



# PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL HYBRID MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, June 12, 2024 at 6:00 PM

## PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

**Chair:** Angela Battazzo

**Vice Chair:** Michael Murphy

**Commissioners:** Kate Akyuz, Adam Ragheb,  
and Victor Raisys

## LOCATION

Mercer Island Community & Event Center and Zoom

Slater Room

8236 SE 24<sup>th</sup> Street | Mercer Island, WA 98040

(206) 275-7706 | [www.mercerisland.gov](http://www.mercerisland.gov)

*We strive to create an inclusive and accessible experience. Those requiring accommodation for Planning Commission meetings should notify the Deputy City Clerk's Office 3 days prior to the meeting at (206) 275-7791 or by emailing [cityclerk@mercerisland.gov](mailto:cityclerk@mercerisland.gov).*

Individuals wishing to speak live during Public Appearances (public comment period) must register with the Deputy City Clerk at (206) 858-3150 or [cityclerk@mercerisland.gov](mailto:cityclerk@mercerisland.gov) by 4pm on the day of the Planning Commission meeting. Each speaker will be allowed three (3) minutes to speak.

Join the meeting at 6:00 pm (Public Appearances will start sometime after 6:00 PM) by:

- 1) **Telephone:** Call 253.215.8782 and enter Webinar ID 873 0462 8246, Passcode 323468.
- 2) **Zoom:** Click this [Link](#) (Webinar ID 873 0462 8246, Passcode 323468)
- 3) **In person:** Mercer Island Community & Event Center | 8236 SE 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Mercer Island, WA 98040

## CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL, 6 PM

## PUBLIC APPEARANCES

This is the opportunity for anyone to speak to the Commission about issues of concern.

## SPECIAL BUSINESS

1. **Planning Commission meeting minutes of the May 29 and June 5 Special Meetings.**  
**Recommended Action:** Approve the minutes.
2. **PCB 24-16: Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review: Deliberations**  
**Recommended Action:** Prepare a recommendation to the City Council.

## OTHER BUSINESS

3. **Deputy Director's Report**
4. **Planned Absences for Future Meetings**

## ADJOURNMENT



# PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 29, 2024

## CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Murphy at 6:04 pm.

Chair Michael Murphy, Vice Chair Adam Ragheb, and Commissioners Kate Akyuz, Angela Battazzo, Carolyn Boatsman, Chris Goelz, and Victor Raisys, were present remotely.

### Staff Remote Participation:

Alison Van Gorp, Deputy CPD Director, Adam Zack, Senior Planner, and Deb Estrada, Deputy City Clerk

Chair Murphy, Commissioners, and staff thanked Commissioners Boatsman and Goelz for their work on the Planning Commission.

**APPEARANCES.** There were no public appearances.

## SPECIAL BUSINESS

### 1. PCB 24-13: Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review – Public Hearing

The public hearing was opened at 6:14 PM

- Matt Goldbach, Mercer Island, spoke in opposition to moving forward without more resident involvement.
- Lucille Zehr, Mercer Island, expressed concern that there wasn't more resident input prior to making a decision.
- Senator Lisa Wellman, Mercer Island, expressed concern that the Planning Commissioners were not present in person to discuss the Comprehensive Plan.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed at 6:33 PM

The Commission requested the following information:

- Public Comment Tracking
- Scope of Work
- Housing Element Minimum Requirements

A motion was made by Akyuz; seconded by Boatsman to:

**Close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented.**

A motion was made by Boatsman; seconded by Ragheb to

**Amend Policy Gap 4 to read, "Reduce impact to people and areas that have been disproportionately affected by noise, light, air pollution, or other environmental impacts."**

Approved: 6-1

Main motion approved: 5-2

A motion was made by Boatsman; seconded by Ragheb to:

**Amend Transportation Element Goal 12 to read as follows:**

**Promote bicycle and pedestrian networks that safely access and link commercial areas, residential areas, schools, and parks, and transit, within the City.**

Approved: 7-0

A motion was made by Boatsman; seconded by Goelz to:

**Amend Land Use Element, text on page 5 to read as follows:**

**Beginning in 2022, the City began composing a Climate Action Plan. The Climate Action Plan establishes strategies for the City to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled to meet its adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals address climate change. Those strategies are an important step to move the City forward in its response to the changing climate. Where needed, goals and policies were amended or added to this Land Use Element to support the strategies in the Climate Action Plan, including amendments to the policies under goals 26, 27, and 28.**

Approved: 5-2

A motion was made by Boatsman; seconded by Akyuz to:

**Amend Housing Element Policy 1.4.M to read as follows:**

**Neighborhoods in which environmental health hazards, including noise and light pollution, are minimized to the extent possible.**

Approved: 6-1

A motion was made by Raisys; seconded by Boatsman to:

**Adopt the staff recommended findings in PCB24-13 Table 2 as a working document.**

Approved: 4-3

**2. PCB 24-12: Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review – Open House Summary and Consistency Review**

The report was received, no action necessary.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**3. Deputy Director's Report** – No report provided.

**4. Planned Absences for Future Meetings.**

**ADJOURNED** - The meeting adjourned at 9:14 pm

---

Deborah Estrada, Deputy City Clerk



# PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 5, 2024

Item 1.

## CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Murphy at 6:00 pm.

Chair Michael Murphy, Vice Chair Adam Ragheb, and Commissioners Kate Akyuz, Angela Battazzo, and Victor Raisys, were present remotely.

## Staff Remote Participation:

Alison Van Gorp, Deputy CPD Director, Adam Zack, Senior Planner, and Deb Estrada, Deputy City Clerk

**APPEARANCES.** There were no public appearances.

## SPECIAL BUSINESS

### 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of the May 15, 2024, Special Meeting:

A motion was made by Battazzo; seconded by Akyuz to:

**Approve the minutes.**

Approved 5-0

### 2. PCB 24-14: Planning Commission Administration – Elections, Bylaws, Housing Work Group Appointment

Deputy City Clerk Estrada opened the floor for nominations for Chair.

Vice Chair Ragheb nominated Chair Murphy for Chair. Murphy declined the nomination.

Chair Murphy nominated Commissioner Battazzo for Chair.

There being no other nominations. Deputy City Clerk Estrada called for a motion.

