part is the truth.

Let me know if your interested in banning with our side of the spectrum. I am calling Dave Reichert and see if I can get his support. The prostitution problem is huge and he may want to support the facility for the woman that could get housing.

I will keep you posted.

Thank you,

Susan
Susan P Manns-Bates
Jeremiah 29:11-13

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Rehab Center**
Date: 10/4/2015 12:04:27 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: susanpmanns@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com

Hello Dave,

I understand your frustration and unfortunately I wish I had paid attention to matters of government more. I am still inclined to support this location and this is simply why, the people in this area are screaming about protecting there kids from drug addicts, the problem is the drug addicts are already here and here in full force along with prostitution, sex offenders and other dangerous criminals living in the proposed location now with little to no supervision. Without some sort of treatment facility it will only get worse and with limited police enforcement due to budget problems this community is at great risk. Forgive me for sounding disrespectful but what do legislatures of King County know about the problem of drug addiction and how it spreads? Likely, nothing other than crime stats and jail population data. I was trafficked at 17 years old by a horrible man, I was forced into prostitution and fed drugs to deal with that life. I am known by Dave Reichert and King County Green River Task Force as the 16 living victim of the green river killer, Sandra Majors died in my place in December or 1982. Look online for Charlie Hagers documentary on the Green River Killer, that is my voice in the interview. God saved my life that day and pulled me from a pit you will never understand. It took 15 years to break free of that life and the man who had me bound. I am now 33 years sober clean and free and 20 years free of sex trafficking. Today, I am a respected member of my community, a leader in my church and I work for one of the largest law firms in this State- Miracle. But I am a Miracle because of Jesus and a treatment facility that helped me and my children. I wouldn't be a functioning asset to our society had I not found a treatment facility. The facility was located in an elementary school with children there called 1st Place in Seattle, Barb Bennett and her husband are the co-founders.

25 years ago it was well known that the stretch between 260th and 272nd was the place to go if you wanted to get high or commit crimes, there is so much under cover prostitution and drug selling in this area it is ridiculous and if my neighbors understood that truth,they would be terrified to live here. Things have not changed in 25 years because the police presence and monitoring hasn't changed, criminals know they can go to Des Moines and do what they want. I have volunteered and worked with the drug and criminal population for 15 + years in this area and did you know pimps are locking little girls in the trunk of their car in this area and making them wait there until it is time to put them to work. Did you know that Federal Way Police will dump a prostitute at Safeway on 272nd instead of taking them to Jail and leave the girl for Des Moines to deal with. Did you know that in Woodmont Library there is a white beat up camper that is a Meth lab and daily 15-25 homeless people either sleep, rest or get high in that parking lot? Did you know that every day in Safeway parking lot I alone see about 15 drug deals as I go shopping for my family? The south end has never had any homeless services or drug addiction services in-patient, so that is why the problem will continue to grow. If you have cancer you go get chemo, if you have the problem with "sin", addiction, prostitution, sex offenses, mental illness - you go to a treatment program. Taking the only hope away from this community is a bad idea unless you are willing to add about 10 more full-time officers. I was at Safeway last week, a man approached and touched a little girl, she ran screaming to her mom. The Safeway manager followed the suspect around the store with his phone camera while waiting for an officer to show up. It took over 20 minutes for an officer to arrive, I know this because I was helping the store manager monitor the guy. This is simply a sign of what will only get worse in this area, my neighbors are living outside of reality if they think moving a facility that would help the problem away from here is going to keep there kids safe. Des Moines is know longer the wealthy, upper scale community it used to be, after the market crash everything changed here.

Besides Dave Reichert & Patty Murray, you are the first politician I have ever talked to that appears to truly care and is not just playing the numbers game for your next election. It is unfortunate but you and I know that is true. Des Moines is being taken over by crime, prostitution, addiction and sex offenders and it isn't going to change if you move the only facility that would have helped bring the "sins of the dark" to the "light". Making people accountable and giving them treatment is the only way you are going to fix this problem. Methadone is a downer, people on methadone don't have the energy to commit crimes or hurt kids until they need more dope and by then they won't be in this neighborhood - they will go were the dope is. You have a sex offender house on Kent Des Moines off 16th- why didn't the family's put up signs about that and in the 8 years that sex offender house has been there not one crime has been committed against kids or anyone else from one man that has lived in that house and at least 100 men have lived there collectively. On the contrary, those men are becoming rehabilitated and getting back to normal lives. If the community would have stopped that then the crime they hate the most would have been able to continue in our community because there would have been no were for those men to face their demons and get better.

What has happened to humanity and compassion? We have become a society of politically correct self centered people, who only look at the surface and never investigate anything further. This community just saw a facility that they are scared of and don't understand and so they freaked and used a school as a way to get rid of it, when there school kids start doing drugs because it is only two blocks from the school what will they think then? I wish I would have allowed a treatment facility?

Lastly, if you move this facility to Score - the second those "drug addicts" get out of their AA classes, and they decide they want to relapse where do you think they will go? Right here on 272nd to meet a drug dealer for some dope because no one is watching and no one seems to care.

