

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH**  
**City Council**  
**Services, Safety & Parks Committee**

6:30 PM  
June 22, 2022

**MINUTES**

Council Chambers, 135 E.  
Sunset Way, Issaquah WA

**COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT**

*Committee Members:*

Tola Marts, Chair  
Chris Reh  
Barbara de Michele

*Administration/Staff:*

Wally Bobkiewicz, City Administrator  
Chris Grabowski, Deputy City Clerk

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Marts called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

No one spoke at public comment.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

a) **ID 1088 Board & Commission Consolidation**

*Presented by:*

*Tisha Gieser, City Clerk*

No one spoke at public comment.

General Committee comments included the following:

- Regarding sunsetting the Cable TV board there was unanimous agreement.
- Committee concurred with staff on having the Cemetery Board look at having their duties taken up by the Park Advisory Board. There may also be a need to ask for citizen input on this topic.
- The committee felt that another board that it may be possible to sunset is the Sister Cities Commission.

b) **ID 1169 Human Services Strategic Plan: Grants Program & Emergency Housing Options**

*Presented by:*

*Monica Negrila, Human Services Manager*

*Alexis Mercedes Rinck, Subregional Planning Manager*

*Mallory Van Abbema, East King Subregional Planning Specialist*

After the staff presentation, the following people spoke at public comment:

- Doug Schlepp – spoke in support of the pilot program.
- Erin Longchari – spoke in support of the pilot program.
- Brad Poston – spoke in support of the pilot program.
- Paul Lwali – spoke in support of the pilot program.

General Committee comments included the following:

Formula for Human Services Grant:

- There were concerns about costs and timelines.
- Current levels of human services allocations will be eaten up quickly.
- Make more substantial investment in human services for 2023- 2024.
- There was Committee agreement to apply the Consumer Price Index (CPI) moving forward.
- Baseline \$500,000 + population growth/per capita +CPI

Pilot Program:

- There was a question raised about ensuring that there is no duplication of services and ensuring that the City is not providing a service that King County Regional Homelessness Authority (KCRHA) is better suited for, or already providing.
- There was an ask to ensure that data is tracked and that the pilot program closely tracks data and outcomes.
- The proposal is a good fit for the use of the sales tax money (HB 1590)
- This is a local resource for an identified need in Issaquah
- The unit cost is proportional with regional data and costs
- This provides for a comprehensive response that aligns with the other human services programs
- There was consensus among the Committee to report back to City Council and for this project to be included in the City's 2023 -2024 Budget process

**c) ID 1162 Tenant and Landlord Protection Options**

*Presented by:*

*Monica Negrila, Human Services Manager*

*Hannah Roberts, Human Services Coordinator*

After the staff presentation Councilmember Marts shared public comment that had been received by email. The following individuals spoke at public comment:

- Julian Mydlil – spoke in support of protection options, felt the City could do more.
- Guillermo Rivera – spoke in support of tenant protections.

General Committee comments included the following:

- There was consensus that the City should not go it alone, and that there should be concurrency among neighboring jurisdictions on this topic.
- The current proposal does not match ARCH goals.
- More information and context are needed regarding enforcement obligations.
- Committee asked that staff return to the July 19 meeting with more information and update on how other jurisdictions are handling this issue.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:19 PM.

---

Tola Marts, Chair

---

Chris Grabowski, Deputy City Clerk





# Staff Report

## ID # 0724 – City Facilities Assessment & Surplus Property Policy

**Meeting Date** July 19, 2022  
**Department** Administrative Services  
**Staff Lead** Autumn Monahan, Administrative Services Director  
 Gene Paul, Management Analyst

### Attachments

- A. Draft Surplus Property Policy
- B. Draft Property Evaluation Criteria

### Direction Needed

The City Administration seeks feedback on:

- Whether to proceed with adopting the draft surplus real property policy.

Staff will also provide a briefing/update on:

- Current facility use
- City Hall Project Management RFP
- Building assessment/audit (2023)

### Recommendation

The Administration recommends the City Council adopt the draft surplus real property policy.

### Background

Over the past 40 years, the City of Issaquah has acquired numerous properties and buildings to serve a wide variety of intended public purposes. Like other cities, the Administration believes it is important to assess and evaluate how those properties are being utilized and managed. In 2019, the Facilities Division updated and consolidated information on 18 City-owned properties and facilities that were

not directly being used by the City at that time. This information included the history of the acquisition, condition of the property/building, current lease information (if applicable), and any other relevant facts. This information was provided to the City Council in 2020 with the intent of a future discussion on how to best evaluate these properties for long-term retention or potential surplus.

The City currently has a fairly modest surplus property policy, which is contained in the City's adopted [Financial Management Policy](#). Section 10.6 governs surplus assets and briefly states that "Titled vehicles, real property, and any City property with a value of greater than \$5,000 will be surplus by the City Council by resolution." The Administration intends to make this process more specific and robust by creating this surplus real property policy.

To help further this discussion, the Administration researched Washington cities that have policies for surplus real property and identified the best practices from those policies. This research was heavily supported by the resources available through the Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC). The [MRSC webpage](#) on the sale of surplus city property contains several examples of how different cities have created formal policies on surplus property. These examples include the cities of Bellevue, Bellingham, Bainbridge Island, Renton, and Vancouver. In addition to these cities, staff also examined policies and best practices from the cities of Bothell, Port Townsend, and Seattle.