A motion was made by Ragheb; seconded by Akyuz to:

**Elect Angela Battazzo as Chair**

Approved 5-0

Deputy City Clerk Estrada opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chair.

Chair Battazzo nominated Commissioner Murphy for Vice Chair.

There being no other nominations. Deputy City Clerk Estrada called for a motion.

A motion was made by Akyuz; seconded by Raisys to:

**Elect Michael Murphy as Vice Chair**

Approved 5-0

Deputy Director Van Gorp reported that the Planning Commission bylaws would be updated to incorporate City Code amendments made by Council.

Deputy Director Van Gorp explained that Commissioner Boatsman's departure left a vacancy on the Housing Work Group, which Council intended to reconvene. Vice Chair Murphy asked for a motion to appoint a volunteer from the Planning Commission to fill the vacancy.

A motion was made by Akyuz; seconded by Murphy to:  
**Appoint Angela Battazzo to serve on the Housing Work Group**  
 Approved 5-0

### 3. PCB 24-15: Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review – Deliberations

**Consensus** – There was consensus that the next iteration of the comment table be grouped by topic, provide analysis on the alignment of each comment with Commerce Guidance, MPPs and CPPs, as well as a staff response and recommended amendments, where appropriate.

A motion was made by Ragheb; seconded by Raisys to:  
**Add to the Planning Commission findings: “Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.9 received two strong public comments. During a brief discussion, it was brought up that key definitions related to this goal are not currently contained within the Comprehensive Plan document.”**

A motion was made by Akyuz; seconded by Murphy to:  
**Table the motion to be considered with the revised table that includes all the public comments.**  
 Approved 3-2

A motion was made by Ragheb; seconded by Murphy that:  
**The Planning Commission add to its findings: “Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.10 received six public comments asking that we note that off-street parking is important to families and those who are handicapped.”**  
 Approved: 5-0

A motion was made by Ragheb; seconded by Akyuz to:  
**Correct the phrase on Page 2, third paragraph from “The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I 90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.” to “The regional Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail runs along the I 90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.”**  
 Approved: 5-0

A motion was made by Ragheb; seconded by Murphy to:  
**Amend Transportation Element Policy 3.3 on Page 4 to add “and retain trees” per public comment. It currently reads “Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.” And as amended would read, “Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees and retain trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.”**  
 Approved: 4-1

A motion was made by Ragheb; seconded by Raisys to:

- 1) Revise the second to last paragraph on Page 19 from **“Link light rail runs through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. The light rail provides frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.”** to **“Link light rail is planned to run through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. It is planned for the light rail to provide frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.”**
- 2) Revise the second paragraph of Page 23 from **“The opening of the East Link light rail line provides an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.”** to **“The analysis assumes the opening of the East Link light rail line in 2023, which will result in an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.”**

Failed: 3-2

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**4. Deputy Director's Report** – No report provided.

**5. Planned Absences for Future Meetings.**

**ADJOURNED** - The meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm

---

Deborah Estrada, Deputy City Clerk



# PLANNING COMMISSION CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

**PCB 24-16**  
**June 12, 2024**  
**Special Business**

## AGENDA BILL INFORMATION

<b>TITLE:</b>	PCB 24-16: Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review: Deliberations	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion Only <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Needed: <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation
<b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b>	Prepare a recommendation to the City Council	

<b>STAFF:</b>	Alison Van Gorp, CPD Deputy Director Adam Zack, Senior Planner
<b>EXHIBITS:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Open House and Survey Summary Report</li> <li>2. Planning Commissioner Comments</li> <li>3. Public Comments</li> <li>4. Public Comments Tracked by Element</li> </ol>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide the Planning Commission (PC) with additional information as requested so that they can continue deliberating their recommendation.

- On May 1, 2024, the City held the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update Open House (Open House) and opened an online survey. The online survey was open from May 1 to 20;
- The initial results of the online survey were provided to the PC with [PCB 24-12](#), with a note that a summary report would be available at a later date;
- On May 29, 2024, the PC held a public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan update and continued deliberations to June 5, 2024;
  - An initial draft of findings was provided with [PCB 24-13](#) Exhibit 1;
  - The public hearing drafts of the Comprehensive Plan elements were provided with [PCB 24-13](#) Exhibits 2-8;
- On May 29, 2024, consultants from BERK Consulting Inc. delivered a report summarizing the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update Open House and online survey (Exhibit 1);
- On June 5, 2024, the PC continued deliberating its recommendation to the City Council; and
- The PC will resume deliberating its recommendation to the City Council on June 12, 2024, with a focus on the Land Use, Housing, and Economic Development elements.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS


The public can submit written comments regarding the Comprehensive Plan periodic review to [comp.plan@mercerisland.gov](mailto:comp.plan@mercerisland.gov). Public comments submitted by 4:30 PM on Tuesday June 11, 2024, will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting on June 12. Comments received after June 4 will be provided to the Planning Commission at a later meeting.

## BACKGROUND

The City has been engaged in the periodic review of its Comprehensive Plan since March 2022, when the City Council approved the Scope of Work, Master Schedule, and Public Participation Plan with [Resolution No. 1621](#). At public meetings over the last two years, the PC has prepared public review drafts of each element slated for update and the new Economic Development and Parks and Open Space elements. The public was able to comment

on the drafts during the public meetings and submit written comments throughout the periodic review process. The periodic review process to date is summarized in figures 1, 2, and 3.

**Figure 1. Comprehensive Plan Project Summary Timeline, 2022-2023.**



**Figure 2. Comprehensive Plan Project Summary Timeline, 2023-2024.**







Figure 3. Comprehensive Plan Project Summary Timeline, 2024-2025.



**Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Open House and Survey Summary Report**

The Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Open House and Survey Summary Report (Summary Report) provides an overview of the feedback the City gathered during the Open House on May 1 and the online survey it conducted from May 1 to 20, 2024 (Exhibit 1). The PC already received the results of the online survey with [PCB 24-12](#). The input detailed in the Summary Report can help the PC as it considers its recommendation to the City Council. Input from the survey was already incorporated into the staff recommended findings provided in [PCB 24-13](#).