You are a very nice man caught up in a community of ignorance(because they don't understand the truth and they are scared for their kids), well meaning people; trying to protect their families. Pretending you live in a fairy tale doesn't make it so, I am connected with people at Valley Cities and I have to be honest - I am ready to fight for this facility with a few politicians I know and lawyers. There is likely some legal issues here no one wants to address, legislature can't over rule the law. Don't give into the political pressure - this is your city not theirs and you know I am telling the truth. As your officers they know I am telling the truth. Take this opportunity to change Des Moines once and for all.

I am praying and asking GOD for guidance and direction and what God sets forth no man can take under. :)

Many blessing to you!

Susan P Manns-Bates

Susan P Manns-Bates
Jeremiah 29:11-13

On Sun, Oct 4, 2015 at 7:36 AM, <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Susan,

Thank you for your email follow-up on the Woodmont Recovery Center issue. I appreciate your kind words over the last several months.

Unfortunately, I'm going to have to discourage your efforts on what you propose. Some influential legislators and King County have been working diligently to see if there is a more appropriate site for the facility, where some of the real and perceived impacts would be lessened. I think the leadership at Valley Cities has come to recognize that they hadn't thought through everything, including a public process to help ease the transition into building in Woodmont. For that reason, I have to ask you to hold off.

Your heart is good and true, and there are people in our community who definitely need help closer to Des Moines than Seattle. But finding the right location is important to everyone, and that search is progressing.

One thing I do need to correct, I and my fellow Councilmembers didn't "decide" anything. Valley Cities submitted a complete application, for a facility which was allowed under the existing zoning code, and which is deemed under state law as an "essential public facility." City staff could not have said no to the project, and neither could the hearing examiner. But I had no say regarding this project ... from start to finish.

This issue has been a frustrating and troubling one from the very start. I can only hope that God's guidance helps steer the final result.

Thank you again.

Dave

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 10/3/2015 7:45:56 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, susanpmanns@gmail.com writes:

> Dear Dave,
>
> I have a friend that works at Valley Cities in the housing department. She is a woman of GOD and a mastered level social worker. We are banning together and getting a group together "for" the Woodmont facility and the choosen location. Please see the article I posted on the facebook today:
>
> https://www.facebook.com/groups/KidsBeforeAddicts/1508528536128104/?notif_t=group_comment
>
> Also, I have emailed Charlie Harger from Komo to see if he would do an article on the different perspective I have given in my article.
>
> I am on your side and believe you made a wise decision, sorry about the comment on not enough police presence but that part is the truth.
>
> Let me know if your interested in banning with our side of the spectrum. I am calling Dave Reichert and see if I can get his support. The prostitution problem is huge and he may want to support the facility for the woman that could get housing.
>
> I will keep you posted.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Susan
> Susan P Manns-Bates
> Jeremiah 29:11-13

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Rehab Center**
Date: 10/4/2015 8:32:54 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: gdelgado@desmoineswa.gov

Chief,

FYI. Note the items in the second paragraph.

Dave K.

From: susanpmanns@gmail.com
To: DesMnsDave@aol.com
Sent: 10/4/2015 1:04:27 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Re: Woodmont Rehab Center

Hello Dave,

I understand your frustration and unfortunately I wish I had paid attention to matters of government more. I am still inclined to support this location and this is simply why, the people in this area are screaming about protecting there kids from drug addicts, the problem is the drug addicts are already here and here in full force along with prostitution, sex offenders and other dangerous criminals living in the proposed location now with little to no supervision. Without some sort of treatment facility it will only get worse and with limited police enforcement due to budget problems this community is at great risk. Forgive me for sounding disrespectful but what do legislatures of King County know about the problem of drug addiction and how it spreads? Likely, nothing other than crime stats and jail population data. I was trafficked at 17 years old by a horrible man, I was forced into prostitution and fed drugs to deal with that life. I am known by Dave Reichert and King County Green River Task Force as the 16 living victim of the green river killer, Sandra Majors died in my place in December or 1982. Look online for Charlie Hagers documentary on the Green River Killer, that is my voice in the interview. God saved my life that day and pulled me from a pit you will never understand. It took 15 years to break free of that life and the man who had me bound. I am now 33 years sober clean and free and 20 years free of sex trafficking. Today, I am a respected member of my community, a leader in my church and I work for one of the largest law firms in this State- Miracle. But I am a Miracle because of Jesus and a treatment facility that helped me and my children. I wouldn't be a functioning asset to our society had I not found a treatment facility. The facility was located in an elementary school with children there called 1st Place in Seattle, Barb Bennett and her husband are the co-founders.

25 years ago it was well known that the stretch between 260th and 272nd was the place to go if you wanted to get high or commit crimes, there is so much under cover prostitution and drug selling in this area it is ridiculous and if my neighbors understood that truth,they would be terrified to live here. Things have not changed in 25 years because the police presence and monitoring hasn't changed, criminals know they can go to Des Moines and do what they want. I have volunteered and worked with the drug and criminal population for 15 + years in this area and did you know pimps are locking little girls in the trunk of their car in this area and making them wait there until it is time to put them to work. Did you know that Federal Way Police will dump a prostitute at Safeway on 272nd instead of taking them to Jail and leave the girl for Des Moines to deal with. Did you know that in Woodmont Library there is a white beat up camper that is a Meth lab and daily 15-25 homeless people either sleep, rest or get high in that parking lot? Did you know that every day in Safeway parking lot I alone see about 15 drug deals as I go shopping for my family? The south end has never had any homeless services or drug addiction services in-patient, so that is why the problem will continue to grow. If you have cancer you go get chemo, if you have the problem with "sin", addiction, prostitution, sex offenses, mental illness - you go to a treatment program. Taking the only hope away from this community is a bad idea unless you are willing to add about 10 more full-time officers. I was at Safeway last week, a man approached and touched a little girl, she ran screaming to her mom. The Safeway manager followed

