

[Senescu3](#)

replied

*Wed, 7 May 2025 at 2:21 PM*

To:"PDC Support" <pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov>

External Email

I offer the following in response to the PDC complaint filed by Tammy Weisman on April 10, 2025, Case #170564:

On March 25, 2025, my fellow councilmember from Ward 3, Leslie Lewallen, and I held an informal Town Hall at the Camas Library from 4-6pm. The purpose of the Town Hall was to connect with community members. There were about 20 people in attendance.

Unlike formal hearings or council meetings, my understanding is that Town Halls are designed to be conversational and community centered. A Town Hall meeting offers a chance for genuine dialogue between the people and those elected to serve them. I went into this meeting with this attitude.

The Communication's Director Bryan Rachal had made a Facebook post about the Town Hall asking for suggestions on topics. Councilmember Lewallen and I were prepared to discuss a number of topics that folks were interested in.

About 10 minutes prior to the meeting a gentleman arrived, and councilmember Lewallen and I asked if he was there for a particular topic. He indicated that he was there to discuss fluoridation in the water. We listened to his comments and thanked him for being there. As folks arrived, the conversation continued. We had a spirited discussion on this matter for about an hour and 15 minutes. As there were other matters that people wanted addressed, we wrapped up the fluoride conversation and moved on to the Regional Fire District (RFA) topic, followed by other topics.

We were thankful for Fire Chief Free's attendance at the Town Hall. He appropriately answered questions from attendees.

In council meetings prior to the RFA being placed on the ballot, I was vocal that I was not necessarily in support of an RFA; however, because it would be creating a new taxing entity, I was in favor of placing this matter on the ballot for a vote of the people. Pursuant to RCW 42.17A.555 (1)(b) and (2) members of the legislative body, members of the board, council, or commission of the special purpose district, or members of the public are afforded an approximately equal opportunity for the expression of an opposing view. In fact,

councilmember Svilarich, who was also in attendance at the meeting, expressed his support of the RFA and advocated for the same.

As casual conversations ensued, I commented that I fully support my vote to place the RFA on a ballot for voters to decide. I indicated that the RFA is a separate taxing entity and that I, as a citizen, was not in favor of this. I said that I am only one vote and encouraged people to research both sides of the issue and vote what they feel is best. This was all that was said. I did not “explain at length” as Ms. Weisman states.

I hope that my impact was to inform people that the RFA is a separate taxing entity and share facts. The Fire Chief and another councilmember in attendance did a good job of pointing out the pros of an RFA, but no cons were presented. My comments were less than 30 seconds in length. I was there to listen to people and provide information.

I was disheartened to receive this complaint as I was happy to hear Ms. Weisman’s comments. I am just doing my job to educate. I value everyone’s comments and intend to have another Town Hall with councilmember Lewallen in June.

If I violated any rule, it was unintentional. I assure you my intentions were and remain well meaning.

There were several people at the Town Hall that can verify my statement and intent (Randal Friedman, Deborah Nagano, Stephen Dabasinskas, Brian Wiklem, Carrie Wiklem, Samantha Horner, and Brian Lewallen).

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Senescu