**June 5 Recap**

On June 5, 2024, the PC continued deliberating its recommendation to the City Council. The deliberations focused on the Transportation, Capital Facilities, Utilities, and Parks and Open Space elements. During the meeting the PC approved three motions to address public comments on the Transportation Element. The approved motions were:

Add to the PC findings: “Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.10 received six public comments asking that we note that off-street parking is important to families and those who are handicapped.”

Correct the phrase on Page 2, third paragraph from “The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I 90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.” to “The regional Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail runs along the I 90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.”

Amend Transportation Element Policy 3.3 on Page 4 to add “and retain trees” per public comment [PUB-1]. It currently reads “Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.” And as-amended would read “Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees and retain trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.”

Additionally, one motion was tabled for discussion later. A tabled motion requires a majority vote from the PC to resume consideration of this motion. Another option for addressing the tabled motion without further discussion

is to make a motion to “lay on the table”. By adopting the motion to “lay on the table,” a majority has the power to halt consideration of a question immediately without debate. This motion requires a second and is not debatable or amendable. Laying the motion on the table would call an immediate vote on the motion, giving the PC the option to quickly resolve the motion if desired.

The tabled motion was:

Add to the PC findings: “Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.9 received two strong public comments. During a brief discussion, it was brought up that key definitions related to this goal are not currently contained within the Comprehensive Plan document.

### **Transportation Policy 4.9**

Proposed Transportation Policy 4.9 states: “Implement transportation programs that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups.” This policy was drafted to align with the King County Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) T-9, which states: “Implement transportation programs and projects that prevent and mitigate the displacement of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low and no- incomes, and people with special transportation needs.”

To follow up on Planning Commission questions at the June 5 meeting, staff have researched the definitions of the terms used in Transportation Policy 4.9. The King County [CPPs](#) include a glossary (see page 112), but it does not include the term “Black, Indigenous, and People of Color”. The glossary does include definitions of some other pertinent terms, such as “historically underserved communities” and “extremely low-income households”. In addition, it may be helpful to note, King County [declared racism a public health crisis](#) in 2020 and has since undertaken many anti-racist policies and programs, with an focus on Black, Indigenous, and People of Color specifically.

## **ISSUE/DISCUSSION**

### **Comments**

The PC has received 15 public comments and three Planning Commissioner comments as it has deliberated its recommendation to City Council from May 29 to June 5, 2024. The comments provided by Planning Commissioners are provided in Exhibit 2. Public comments received to date are provided in Exhibit 3. An expanded comment tracking table is provided in Exhibit 4. The PC has requested staff make some recommendations concerning the public comments to assist in their making a recommendation. The Public Comments Tracked by Element in Exhibit 4 includes additional staff commentary as requested by PC and each comment listed by Comprehensive Plan Element.

Many of the public comments that propose amendments to the draft text of the Comprehensive Plan are labeled “Policy Choice” in Exhibit 4. Comments marked as “policy choice” propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. The PC may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent. Some comments in the Exhibit are marked as “Word Smithing.” These are comments proposing an alternate wording for non-policy and non-goal parts of the draft element. The PC can amend the text as proposed by a word smithing comment without changing the policy direction, but further consistency analysis would be required to ensure that the amendment does not conflict with policies elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

The City has received comments on the Comprehensive Plan update from Puget Sound Energy (PSE) and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) (PCB 24-12, Exhibit 6). Staff has reviewed those comments

and recommends the two amendments listed in Table 1. The other agency comments that do not have a staff recommendation are optional, proposing amendments over and above those required for compliance. The PC can consider these optional comments and, if desired, staff will draft a recommended amendment based on those comments if requested.

**Table 1. Staff Recommended Responses to Other Agency Comments.**

Comment Proposed By	Element	Policy Amendment
WA Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)	Land Use	Amend Policy 19.6: "Important wildlife habitats including forest, watercourses, wetlands, <u>riparian areas</u> , and shorelines should be connected via <u>intentional infrastructure planning and natural areas linkages</u> including walking paths along forested road rights-of-way.
WDFW	Land Use	Amend Policy 19.7: " <u>View preservation actions should be balanced with the <del>efforts requirement</del> to preserve the community's natural vegetation and tree cover along shorelines.</u>

**NEXT STEPS**

Making a recommendation to the City Council at the meeting on June 12 will conclude the PC review of the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. Before the end of the year, the PC will review and make a recommendation to the City Council on proposed amendments to the development code to implement the updated Comprehensive Plan.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

If commissioners would like to propose changes to the public hearing draft elements, please be prepared to make a motion. The motion should include at least: (1) the element name, (2) goal or policy number, and (3) the specific amendment proposed. To the extent possible, please provide the proposed amendment in writing by the end of the day on Monday, June 10, 2024, so other commissioners have the opportunity to review the proposed amendment.

Continue deliberations and consider the recommended motion provided in [PCB 24-13](#): "Motion to recommend adoption of the updated Comprehensive Plan as amended to the City Council."

# Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update Open House and Survey Summary

May 29, 2024

## Introduction

On May 1, 2024, the City of Mercer Island hosted an Open House to inform community members about the Draft Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update. The Open House briefed attendees on the requirement to undertake a periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan to ensure it was updated with current information and complied with changes in state law. It also outlined work that had been undertaken by the City since 2022 to review existing elements in the Comprehensive Plan and identify necessary amendments, as well as the addition of two new elements: the Economic Development Element and the Park and Open Space Element. Additionally, the event served as a venue to share information about significant revisions to the Housing Element arising from new requirements in 2023 from HB 1220, which amended the Growth Management Act (GMA) to require local governments to plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all income levels.

### Exhibit 1. Open House Welcome Board



The open house was held on Wednesday, May 1, 2024, from 6:00-8:00pm at the Mercer Island Community and Event Center. Thirty-two members of the community attended (See Appendix A). Additional attendees included City staff, members of the Mercer Island Planning Commission, and the City Council. After signing-in, attendees were provided with a handout with information on where to find additional information online, an invitation to take a survey related to the update, and a detailed timeline of work the City has undertaken and upcoming key dates related to the periodic review and update of the Comprehensive Plan (See Appendix B).

Attendees received a presentation from City staff that summarized updates, key information, and dates regarding the periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan (See Appendix C). After the staff presentation, community members were invited to circulate to different stations set up around the room with Display Boards highlighting information on key elements of the periodic update (See Appendix E), such as the board seen in Exhibit 2.