the suspect around the store with his phone camera while waiting for an officer to show up. It took over 20 minutes for an officer to arrive, I know this because I was helping the store manager monitor the guy. This is simply a sign of what will only get worse in this area, my neighbors are living outside of reality if they think moving a facility that would help the problem away from here is going to keep there kids safe. Des Moines is know longer the wealthy, upper scale community it used to be, after the market crash everything changed here.

Besides Dave Reichert & Patty Murray, you are the first politician I have ever talked to that appears to truly care and is not just playing the numbers game for your next election. It is unfortunate but you and I know that is true. Des Moines is being taken over by crime, prostitution, addiction and sex offenders and it isn't going to change if you move the only facility that would have helped bring the "sins of the dark" to the "light". Making people accountable and giving them treatment is the only way you are going to fix this problem. Methadone is a downer, people on methadone don't have the energy to commit crimes or hurt kids until they need more dope and by then they won't be in this neighborhood - they will go were the dope is. You have a sex offender house on Kent Des Moines off 16th- why didn't the family's put up signs about that and in the 8 years that sex offender house has been there not one crime has been committed against kids or anyone else from one man that has lived in that house and at least 100 men have lived there collectively. On the contrary, those men are becoming rehabilitated and getting back to normal lives. If the community would have stopped that then the crime they hate the most would have been able to continue in our community because there would have been no were for those men to face their demons and get better.

What has happened to humanity and compassion? We have become a society of politically correct self centered people, who only look at the surface and never investigate anything further. This community just saw a facility that they are scared of and don't understand and so they freaked and used a school as a way to get rid of it, when there school kids start doing drugs because it is only two blocks from the school what will they think then? I wish I would have allowed a treatment facility?

Lastly, if you move this facility to Score - the second those "drug addicts" get out of their AA classes, and they decide they want to relapse where do you think they will go? Right here on 272nd to meet a drug dealer for some dope because no one is watching and no one seems to care.

You are a very nice man caught up in a community of ignorance(because they don't understand the truth and they are scared for their kids), well meaning people; trying to protect their families. Pretending you live in a fairy tale doesn't make it so, I am connected with people at Valley Cities and I have to be honest - I am ready to fight for this facility with a few politicians I know and lawyers. There is likely some legal issues here no one wants to address, legislature can't over rule the law. Don't give into the political pressure - this is your city not theirs and you know I am telling the truth. As your officers they know I am telling the truth. Take this opportunity to change Des Moines once and for all.

I am praying and asking GOD for guidance and direction and what God sets forth no man can take under. :)

Many blessing to you!

Susan P Manns-Bates

Susan P Manns-Bates
Jeremiah 29:11-13

On Sun, Oct 4, 2015 at 7:36 AM, <DesMnsDave@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Susan,

Thank you for your email follow-up on the Woodmont Recovery Center issue. I appreciate your kind words over the last several months.

Unfortunately, I'm going to have to discourage your efforts on what you propose. Some influential legislators and King County have been working diligently to see if there is a more appropriate site for the facility, where some of the real and perceived impacts would be lessened. I think the leadership at Valley Cities has come to recognize that they hadn't thought through everything, including a public

process to help ease the transition into building in Woodmont. For that reason, I have to ask you to hold off.

Your heart is good and true, and there are people in our community who definitely need help closer to Des Moines than Seattle. But finding the right location is important to everyone, and that search is progressing.

One thing I do need to correct, I and my fellow Councilmembers didn't "decide" anything. Valley Cities submitted a complete application, for a facility which was allowed under the existing zoning code, and which is deemed under state law as an "essential public facility." City staff could not have said no to the project, and neither could the hearing examiner. But I had no say regarding this project ... from start to finish.

This issue has been a frustrating and troubling one from the very start. I can only hope that God's guidance helps steer the final result.

Thank you again.

Dave

Dave Kaplan
Mayor & Councilmember
City of Des Moines, WA

In a message dated 10/3/2015 7:45:56 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, susanpmanns@gmail.com writes:

> Dear Dave,
>
> I have a friend that works at Valley Cities in the housing department. She is a woman of GOD and a mastered level social worker. We are banning together and getting a group together "for" the Woodmont facility and the choosen location. Please see the article I posted on the facebook today:
>
> https://www.facebook.com/groups/KidsBeforeAddicts/1508528536128104/?notif_t=group_comment
>
> Also, I have emailed Charlie Harger from Komo to see if he would do an article on the different perspective I have given in my article.
>
> I am on your side and believe you made a wise decision, sorry about the comment on not enough police presence but that part is the truth.
>
> Let me know if your interested in banning with our side of the spectrum. I am calling Dave Reichert and see if I can get his support. The prostitution problem is huge and he may want to support the facility for the woman that could get housing.
>
> I will keep you posted.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Susan
> Susan P Manns-Bates
> Jeremiah 29:11-13