Overall, there are varied approaches to how these cities convey their policy. Some cities, like Renton and Bainbridge Island, approved resolutions for their policies. Others, like Bellevue and Bothell, placed it into their municipal codes.

There was also a broad spectrum of policies. On one end of the spectrum is the City of Bellevue, which covers everything with two sentences in their municipal code that state "Except as provided in BCC [4.32.020](#) and [4.32.030](#), any sale of real property shall be submitted to the council for approval. A public hearing on the proposed sale is not required." On the other end of the spectrum is the City of Seattle with a 32-page document on the evaluation and disposal of real property.

Regardless how cities have conveyed their policies, there tend to be common elements to most of the policies that detail their process. Generally, these policies consist of:

- A policy statement or set of guiding principles for the overall approach in the policy
- A description of data collected while inventorying properties
- A description of how the Administration reviews that data and makes recommendations concerning a property

- A description of how the City Council reviews recommendations and makes determinations

### Summary of the Draft Policy presented in April 2021

At the [April 13, 2021 Council Study Session](#), the Administration first presented the draft real property policy. The structure of the policy was based on the research of other policies and the desire to keep a high-level and flexible approach. Specifically, the Administration recommended at that time that staff would have standard operating procedures for the inventory, evaluation, and recommendation phases of this work, while the City Council would have an approved policy approved that summarizes the Administration phase and delineates the City Council phase of work. As described, this method would create a formal policy that would not require City Council action for staff to update administrative procedures but still provide the framework of a formal policy for the City Council. Finally, it would preserve some flexibility by not creating a heavily detailed and potentially cumbersome policy like other cities have adopted into their municipal codes.

#### *Initiation*

The Administration proposed that the surplus real property process could be triggered by a request from either the Administration or the City Council.

#### *Administration Review*

Once initiated, the Administration would prepare a staff report that details the property and contains a recommendation to the City Council of whether the property should be considered for surplus. The draft version of the Property Evaluation Criteria in Attachment B represents the standard method of assessment recommended by the Administration. This draft document was developed by reviewing evaluation processes performed by other cities and compiling the theme and best practices. In applying these criteria to properties, the Administration's evaluation would begin with a series of four groups of questions intended to gain a thorough understanding of the property being reviewed. The four question areas seek to determine:

- The relevance of the property to current and future city priorities,
- The current use,
- The current condition of the property,
- If there are other City uses that should be considered for the property.

The responses to these four groups of questions would then be evaluated by staff in order to determine the Administration's recommendation on whether the property should be retained by the City or considered as a candidate property to surplus.

#### *City Council Review*

Any property that continues in this review process will go to the City Council for review and final determination. The Administration is recommending the following for that the City Council's general process:

- Conduct a public hearing (if necessary)
- Make a final determination
- Approve a resolution (if necessary) that provides direction on disposal of the property

#### *Public Hearing*

There are certain situations where the Washington State laws require a public hearing as part of the City Council's determination that a property is surplus. Those situations include:

- The intergovernmental transfer of property having a value of more than \$50,000 ([RCW 39.33.020](#))
- The lease or sale of land or property originally acquired for public utility purposes ([RCW 35.94.040](#))

In those situations, the public notice and hearing process will comply with the requirements found in the applicable RCW Chapter.

For property that falls outside of these requirements, public hearings are not legally required. However, the Administration recommends that a public hearing will be held for any property with an assessed value of \$50,000 or more. This threshold aligns with RCW 39.33 and the value associated with the intergovernmental transfer of property.

For the amount and type of public notice, the Administration based the recommendation on the proposed changes to Title 18 and the public notice required for public hearings on land use. Specifically, the notice shall be:

- Published in the newspaper
- Mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the exterior boundaries of the site or 20 property owners, whichever is greater

These notice parameters would be more stringent than the current [IMC 18.04.180](#), which only requires notification to property owners within 300 feet of the property. However, they are not the most stringent in the region as the City of Kent uses 1,000 feet as its threshold. 500 feet is intended to balance the staffing time and cost considerations of carrying out this method with the need for proper public notification.

#### *Determination*

Following the Council's review of the surplus property report and conclusion of the public hearing, the Council shall determine whether the property shall be declared surplus and if so, how it will be disposed of. The disposition decisions should include whether an appraisal is required, the type of sale the City Council would accept and any special restriction that should be imposed. If the City Council determines a property is surplus to the City's needs, the Council would complete the process by adopting a resolution making such a declaration.

#### **Updates to the Draft Policy since April 2021**

Since the April 2021 presentation, the Administration has updated the draft policy and the evaluation criteria. These updates have incorporated Council feedback as well as the input of the City Attorney. These improvements include:

- Adjusting the language to clarify that it only applies to real property
- Clarifying that public notice for a public hearing will be published in the "newspaper of record"
- Including tenants in the public notification process
- Adding the City's website and communication channels to the list of places where public notice for a public hearing will be provided
- Adjusting the Property Evaluation Criteria to specify a public benefits analysis that analyzes property value, both costs and revenues, and uses an equity lens to consider who benefits from the property