**Exhibit 2: Comprehensive Plan Overview**

**MERCER ISLAND 2044 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

## Growth Management & Comprehensive Plans

**Washington State Growth Management Act**  
*(first enacted in 1990)*

**PSRC's VISION 2050 Multicounty Planning Policies**  
*(King, Kitsap, Snohomish, & Thurston Counties)*

**2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies**  
*(King County & 39 cities)*

**Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan**  
*(First adopted in 1960, amended in 1995 to comply with GMA, last periodic update was in 2015)*

**Development Regulations & City Programs**

**Development / Construction**

**WHAT IS THE GMA?**

The GMA, or Growth Management Act, is a state law that outlines strategies for managing growth and directing development in counties and cities. For cities like Mercer Island, it mandates the creation of a Comprehensive Plan with a 20-year planning horizon. This plan must undergo review and potential revision every decade to ensure alignment with any updates to the GMA and to stay current with evolving needs and priorities.

The GMA requires that certain elements be addressed in every Comprehensive Plan. For Mercer Island, those elements are:

Land Use	Transportation	Parks and Recreation
Housing	Economic Development	Shorelines
Capital Facilities Plan	Utilities	Climate Change & Resiliency*

\*The Climate Change and Resiliency element was added in 2023 as a mandatory element, the deadline for Mercer Island to add a climate change is June 30, 2029.

**WHAT IS VISION 2050?**

Vision 2050 is the plan for growth, in the Puget Sound region. Adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), it serves as the blueprint for growth and transportation investments across the four-county region. This plan provides guidance for countywide planning policies and regional allocation of growth. With the region's population projected to reach 5.8 million people by 2050, Vision 2050 will direct infrastructure investments and concentrate growth accordingly.

**WHAT IS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN?**

A Comprehensive Plan is the centerpiece of local long-range planning, projecting ahead over a 20-year planning horizon. It contains a vision, goals, objectives, policies, and implementation actions to guide decision-making by elected officials and staff. The GMA emphasizes implementation, recognizing that achieving a plan's objectives requires regulatory and financial support, including zoning regulations, program initiatives, and both capital and non-capital spending. Development regulations and capital budget decisions must align with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**HOW MUCH WILL MERCER ISLAND GROW BY 2044?**

By 2044, Mercer Island is expected to have **1,239** new households and **1,300** new jobs than in 2019.

Source: BERK, 2024.

The presentation, display boards at each station, and additional Open House material are posted to the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update project page on the City's Let's Talk website. A link to the presentation can be accessed [here](#).

In conjunction with the Open House the City also opened a survey on May 1, 2024, to gather community member's insight on issues related to the Periodic Update of the Comprehensive Plan. The survey closed

on May 20, 2024, with eighty-seven respondents. A printout of the survey questions and responses can be found in [Appendix F](#).

Following this introduction, you will find a summary of the Open House, including observations on common themes noted from the written comments provided by attendees and responses to engagement activities. Additionally, a summary of the online survey responses and key findings is provided.

## Public Communication

The Open House event on May 1 was promoted through various print, emailed, and online methods. This included the Mercer Island Report, the online Community Planning and Development Weekly Bulletin, the Mercer Island Weekly E-newsletter, appropriate city calendars, official communication and through social media. See Exhibit 3.

The survey was promoted through the project webpage, social media, and the e-newsletter. These are in addition to the May 1, 2024, Open House promotions, some of which mentioned the survey's availability and included links to the project website where it was hosted. See Exhibit 4.

### Exhibit 3. Promotion Methods of the May 1 Open House

Medium	Date	Additional Notes
Let's Talk Mercer Island (Online)	March 29, 2024	Published on Project webpage
Planning Commission Calendar (Online)	April 1, 2024	First published on April 1
Mercer Island Reporter	April 17, 2024	Legal Notice of possible Planning Commission Quorum
Community Planning and Development Weekly Bulletin (Online)	April 15, 22, & 29, 2024	Notice of Open House and possible Planning Commission Quorum
Mercer Island Weekly E-Newsletter	April 17 & 24, 2024	(Emailed)
City Council Calendar (Online)	April 29, 2024	Notice of possible City Council quorum at the May 1, 2024 Open House
City Manager Communication	April 16, 2024	Report to City Council
City Social Media Posts	April 30, 2024	Posted on Facebook

### Exhibit 4. Promotion of the Survey

Medium	Date
Let's Talk Project webpage.	May 2, 2024
City Social Media Post (Facebook)	May 10, 2024
Mercer Island Weekly E-Newsletter	May 1, 2024

## Key Takeaways

The feedback gathered from the open house and online survey highlighted several key themes and priorities for the community, following are some takeaways from these community engagement efforts:

- 32 individuals attended the May 1, 2024, open house.
- 87 responses were received from the online survey available from May 1 to May 20, 2024.
- General agreement that Mercer Island is a good place to live.
- Concerns about changes resulting from new development and its impacts on livability.
- Support for a greater diversity of housing types on the island to allow more housing choice.
- High importance placed on the preservation of mature trees and landscaping.
- Support for improvements to safely and conveniently access transit options.
- Need for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
- High value placed on parks and open spaces.





# Open House Summary

## Informational Stations

Five of the seven information stations at the Open House highlighted different elements of the Comprehensive Plan and one provided background on the GMA and the city’s current Comprehensive Plan. See Appendix E to view all sixteen boards on display at the Open House. Stations focused on elements featured display boards depicting the elements’ goals, policies, and general information for community review. Staff members from various City departments managed the stations to help attendees understand the proposed changes to each element and answer any questions.

Attendees could engage with City staff at each station. At the Housing Element and Economic Development Element stations, attendees were also given the opportunity to share their ideas and preferences on display boards, by placing post-it notes and colored dots. Staff encouraged attendees to share their input through the online Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Survey, which opened on May 1, 2024. Additionally, attendees could leave anonymous written comments in the comment box (Appendix D).

## GMA & Comprehensive Plan Information Station 1

After signing in to the Open House, people entered the room where the event was held and came upon the first informational station with two display boards explaining the Comprehensive Plan process and the state and regional laws that affect it, including an introduction to the GMA. Another display board included a timeline showing important dates over the past two years since the City initiated the periodic review and update of the Comprehensive Plan, including past City Council presentation, planning commission meetings, and community workshops. See Exhibit 5. The timeline noted upcoming dates and opportunities when the public could participate to share input regarding the update of the Comprehensive Plan. Larger images of the following three display boards can be found in Appendix E.