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center Notes from Special Meeting 9-16-15**
Date: 10/7/2015 6:22:38 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
To: BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov
CC: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Thanks Bonnie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 7, 2015, at 2:59 PM, "Bonnie Wilkins" <BWilkins@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

> The minutes from the September 16th Woodmont Recovery Special meeting are available on the web-site; under City Council minutes and under the Woodmont Section where all other related documents are located.
>
> If you have any questions, please let me know!
>
> Bonnie

Subj: ***Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Center follow up - great news***
Date: 10/13/2015 10:23:48 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: tina.orwall@gmail.com
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

FYI Tina

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tad Doviak <taddoviak@gmail.com>
Date: October 13, 2015 at 11:03:07 PM PDT
To: Tad Doviak <taddoviak@gmail.com>
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center follow up - great news

Thank you everyone who wrote letters to our lawmakers. I think we made an impact. This is an excerpt from Senator Keiser's email update from October 13th. In her words, "the pause button has been pushed". This is wonderful news to hear that our lawmakers in Olympia are giving this weighty matter the serious consideration it has always needed. Please take a moment to thank Senator Keiser for her work and for looking out for the best interests of all of the residents of her district and the Woodmont area.

karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov

Hitting the pause button

Finally, regarding the medical treatment controversy in the Woodmont neighborhood in Des Moines. I want to assure everyone that nothing will happen without a full review of options. At this point, the pause button has been pushed and we are considering different locations and services for our neighbors who need mental health treatment or drug rehabilitation treatment. We share the same goals: To have healthy, safe and thriving communities.

I remain concerned about conditions in the area, and am worried that the current unkempt property on Pacific Avenue South next to the Taco Bell near S. 272nd Street has become a haven for prostitution, crime and drugs. While I was visiting the Woodmont library last week, I noticed that the library is installing a security gate that will be locked after 9 p.m. That is another strong signal that the current condition in the area needs improvement. Let's work together to improve the Woodmont community, not tear it apart in argument and anger.

As always if you have any questions or comments, please feel free to e-mail me or my assistant Tara Jo Heinecke. I hope you have a fun and spooky Halloween!

Always,

Senator Karen Keiser

=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center follow up - great news**
Date: 10/14/2015 6:15:07 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@gmail.com

Has Karen been in these conversations?

Dave

In a message dated 10/13/2015 11:23:48 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, tina.orwall@gmail.com writes:

FYI Tina

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tad Doviak <taddoviak@gmail.com>
Date: October 13, 2015 at 11:03:07 PM PDT
To: Tad Doviak <taddoviak@gmail.com>
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Center follow up - great news

Thank you everyone who wrote letters to our lawmakers. I think we made an impact. This is an excerpt from Senator Keiser's email update from October 13th. In her words, "the pause button has been pushed". This is wonderful news to hear that our lawmakers in Olympia are giving this weighty matter the serious consideration it has always needed. Please take a moment to thank Senator Keiser for her work and for looking out for the best interests of all of the residents of her district and the Woodmont area.

karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov

Hitting the pause button

Finally, regarding the medical treatment controversy in the Woodmont neighborhood in Des Moines. I want to assure everyone that nothing will happen without a full review of options. At this point, the pause button has been pushed and we are considering different locations and services for our neighbors who need mental health treatment or drug rehabilitation treatment. We share the same goals: To have healthy, safe and thriving communities.

I remain concerned about conditions in the area, and am worried that the current unkempt property on Pacific Avenue South next to the Taco Bell near S. 272nd Street has become a haven for prostitution, crime and drugs. While I was visiting the Woodmont library last week, I noticed that the library is installing a security gate that will be locked after 9 p.m. That is another strong signal that the current condition in the area needs improvement. Let's work together to improve the Woodmont community, not tear it apart in argument and anger.

As always if you have any questions or comments, please feel free to e-mail me or my assistant Tara Jo Heinecke. I hope you have a fun and spooky Halloween!

Always,

Senator Karen Keiser

=

Subj: **Re: Letter Regarding Woodmont**
Date: 10/16/2015 9:07:32 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you Tony

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 16, 2015, at 9:45 AM, Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Eckert <seckert@valleycities.org>
Date: October 16, 2015 at 9:44:54 AM PDT
To: <dbrewer@desmoineswa.gov>, "Vollendroff, Jim" <Jim.Vollendroff@kingcounty.gov>, <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Re: Letter Regarding Woodmont

Here is the signed version of the delay letter. Sorry about the confusion.

