

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH****Environmental, Equity, Parks & Transportation Advisory Boards Special Meeting**

6:30 PM

Blakely Hall, 2550 NE Park Dr.

February 16, 2023

**MINUTES**

Issaquah, WA 98029

**BOARD AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT***Board members:*Environmental Board

Jaimie Finch  
 Don McQuilliams  
 Rishi Hazra  
 Janet Wall (alternate)  
 Tom Anderson (alternate)

Parks Board

Chris Kovac  
 Brenda Spears  
 Marlene Waxse  
 Zach Szablewski  
 Nicholas Lee  
 Andrew Myers (alternate)

Equity Board

Lucrecia Choto  
 Kelly Munn (alternate)  
 Priti Mody-pan (alternate)  
 Cristina Abonce  
 Helen Kibenge

Transportation Advisory Board

Dave Waggoner  
 Kristi Tripple  
 Jeri Bernstein  
 Cynthia Krass  
 Micah Zeitz-Chua  
 Tom McDonald  
 Julian Mydlil

*Administration/Staff:*

Andrea Snyder, Deputy City Administrator  
 Robert Hamud, Finance Director  
 Stacy Vynne McKinstry, Sustainability Manager  
 David Reedy, Sustainability Coordinator  
 Monica Negrila, Human Services Manager  
 Jeff Watling, Parks & Community Services Director  
 Jennifer Fink, Park Planner  
 Hasanthi Piyasena, Parks Operations Specialist  
 Isabel Diaz, Senior Transportation Engineer

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN BOARD SUMMIT**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting is to host a summit for four of the City's advisory boards - the Environmental Board, Equity Board, Park Board, and Transportation Advisory Board - to provide input on the criteria for projects in the City's 2024-2029 Capital Improvement Plan.

**Welcome & Introductions**

The meeting convened at 6:30 PM.

**Public Comment** – None.

**What is a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)?**

- Staff Presentation by Andrea Snyder, Deputy City Administrator

- Q&A

### CIP Project Selection Process

- Staff Presentation by Andrea Snyder, Deputy City Administrator
- Q&A

### CIP Selection Criteria

- a) Breakout Activity
- b) Report Out & Discussion
  - Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) feedback:
    - Identified resources should include long-term maintenance costs of the capital asset.
    - The board felt that the environmental criteria was not explicit enough and could include some contradictory grading as projects could have a negative impact on ecosystems but a positive impact on climate goals.
    - Safety and legal mandate should be separated. Safety was potentially too much of a catch-all term.
    - The equity criteria could use some work. Specifically, the first sentence which notes that projects should be for all City of Issaquah residents felt counterintuitive to the work of equity. Additionally, there should be a space to have a conversation about the specific harm of potential projects.
    - The equity board expressed appreciation to TAB for their points on equity and for their engagement of the topic.
  - Equity Board feedback:
    - The board thought that rather than having equity as a separate criterion it would be better to have equity folded into all other criteria.
    - Some of the language in the equity criteria is not aligned with the equity framework. An example is the use of the word “subgroup” which can be othering.
    - The board was concerned that many of the long-term plans might have been developed before COVID and might not accurately reflect priorities given the change of circumstances.
    - Concern that there was a lack of transparency and accountability in the long-term commitment criteria. There are also equity concerns. TAB also reiterated their support of this point.
    - Community Priority criteria necessarily includes the Strategic Plan criteria, long standing commitment criteria, and replacement or Capital Maintenance. Should not be separated into separate criteria.
  - Environment Board feedback:
    - Overall, criteria look good. Environmental criteria are improved from previous version.
    - There was significant concern about the application of the Red, Yellow, Green system and how that would be implemented. The board felt the three levels were not specific enough.
      - Red, Yellow, Green should be further defined. Suggestion: Red= Sustains or degrades environment. Yellow= Enhances. Red= Protects.
    - The board recommended splitting the environment criteria into two – one focused on the natural environment and one on climate resiliency. TAB asked for clarification and felt like it aligned with their points made in bullet 2.
    - The board felt like historic preservation was not adequately represented in the current criteria.

- The board wanted an opportunity to note in the criteria if any project had a specific conflict with an existing plan in addition to a space to note if a project was connected to an existing plan.
- The durability or life cycle of a project might have an impact on the sustainability of a project and should be considered.
- Park Board feedback:
  - The board appreciated raising the bar for the environment criteria and for starting down the road of strategic consideration of equity although the board agreed the equity language could be fine-tuned.
  - They felt like the criteria might be over indexed to existing plans.
  - It seemed like there might be too many and/or notes in criteria and the board suggested having a heading with subdivisions instead.
  - The board noted they would appreciate something more nuanced than the Red, Yellow, Green split in the weighting of criteria.
  - The board felt that Economic Benefit was not adequately reflected in the criteria.
  - The board wanted the staff to be careful to avoid wording the criteria as a binary yes/no.
  - The board thought there should be more consideration of what makes Issaquah Issaquah – some reflection on community culture.
  - Finally, an additional board member spoke up and said that it felt repetitive to have two criteria that touch on strategic plans and that one would do better – even if it was weighted more than other plans.
  - Equity criteria should include considerations for geography/neighborhood and accessibility.

**Next Steps**

**Public Comment** – None.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:36 PM.