### Display Boards

Exhibit 5. Display Boards at First Informational Station

**MERCER ISLAND 2044 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**  
Growth Management & Comprehensive Plans

**Washington State Growth Management Act** (first enacted in 1989)

**PIRC's VISION 2050 Multi-county Planning Policies** (King, Kitsap, Snohomish, & Whatcom Counties)

**2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies** (King County & SR 520)

**Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan** (first adopted in 1986, amended in 1998 by complying with GMA, last periodic update was in 2012)

**Development Regulations & City Programs**

**Development / Construction**

**HOW MUCH WILL MERCER ISLAND GROW BY 2044?**  
By 2044, Mercer Island is expected to have 1239 new households and 1,330 new jobs (in 2019).

**WHAT IS THE GMA?**  
The GMA, or Growth Management Act, is a state law that outlines strategies for managing growth and directing development in counties and cities. For cities like Mercer Island, it mandates the creation of a Comprehensive Plan with a 20-year planning horizon. The plan must undergo review and possible updates every decade to ensure alignment with any updates to the GMA and to stay current with existing needs and priorities.

The GMA requires that certain elements be addressed in every Comprehensive Plan. For Mercer Island, these elements are:  
 Land Use Planning  
 Transportation  
 Parks and Recreation  
 Housing  
 Economic Development  
 Stormwater  
 Capital Facilities Plan  
 Utilities  
 Climate Change & Resiliency

**WHAT IS VISION 2050?**  
Vision 2050 sets the plan for growth in the Puget Sound region, adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), a unit of the Puget Sound Growth and Climate Change Commission. It provides guidance to regional planning policies and regional allocation of growth. With the region's population projected to reach 18 million people by 2050, Vision 2050 will direct infrastructure investments and concentrate growth accordingly.

**WHAT IS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN?**  
A Comprehensive Plan is the cornerstone of local long-range planning, providing a clear vision for the future of the community. It sets the stage for growth and development, providing a framework for decision-making by elected officials and staff. The GMA emphasizes implementation, monitoring and updating a plan to reflect the region's changing needs and priorities. Development regulations, program initiatives, and both local and non-regional funding, including grants, regulations, program initiatives, and both local and non-regional funding, Development regulations and capital budget decisions must align with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**MERCER ISLAND 2044 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**  
The Comprehensive Plan

**MERCER ISLAND'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TODAY**  
The plan, or Growth Management Act, is a state law that outlines strategies for managing growth and directing development in counties and cities. For cities like Mercer Island, it mandates the creation of a Comprehensive Plan with a 20-year planning horizon. The plan must undergo review and possible updates every decade to ensure alignment with any updates to the GMA and to stay current with existing needs and priorities.

The GMA requires that certain elements be addressed in every Comprehensive Plan. For Mercer Island, these elements are:  
 Land Use  
 Transportation  
 Utilities  
 Parks and Recreation  
 Economic Development  
 Stormwater  
 Capital Facilities

**WHAT'S NEW?**  
Washington State, the region, and Mercer Island are constantly changing and evolving, influenced by natural influences and human activity. To make the City's Comprehensive Plan more flexible and adaptable to these changes, the City's Comprehensive Plan requires regular review and amendments to meet new data needs. With regional growth and development and with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and also with the community's vision.


Major issues to be reviewed periodically include:  
 Economic Development  
 Housing  
 Land Use  
 Transportation  
 Utilities  
 Parks and Recreation  
 Stormwater  
 Capital Facilities

**WHAT'S NEW?**  
Washington State, the region, and Mercer Island are constantly changing and evolving, influenced by natural influences and human activity. To make the City's Comprehensive Plan more flexible and adaptable to these changes, the City's Comprehensive Plan requires regular review and amendments to meet new data needs. With regional growth and development and with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and also with the community's vision.

Major issues to be reviewed periodically include:  
 Economic Development  
 Housing  
 Land Use  
 Transportation  
 Utilities  
 Parks and Recreation  
 Stormwater  
 Capital Facilities

**WHAT'S NEW?**  
Washington State, the region, and Mercer Island are constantly changing and evolving, influenced by natural influences and human activity. To make the City's Comprehensive Plan more flexible and adaptable to these changes, the City's Comprehensive Plan requires regular review and amendments to meet new data needs. With regional growth and development and with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and also with the community's vision.

Major issues to be reviewed periodically include:  
 Economic Development  
 Housing  
 Land Use  
 Transportation  
 Utilities  
 Parks and Recreation  
 Stormwater  
 Capital Facilities



## Land Use and Shoreline Elements Information Station 2

The Land Use Element and Shoreline Element information were combined at one information station. See Exhibit 6 and Exhibit 7. Larger images of the two boards displayed at this station can be found in Appendix E.

The Land Use Element display board highlighted new and updated land use goals focused on development outside of the Town Center. Key proposed amendments aim to better align with the: land use objectives in the city’s adopted Climate Action Plan, proposed amendments to the Housing Element and the New Park and Open Space Element. A proposed new goal addresses reducing community-wide greenhouse gas emission.

No changes are proposed to the existing Shoreline Element. The related display board showed a map of the island’s shoreline environments and listed the Shoreline Master Program Goals, which have remained unchanged since the last periodic update in 2015.

**Exhibit 6. Snippet from the Land Use Element Board**

**Interconnected**

The Land Use Map is interconnected with other elements in the Comprehensive Plan. Changes to land use affects those elements, including:

Transportation

Public Services

Parks & Open Space

**COMING SOON**

The Land Use Map will see some minor changes and updates to align with the new Parks and Open Space Element.

**Mercer Island Land Use Plan**

The Land Use Plan is intended to be a general depiction of land uses. The map is not a description of zoning boundaries nor should it be interpreted on a site specific basis.

**Legend**


- Commercial Office
- Linear Park (I-90)
- Multi-Family
- Neighborhood Business
- Open Space
- Park
- Public Facility
- Single Family
- Town Center

The Mercer Island City limits delineate the designated Urban Growth Area. The City limits are contiguous with the Mercer Island Lake Washington Shoreline.