Sarah Eckert
Executive Assistant

Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation
325 West Gowe Street
Kent, WA 98032
206-408-5180 *(New Number As of 9/21/2015)*
seckert@valleycities.org

On Fri, Oct 16, 2015 at 9:28 AM, Sarah Eckert <seckert@valleycities.org> wrote:
Dear Mr. Brewer,
Good Morning. Per Ken Taylor's request I have attached a letter regarding the delay for Woodmont Recovery Campus in Des Monies. Please feel free to contact Ken Taylor at ktaylor@valleycities with any questions. Thank You.
Sincerely,
Sarah Eckert

Sarah Eckert
Executive Assistant

Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation
325 West Gowe Street
Kent, WA 98032
206-408-5180 *(New Number As of 9/21/2015)*
seckert@valleycities.org

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

<Woodmont Delay Letter 10.2015.pdf>

Subj: **Re: Letter Regarding Woodmont**
Date: 10/16/2015 12:30:59 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: momeof2c@msn.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov

It has also been posted on the Woodmont Facebook page

Excuse any spelling or grammar errors, this is sent from my iPhone

On Oct 16, 2015, at 10:45 AM, Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dan Brewer <DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov>
Date: October 16, 2015 at 10:42:38 AM PDT
To: Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>, Michael Matthias <MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Letter Regarding Woodmont

The letter has been posted to the Woodmont page on the web site.

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: **Fwd: Letter Regarding Woodmont**
Date: 10/16/2015 1:55:54 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov

Tina,

This is the letter.

Dave K.

From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov, ALingle@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 10/16/2015 9:38:46 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Fwd: Letter Regarding Woodmont

Here's the letter from Valley Cities.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Eckert <seckert@valleycities.org>
Date: October 16, 2015 at 9:28:49 AM PDT
To: <dbrewer@desmoineswa.gov>, "Vollendroff, Jim" <Jim.Vollendroff@kingcounty.gov>, <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Letter Regarding Woodmont

Dear Mr. Brewer,
Good Morning. Per Ken Taylor's request I have attached a letter regarding the delay for Woodmont Recovery Campus in Des Monies. Please feel free to contact Ken Taylor at ktaylor@valleycities with any questions. Thank You.
Sincerely,
Sarah Eckert

Sarah Eckert
Executive Assistant

Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation
325 West Gowe Street
Kent, WA 98032
206-408-5180 *(New Number As of 9/21/2015)*
seckert@valleycities.org

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: **Fwd: Letter Regarding Woodmont**
Date: 10/16/2015 1:56:42 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov

And the signed version.

Dave K.

From: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
To: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov, MMatthias@desmoineswa.gov
Sent: 10/16/2015 9:46:03 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Fwd: Letter Regarding Woodmont

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Eckert <seckert@valleycities.org>
Date: October 16, 2015 at 9:44:54 AM PDT
To: <dbrewer@desmoineswa.gov>, "Vollendroff, Jim" <Jim.Vollendroff@kingcounty.gov>, <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: Re: Letter Regarding Woodmont

Here is the signed version of the delay letter. Sorry about the confusion.

Sarah Eckert
Executive Assistant

Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation
325 West Gowe Street
Kent, WA 98032
206-408-5180 *(New Number As of 9/21/2015)*
seckert@valleycities.org

On Fri, Oct 16, 2015 at 9:28 AM, Sarah Eckert <seckert@valleycities.org> wrote:
Dear Mr. Brewer,
Good Morning. Per Ken Taylor's request I have attached a letter regarding the delay for Woodmont Recovery Campus in Des Monies. Please feel free to contact Ken Taylor at ktaylor@valleycities with any questions. Thank You.
Sincerely,
Sarah Eckert

Sarah Eckert
Executive Assistant

Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation
325 West Gowe Street
Kent, WA 98032
206-408-5180 *(New Number As of 9/21/2015)*
seckert@valleycities.org

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: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver**
Date: 10/16/2015 1:58:29 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov, DBrewer@desmoineswa.gov
CC: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

FYI

Dave K.

From: shebrush@gmail.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov, dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, lbangs@desmoineswa.gov, jnutting@desmoineswa.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov
Sent: 10/16/2015 11:23:28 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver

Tony - I did see the press release, but we still would like an official waiver on the appeal filing fee for all 11 who are on record at the CUP hearing. We do not want to take a chance of January 1st 2016 coming around and having to once more represent our request or wait for an answer.

At the very first meeting held at Woodmont Elementary, I asked you directly if you were for or against Valley Cities Woodmont Recovery Campus, you were against it. I then asked if you would help us fight to block it from being built, you stated you would within the law. Legally you can waive the appeal fee, it's a simple yes or no.

I sincerely hope that there will be no need to file an appeal, but again we would rather have our information now than in a few months. The cost of an attorney is already going to set us back, any relief financially would be viewed as a good will gesture from the City of Des Moines.

Kind Regards,

Sheila Brush

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver**
Date: 10/16/2015 3:02:38 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: shebrush@gmail.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, LBangs@desmoineswa.gov, JNutting@desmoineswa.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you, I appreciate your response before the end of business day, and the clarity your exact position. Did not realize the concern of "precedent"

You have a great weekend also,

Sheila Brush

On Fri, Oct 16, 2015 at 3:21 PM, Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Sheila,

Thanks for your email. As I said last night, I will consider your request. I am looking into how I can waive a fee without setting a precedent for future requests. I should be in a position to give you a response early next week.

Have a great weekend.

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: Sheila Brush [mailto:shebrush@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 11:23 AM
To: Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>; Vic Pennington <VPennington@desmoineswa.gov>; Dave Kaplan <DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov>; Matt Pina <mpina@desmoineswa.gov>; Melissa Musser <mmusser@desmoineswa.gov>; Luisa Bangs <LBangs@desmoineswa.gov>; Jeremy Nutting <JNutting@desmoineswa.gov>; tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov

Subject: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver

Tony - I did see the press release, but we still would like an official waiver on the appeal filing fee for all 11 who are on record at the CUP hearing. We do not want to take a chance of January 1st 2016 coming around and having to once more represent our request or wait for an answer.