0 0.25 0.5 1 Miles  
City No. 21-28 Issues 4

Display Boards

**Exhibit 7. Land Use Element and Shoreline Master Program Display Boards**



**Housing Element Information Station 3**

The Housing Element information station had four display boards describing the purpose of the Housing element, explaining why it had been rewritten to address changes in state and regional regulations since the last periodic update, highlighting new requirements of local jurisdictions to accommodate housing that is affordable to all income levels. See Exhibit 8 and Exhibit 9

Larger images of the five boards displayed at this station can be found in Appendix E.

**Exhibit 8. A snippet from a Housing Display Board**

**What's New?**

- Element completely rewritten due to Washington State HB 1110 and HB 1220
- By 2044, an expected growth of **1,239 households**.
- Existing land capacity: **1,429 additional housing units**.



Display Boards

Exhibit 9. Housing Display Boards

### Housing Element

**PURPOSE**

- Provide the policy approach the City will take to manage projected growth and accommodate its housing needs.

**WHY WAS IT REBUILT?**

Changes in state laws related to housing have resulted in restructuring this element to a single title.

- Comply with HB 1220. Requires cities to allow moderate density housing units on a single lot.
- Comply with HB 1220. Requires cities to plan and accommodate housing that is affordable to all income levels. This includes:
  - Planning for sufficient land capacity for all economic segments,
  - Allowing for moderate density housing, and
  - Identifying racially disparate impacts (RDI), taking measures to address these impacts, and reduce the risk of displacement.

**KEY GOALS**

- Overall: NEW. Stimulate housing affordable for all income levels.
- Affordable Housing: NEW. Allocation of all income levels can afford to live in Mercer Island because of the housing mix.
- Racially Disparate Impacts (RDI): NEW. Undo identified RDI, avoid displacement, and eliminate disparities in housing.
- Area Displacement: NEW. Reduce and mitigate displacement risk as regulations change and development occurs.
- Residential Regulation: Balance regulations that safeguard public health, safety and welfare.
- Implementation: Implement the Housing Element in a timely & efficient manner.

**WHAT'S NEW?**

- Directing competing revision due to Washington State HB 120 and HB 1220.
- By 2044, an expected growth of 1,239 households.
- Adding land capacity 1,429 additional housing units.

### Housing Element Changes: HB 1220

**What is HB 1220?**

HB 1220 amended the Growth Management Act to require local governments to "plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all income levels."

To comply, Mercer Island must make the following updates:

- Plan for sufficient land capacity to address the housing needs of all economic segments in the community.
  - Identifying housing types and areas in the City with capacity to accommodate housing units at each affordability level.
- Incorporate provisions for moderate-density housing types, (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes).
- Adopt policies, identify programs, and implement strategies to support and enable the production of housing units to accommodate projected housing needs for all economic segments as allocated by income segments by King County to Mercer Island consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) VISION 2035 and the CMA.
- Identify racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing policies and regulations and take steps to undo any impacts and identify areas at higher risk of displacement and include anti-displacement policies.

**How is Mercer Island's housing growth target determined?**

King County developed Countywide Planning Policies (CPP), a shared framework for how to manage regional growth and its adopted growth targets for the region.

King County allocated these growth targets to each jurisdiction and directs each jurisdiction to address affordable housing needs and the condition of its existing housing supply.

Established by the King County CPPs, each jurisdiction must plan for and accommodate its allocated share of countywide future housing for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households.

### Housing Element Changes: HB 1220

**WHAT IS HB 1220?**

- "Plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all income levels."
- Plan for sufficient land capacity to address the housing needs of all economic segments in the community.
- Incorporate provisions for moderate-density housing types.
- Adopt policies, identify programs, and implement strategies to support and enable the production of housing units to accommodate projected housing needs for all economic segments as allocated by income segments by King County to Mercer Island consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) VISION 2035 and the CMA.
- Identify racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing policies and regulations.

**CITY'S PERMANENT HOUSING NEW NET NEED 2019-2044**

**KEY FINDINGS FROM THE CITY'S RACIALLY DISPARATE IMPACTS EVALUATION**

- Residents have a 20 percent higher cost burden than nonresidents, regardless of race.
- Households of color are 8 percent more likely to face housing cost burdens compared to White households.
- Black or African American households in Mercer Island are experiencing severe housing cost burden at more than double the rate of any other racial group.

### Housing Types & Needs

**1,239 new homes** are required to reach Mercer Island's housing growth target from 2019 to 2044.

**HOUSING NEED DISTRIBUTION BY INCOME GROUP**

Income Group	2019	2044	Net Need
Very High	1,000	1,000	0
High	1,000	1,000	0
Upper Middle	1,000	1,000	0
Lower Middle	1,000	1,000	0
Working	1,000	1,000	0
Low	1,000	1,000	0
Very Low	1,000	1,000	0
Extremely Low	1,000	1,000	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,239</b>	<b>1,239</b>	<b>0</b>

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY**

- 25% of the 2019 households in Mercer Island are within cost burdens (30% or severely cost burdened (40%)).
- Households are generally considered cost burdened if housing expenses, including utilities, cost more than 30% of their income. Severe cost burdens is when households' housing costs are greater than 40% of their income.
- Severe cost burdens are higher than 50% of their income. Severe cost burdens occur for both very low and very high-income households.
- Mercer Island has 102 units that were restricted units available.

**HOUSING SUPPLY**

- All new housing in Mercer Island's housing stock are detached single family units.
- Heavy built, older city's homes have 4+ bedrooms.
- Most of Mercer Island's homes are 40- to 50-year old.

**HOUSING MARKET TRENDS AND CONDITIONS**

- Home prices are near the highest in the region.
- The average sale price of condominiums and townhouses is affordable to households earning 70 percent of the area median income.
- Quality of housing units in Mercer Island are valued to be less than \$200,000.
- Growth in home value outpaced growth in income.
- The average quality rent is affordable to households earning around 70% of the AMI.

**WHAT IS AFFORDABLE HOUSING?**

- House Plans: 30% of a household's gross income must be used to pay for housing costs including utilities.

### Housing Types

**Directions**

- Green: What kind of housing does the city want? (Plan's goal)
- Red: What kind of housing should the city restrict? (Plan's goal)
- Blue: Use only when to make comments.


**Other Housing Types**

Please study notes below.

*Engagement Activity*

At the Housing Element information station attendees were provided information on the City’s housing target for the next 20 years and the need for additional multifamily development as well as a better mix of housing types other than multifamily and detached single unit homes. Attendees had the opportunity to share their opinions and preference on different housing types by placing a **green dot** on the type of housing they currently reside in and **orange dots** on housing types they might want or consider living in sometime in the future (participants could place more than one orange dot). See Exhibit 10.

**Exhibit 10. Engagement Activity - Housing Element Display Board**



Key Observations:

- Eight participants indicated that they currently live in a detached single-family home, two live in townhomes, and one in a condominium.
- Participants were open to considering a range of middle housing types as home in the future as follows:
  - A detached single-family home – 7 participants
  - A single-family home with an accessory dwelling unit – 2 participants
  - A unit in a Triplex – 4 participants
  - A unit in a Fourplex – 1 participant
  - A cottage home – 5 participants
  - A townhouse – 6 participants
  - A unit in a courtyard apartment (2-3 story building) - 4 participants
  - A unit in a staked flat apartment (2-3 story building) – 3 participants
  - A unit in a condominium building – 4 participants
  - A detached accessory dwelling unit associated with a single-family home – 2 participants

Participants were also asked to indicate on a sticky note placed on the activity board if there were other housing types not shown they would consider as a home in the future. Two sticky notes were placed on the board stating the following:

*“I would like to do courtyard condos, not apartments. In other words, I want to be able to own, not rent.”*

*“Triplex, fourplex, and five-sixplex all are equally great”*

*“Increase building height in Town Center to increase population, provide lower income housing and increase customer base for retail businesses”*

## Transportation Element Information Station 4

The Transportation Element station display board included the existing goals and information on the purpose of the Transportation Element and its relationship with elements of the Comprehensive Plan with a focus on planning for all modes of transportation to support the City’s housing and job growth targets. Participants were encouraged to view the City’s 2024-2029 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), updated annually, and provides feedback and comments. A QR with a link to the website where the TIP could be reviewed was provided on the display board. See Exhibit 11. A larger image of the board displayed at this station can be found in Appendix E.

### Display Board

**Exhibit 11. Transportation Display Board**

Transportation

**THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**

- Ensures that planning for all modes of transportation in the City aligns with the broader, long-term goals and policies of the other elements with a focus on accommodating housing and job growth permitted in the Land Use Element.
- Deflects concurrency, a requirement that transportation facilities are consistent and adequate enough to serve new development based on level-of-service (LOS) standards for performance. As the City grows, the transportation facilities keep pace with changes in demand.
- Goals and policies include:
  - Land Use Assumptions for estimating travel patterns
  - Traffic Impacts for assessing traffic effects on I-90
  - Facilities and Services needs
  - Financial Plan
  - Intergovernmental Coordination efforts
  - Demand Management Strategies
  - Nonmotorized transportation components

**GOALS**

- T-1. Encourage the most efficient use of the transportation system through effective management of transportation demand and the transportation system.
- T-2. Receive the maximum value and utility from the City’s investments in the transportation system.
- T-3. Minimize negative transportation impacts on the environment.
- T-4. Provide transportation choices for travelers through the provision of a complete range of transportation facilities, and services.
- T-5. Comply with local, regional, state and federal requirements
- T-6. Ensure coordination between transportation and land use decisions and development.
- T-7. Provide a safe, convenient, and reliable transportation system for Mercer Island.
- T-8. Preserve adequate levels of accessibility between Mercer Island and the rest of the region.
- T-9. Balance the maintenance of quality Island neighborhoods with the needs of the Island’s transportation system.
- T-10. Maintain acceptable levels of service for transportation facilities and services on Mercer Island.
- T-11. Ensure parking standards support the land use policies in the Comprehensive Plan.
- T-12. Promote bicycle and pedestrian networks that safely access and link commercial areas, residential areas, schools, and parks in the City

**UPCOMING PROJECTS**

Check out the City’s 2024-2029 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for upcoming transportation upgrades and improvements. Updated annually, it covers city roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation projects.


Provide your feedback and comments through June 4.

## Utilities Element & Capital Facilities Element Information Station 5

The Utilities Element and Capital Facilities Element’s information were combined on one display board at this information station. The display board described the purpose of each element, listed the services and facilities addressed in each element, and indicated that each element would have information updated on current services, level of service, and financial assumptions to support the City’s 20-year growth forecast. See Exhibit 12. A larger image of the board displayed at this station can be found in Appendix E.

### Display Board

#### Exhibit 12. Utilities and Capital Facilities Display Board



## Utilities and Capital Facilities

**UTILITIES:** describes the general location, capacity, and provider of existing & proposed utilities.




**CAPITAL FACILITIES:** catalogs current public facilities. The element includes strategies for capital planning, financing, and revenue sources to support growth.

**BOTH ELEMENTS:**


- Assess capacity to meet the current and future needs based on planned growth out to 2044.
- Discuss existing “level of service” standards, and the investment needed to achieve or maintain them.

**WHAT'S NEW?**

- Updated information on current services provided, level of service, and financial assumptions to support the 20-year growth forecast
- Signed a 20-year contract in 2020 with Puget Sound Energy for carbon-free wind power to operate all City government operations.
- Adopted the PROS (Parks, Recreation and Open Space) plan in 2022

**CAPITAL FACILITIES BUDGET FORECAST**



■	Utilities
■	Streets, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Facilities
■	Buildings, Equipment, and Technology
■	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Includes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks &amp; Open Space</li> <li>• Public Buildings</li> <li>• Public Schools</li> <li>• Telecommunications</li> <li>• Public Streets &amp; Roads</li> <li>• Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water</li> <li>• Sewer</li> <li>• Solid Waste</li> <li>• Electricity</li> <li>• Natural Gas</li> <li>• Stormwater</li> </ul>
---	---

## Economic Development Element Informational Station 6

As part of the City’s Comprehensive Plan periodic review process the City Council directed City staff to include a new Economic Development Element as part of the periodic update. The Economic Development Element station display board included the new element’s purpose and information on how it was developed and its proposed goals. See Exhibit 13.