At the very first meeting held at Woodmont Elementary, I asked you directly if you were for or against Valley Cities Woodmont Recovery Campus, you were against it. I then asked if you would help us fight to block it from being built, you stated you would within the law. Legally you can waive the appeal fee, it's a simple yes or no.

I sincerely hope that there will be no need to file an appeal, but again we would rather have our information now than in a few months. The cost of an attorney is already going to set us back, any relief financially would be viewed as a good will gesture from the City of Des Moines.

Kind Regards,

Sheila Brush

Subj: **Waiver regarding Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 10/19/2015 8:20:39 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: susanrdo@aol.com
To: tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov

Hi Tony,

I just left you a message. I know several citizens have asked about a waiver if an appeal has to be filed. I think this is the right thing to do. This would be an official waiver on the appeal filing fee for all 11 who are on record at the CUP hearing. A response would be appreciated soon as no one wants to take a chance of January 1, 2016 rolling around and not have an answer if an appeal needs to be filed.

Thanks!

Susan

Susan White
253-670-6096

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver**
Date: 10/19/2015 9:16:36 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: shebrush@gmail.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: VPennington@desmoineswa.gov, DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, mmusser@desmoineswa.gov, LBangs@desmoineswa.gov, JNutting@desmoineswa.gov, tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov, bsheckler@desmoineswa.gov

Good morning Tony, et al.,

I'm writing amend request a waiver of appeal filing fees for the Woodmont Recovery Campus for any and all persons who want to file an appeal. Since this is deemed an 'Essential Public Facility' and affects the whole community, then imposing fees on those who want to appeal it would be discriminatory against populations that can't afford it. You have the ability to waive the fees and your precedence would only apply to Essential Public Facilities should you need to declare a reason to waive them.

It seems silly to state the obvious, but I will since it seems that it needs to be reminded. You work for the citizens of Des Moines, not Valley Cities.

Kind Regards,

Sheila Brush

On Fri, Oct 16, 2015 at 3:21 PM, Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

Sheila,

Thanks for your email. As I said last night, I will consider your request. I am looking into how I can waive a fee without setting a precedent for future requests. I should be in a position to give you a response early next week.

Have a great weekend.

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: Sheila Brush [mailto:shebrush@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 11:23 AM
To: Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>; Vic Pennington <VPennington@desmoineswa.gov>; Dave Kaplan <DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov>; Matt Pina <mpina@desmoineswa.gov>; Melissa Musser <mmusser@desmoineswa.gov>; Luisa Bangs <LBangs@desmoineswa.gov>; Jeremy Nutting <JNutting@desmoineswa.gov>; tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver

Tony - I did see the press release, but we still would like an official waiver on the appeal filing fee for all 11 who are on record at the CUP hearing. We do not want to take a chance of January 1st 2016 coming around and having to once more represent our request or wait for an answer.

At the very first meeting held at Woodmont Elementary, I asked you directly if you were for or against Valley Cities Woodmont Recovery Campus, you were against it. I then asked if you would help us fight to block it from being built, you stated you would within the law. Legally you can waive the appeal fee, it's a simple yes or no.

I sincerely hope that there will be no need to file an appeal, but again we would rather have our information now than in a few months. The cost of an attorney is already going to set us back, any relief financially would be viewed as a good will gesture from the City of Des Moines.

Kind Regards,

Sheila Brush

Subj: **Re: Woodmont REcovery issues**
Date: 10/23/2015 12:23:57 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: desmnsluisa@gmail.com
To: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov
CC: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov, TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov

Thank you Pat

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 23, 2015, at 11:33 AM, Pat Bosmans <pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

> Mayor and members of the Council - I received an inquiry from Jack Mayne on the Woodmont Recovery action and forwarded this information to him for that discussion. He wanted to understand "who the client is" and some related issues. We can talk more about this issue on Thursday.
>
> **From:** Pat Bosmans
> **Sent:** Friday, October 23, 2015 10:18 AM
> **To:** 'jgmayne@gmail.com'
> **Subject:** Woodmont REcovery issues
>
> FYI
>
> <Westmark Dev Corp v City of Burien_ 140 Wn App 540 (2).pdf>
>
> <City Attorney.doc>
>
> <MX-3100N_20151023_101930.pdf>

=

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Campus - Design Review Decision Appeal Fee**
Date: 10/26/2015 4:25:07 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: momeof2c@msn.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov
CC: CityCouncil_Internal@desmoineswa.gov

Tony,
If council did have the votes to bring this forward for council review and decision, would the fee be able to be considered/ reviewed in time to be meaningful for this project? If the $800 is paid and the council the elects a staggered fee based on the type of project, would the applicants be eligible for a rebate/ refund if appropriate? Finally, I need further clarification on how our fees are at the low or middle of the pack based on the table below? Does the hourly rate add up in Kent to exceed the $800? To confirm- our fee is $800, but there are no additional hourly fees?

Did staff have an estimation of the number of hours a similarly sized project would take?
Thank you,
Melissa

Excuse any spelling or grammar errors, this is sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2015, at 3:37 PM, Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:

This is a draft of my response to the request to waive the appeal fee for the Woodmont recovery Campus design review decision. I plan on sending it out tomorrow morning. I would appreciate hearing any comments you may have. Thanks.

At the October 15th City Council meeting, and subsequently in several emails, I was asked to waive the fee for an appeal of the final design review decision for the Woodmont Recovery Campus. The fees charged by other cities for such appeals were provided by Sheila Brush at the same Council meeting. It has also been suggested that, if the fee cannot be waived, that we set a low or no fee for appeals related to essential public facilities. After careful review of the City Code and researching other cities, I believe I do not have the authority to waive the fee, nor do I believe I have the authority to set a low or no fee for a specific category of development. Finally, after reviewing the fee schedules of several cities, it is apparent that our fee is in the middle to the lower end of the scale. Many cities have a lower application fee for an appeal, but they then require the applicant to pay the actual cost of the hearing examiner. Below is more detail with regards to these decisions.

The process for setting a fee for a design review decision and waiving the fee is provided for in DMMC 18.20 Land Use Review Procedures. Specifically, 18.20.300 states:

> **18.20.300 Appeal fees.**<Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) 1.jpg>
> The fee for appeals made pursuant to this chapter, excluding DMMC 18.20.280, shall be set by administrative order of the City Manager or the City Manager's designee and shall be payable in advance, provided: (1) the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall waive such fees upon a finding of indigence according to standards adopted by the Des Moines Municipal Court, and (2) the decision-making body shall have discretion and jurisdiction to direct that any fees paid shall be refunded to a prevailing appellant upon a finding of just cause. [Ord. 1591 § 79, 2014.]

Since the Code specifically provides for a mechanism to waive the fee (i.e. the applicant is indigent), the City Manager may not waive the fee for any other reason.

With regards to setting the fee itself, when the Code specifically authorizes the City Manager to set a

fee, I believe it is the City Manager's responsibility to set a fee that is reasonable, that covers the cost to provide the services (at least on average) whenever possible, that is competitive with similar fees for similar services charged by other cities, and that is not so high that it is unreasonable. We have conducted a review of the appeal fees for several cities. Our fee is a flat $800. While we are not the lowest when it comes to this fee, most cities are higher when you add in the requirement that the applicant pay the hearing examiner's and/or staff costs as well. Here is a table showing the fees and costs for the cities we contacted. The source material for this table is attached.

Cities Quoted	Sheila Brush public comments	Actual	Hourly for Hearing Examiner
Kent	$240	$287 appeal filing fee plus actual cost of Hearing Examiner	$175/hour
Federal Way	$120.50	$182.50 appeal filing fee plus $2,306.00 Hearing Examiner fee.	Hourly rate n/a.
SeaTac	0	$200 appeal filing fee plus actual cost of Hearing Examiner	$150/ HEX $50/ asst $25/ clerk (Always brings clerk or asst.)
Normandy Park	500 w/ waiver policy	$500 appeal filing fee covers first four hours of staff time (additional time is $50/hour) + $725 Hearing Examiner fee. No waiver policy.	
Renton	no response	$250 appeal filing fee.	
Bellevue	0	No appeal fee but appellant pays for staff time associated with appeal.	

Several people have suggested setting this fee at a very low level, if not making it free, for appeals

concerning essential public facilities. I certainly understand and appreciate the reasoning behind this suggestion—essential public facilities can have a major impact on a community and thus must be allowed to be vetted as fully as possible—it is my belief that this is a policy question that should be decided upon by the City Council, not the City Manager.

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.

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.

<Bellevue.pdf>

<Federal Way.pdf>

<Kent.pdf>

<Normandy Park.pdf>

<Renton.pdf>

<Seatac.pdf>

SHARE

SHARE

Subj: **Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 10/29/2015 10:48:21 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: DesMnsDave@aol.com
To: TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov, mpina@desmoineswa.gov, vpennington@desmoineswa.gov
CC: pbosmans@desmoineswa.gov

FYI

Dave K.

From: Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov
To: ktaylor@valleycities.org, jim.ferrell@cityoffederalway.com, Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, superintendent@fwps.org
CC: Lisa.Tinsley@leg.wa.gov, Joseph.Atkinson@leg.wa.gov, Jess.Honcoop@leg.wa.gov, Lisa.Tinsley@leg.wa.gov
Sent: 10/29/2015 12:32:05 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Recovery Center

Attached is a letter regarding my concern for the Woodmont Recovery Center placement. If you have comments, please feel free to contact my office.

Senator Mark Miloscia

30th Legislative District

Senate Majority Deputy Whip

360-786-7658 Olympia – 206-212-6153 District

Mark.Miloscia@Leg.Wa.Gov

WASHINGTON STATE SENATE
MAJORITY COALITION CAUCUS

Subj: **Re: Woodmont Recovery Center**
Date: 10/30/2015 9:17:35 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: mpina@desmoineswa.gov
To: desmnsdave@aol.com

This is great!

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

DesMnsDave@aol.com wrote:

FYI

Dave K.

From: Mark.Miloscia@leg.wa.gov
To: ktaylor@valleycities.org, jim.ferrell@cityoffederalway.com, Linda.Kochmar@leg.wa.gov, Dkaplan@desmoineswa.gov, Tina.Orwall@leg.wa.gov, Carol.Gregory@leg.wa.gov, superintendent@fwps.org
CC: Lisa.Tinsley@leg.wa.gov, Joseph.Atkinson@leg.wa.gov, Jess.Honcoop@leg.wa.gov, Lisa.Tinsley@leg.wa.gov
Sent: 10/29/2015 12:32:05 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Woodmont Recovery Center

Attached is a letter regarding my concern for the Woodmont Recovery Center placement. If you have comments, please feel free to contact my office.

Senator Mark Miloscia

30th Legislative District

Senate Majority Deputy Whip

360-786-7658 Olympia – 206-212-6153 District

Mark.Miloscia@Leg.Wa.Gov

WASHINGTON STATE SENATE
MAJORITY COALITION CAUCUS

Bonnie Wilkins

From: Melissa Musser <momeof2c@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 3:53 PM
To: Bonnie Wilkins
Subject: Fwd: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver

Below is an email regarding Woodmont from my personal computer

Excuse any spelling or grammar errors, this is sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Melissa Musser <momeof2c@msn.com>
Date: October 21, 2015 at 11:47:13 AM PDT
To: Tony Piasecki <tpiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>
Subject: FW: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 2015 20:55:20 -0700
Subject: Re: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver
From: shebrush@gmail.com
To: momeof2c@msn.com

Hi Melissa, We plan on filing an appeal once the design permits are issued, the cost will be $800 per citizen. I had asked that all appeal fee's be waived for every citizen who wish to file a appeal, we are going to hire a lawyer, Melissa I clearly have already been working with one, but to keep cost down I have taken on this huge task of doing the paralegal work.

Tony has the authority to waive the fee, he claims that only the 11 at the CUP hearing can file an appeal, not true, any citizen of Des Moines can file an appeal against "Essential Public Facility" for the upcoming design permits.

If you read the Design Review on SEPA that I submitted, we do know our legal rights, Bob is way off base, the City keeps trying to spin this under the original SEPA, which is protected under LUPA, we got that, but Ms. Coleman did not chose that path, so we have the law on our side.

I believe with all my heart, this is not what you signed up for, and I am truly sorry for the insults you took personally, but this pause period is already taken a very ugly turn and I believe that this is just the start. Please do not take these words as any threat, I just don't want you to feel the brunt of the upset, since you have been nothing but sincere.

Thank you so much for reaching out, we gotta start somewhere,

Sheila

On Tue, Oct 20, 2015 at 7:57 PM, Melissa Musser <momeof2c@msn.com> wrote:

> Sheila,
> How much in fees were paid?? What is the refund request?
> Thanks,
> Melissa
>
> Excuse any spelling or grammar errors, this is sent from my iPhone
>
> On Oct 19, 2015, at 10:16 AM, Sheila Brush <shebrush@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> Good morning Tony, et al.,
>>
>> I'm writing amend request a waiver of appeal filing fees for the Woodmont Recovery Campus for any and all persons who want to file an appeal. Since this is deemed an 'Essential Public Facility' and affects the whole community, then imposing fees on those who want to appeal it would be discriminatory against populations that can't afford it. You have the ability to waive the fees and your precedence would only apply to Essential Public Facilities should you need to declare a reason to waive them.
>>
>> It seems silly to state the obvious, but I will since it seems that it needs to be reminded. You work for the citizens of Des Moines, not Valley Cities.
>>
>> Kind Regards,
>>
>> Sheila Brush
>>
>> On Fri, Oct 16, 2015 at 3:21 PM, Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov> wrote:
>>
>>> Sheila,
>>>
>>> Thanks for your email. As I said last night, I will consider your request. I am looking into how I can waive a fee without setting a precedent for future requests. I should be in a position to give you a response early next week.
>>>
>>> Have a great weekend.

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: Sheila Brush [mailto:shebrush@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 11:23 AM
To: Tony Piasecki <TPiasecki@desmoineswa.gov>; Vic Pennington <VPennington@desmoineswa.gov>; Dave Kaplan <DKaplan@desmoineswa.gov>; Matt Pina <mpina@desmoineswa.gov>; Melissa Musser <mmusser@desmoineswa.gov>; Luisa Bangs <LBangs@desmoineswa.gov>; Jeremy Nutting <JNutting@desmoineswa.gov>; tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov
Subject: Woodmont Recovery Design Appeal Waiver

Tony - I did see the press release, but we still would like an official waiver on the appeal filing fee for all 11 who are on record at the CUP hearing. We do not want to take a chance of January 1st 2016 coming around and having to once more represent our request or wait for an answer.

At the very first meeting held at Woodmont Elementary, I asked you directly if you were for or against Valley Cities Woodmont Recovery Campus, you were against it. I then asked if you would help us fight to block it from being built, you stated you would within the law. Legally you can waive the appeal fee, it's a simple yes or no.

I sincerely hope that there will be no need to file an appeal, but again we would rather have our information now than in a few months. The cost of an attorney is already going to set us back, any relief financially would be viewed as a good will gesture from the City of Des Moines.

Kind Regards,

Sheila Brush