### Display Board

**Exhibit 13. Economic Development Display Board**

**MERCER ISLAND 2044 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

# Economic Development

**Directions**

Place **green dots** on the goal you think should be top priorities.

Use **sticky notes** to write comments.

**THE \*NEW\* ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT:**

- Articulates the City’s strategy through 2044 for fostering and enhancing the local economy
- Sets goals and policy direction aimed at leveraging the city strengths, capitalizing on opportunities, and building resilience in the local economy to overcome challenges.

The Draft Element was prepared by the Economic Development Work Group (EDWG), comprising two Planning Commissioners and three City Councilmembers.

The EDWG convened eleven times between June 2022 and June 2023 to develop the draft element, ultimately making a recommendation on the draft element and implementation plan on June 8, 2023.

**WHAT GOALS SHOULD THE CITY FOCUS ITS EFFORTS ON FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS?**

<b>SUPPORTING &amp; IMPROVING THE BUSINESS ECOSYSTEM</b>	<p>The City of Mercer Island actively fosters a healthy business ecosystem.</p> <p>Mercer Island’s healthy business ecosystem attracts entrepreneurs, businesses, and investment.</p> <p>Existing businesses thrive as the cornerstone of Mercer Island’s business ecosystem.</p> <p>The business ecosystem on Mercer Island is sustainable in that it meets the social, environmental, and economic needs of residents now and in the future.</p>
<b>REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENTS</b>	<p>The City actively reduces the regulatory burden created by commercial development regulations and permitting processes to support a healthy business ecosystem, entrepreneurs, and innovation in business.</p>
<b>BUSINESS ATTRACTION</b>	<p>The Mercer Island business ecosystem includes a diversity of goods and services enjoyed by residents and visitors.</p> <p>The commercial areas in Mercer Island, and especially the Town Center, are lively, vibrant gathering places for the community and visitors.</p>
<b>CUSTOMER ATTRACTION</b>	<p>Commercial areas are attractive and inviting to the Mercer Island community and visitors.</p> <p>Public space in Town Center is plentiful, providing residents and visitors places to gather, celebrate, and socialize.</p> <p>Mercer Island residents and visitors can safely access commercial areas.</p>

### Engagement Activity

Attendees had the opportunity to share their opinions and preference on which of the proposed goals listed on the draft display board should be the City’s top priority to focus on in the next five years by placing a **green dot** one or more of the four categories the goals are broadly organized under (participants could place more than one orange dot).




*Key Observations:*

There seems to be no one area where the City should focus its economic development efforts in the next 5 years. Participants placement of green dots highlighted a balanced interest in all four areas with “Customer Attraction” having the fewest green dots. The total number of green dots were placed on the following preferred focus areas related to economic development in the City:

- Focus efforts on supporting and Improving the Business Ecosystem – 8 votes  
●●●●●●●●
- Focus efforts on Regulatory Environment Improvements – 7 votes  
●●●●●●●
- Focus efforts on Business Attraction – 8 votes  
●●●●●●●●
- Focus efforts on Customer Attraction – 5 votes  
●●●●●

**Exhibit 14. Economic Development Engagement Activity**



Participants were also invited to write any comments they had related to the new Economic Development Element on a sticky note and place it on the activity board. See Exhibit 14. Ten sticky notes were placed on the board stating the following:

“Coworking spaces”

“We need to bring fiber internet onto the island – then we get more tech businesses here”

“Restaurants”

“A mini “University village” feel by the Town Center”

*“Improve the business environment with less density and better ground floor retail requirements”*

*“Consider controlling allowable locations for banks so that they don’t occupy prime corner retail locations”*

*“All of these are excellent goals to include”*

*“We don’t want more multifamily. Businesses are supposed to be in the core of Town Center which it says on the design commission website so why did they not adhere to the ...”*

*“Big building? Have wiped out small businesses. See earlier study*

*on impact of big buildings on MI Development”*

*“Rents are too high for both renters and retailers. How do you expect people to be able to afford to dine out in the Town Center when the rents are too high?”*

*“Page 4, line 14-20: The Planning Commission received public comment verbally by Traci Grend [? full last name illegible] adding more specific info regarding the South End Commercial Area that may be worth adding”*

*“Thinking Bainbridge Island, Marin County, Santa Barbra”*

## Parks and Open Space Element Station 7

The Park and Open Space Element is the second new element proposed to be included as part of this Periodic Update of the Comprehensive Plan. The Park and Open Space display board was still being drafted but was expected to provide policy direction to establish an Open Space zone and Park zone. The board included a map from the 2022 Park, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS) of all existing parks and Open spaces, the new element will adopt the most recent version of the PROS Plan by reference., Notice that interested participants could provide feedback on the proposed Open Space zone at a future Planning Commission meeting. See Exhibit 15.

Display Board

**Exhibit 15. Parks and Open Space Display Board**

## Comment Box

Attendees were able to leave anonymous remarks in writing and place them in a box provided at the meeting to collect comments. Overall, 25 comments were placed in the comment box. The comments were wide ranging and included thoughts on housing density, tree canopy, neighborhood characters, and other topics. To see images of all comments received, refer to Appendix D.

Comments submitted are transcribed below:

- For help setting the stage so people understand what AMI %s really mean, maybe we can call some of the multi-family “Teacher Housing”.
- You are not aware of toxic herbicides please do something thank you.
- We should get fiber internet for the entire island, not just the middle and high school.
- One submission with several bullets:
  - Allow multifamily housing in more areas of the City
  - Please don’t place all multifamily housing directly adjacent to the highway.
  - Consider at least 5 to 6 stories for multifamily housing, up to 8 stories would be ideal to allow affordability.
  - Ensure mixed-use zoning near new affordable housing for access to amenities.

- Upzone more areas near transit. Especially ½ mile radius near light rail station.
- One submission with several bullets:
  - Kill the off-island PC idea!
  - Hed as part of the growth targets while 1220 is the pacing item, we still need to plan for the end of single family zoning.
  - Island Crest “missing link” is a TIP priority
  - I'd like to see pockets of multi-family to include townhouses and duplexes in the single family zones where it makes sense.
- What type of data will inform your decision on the Island Crest corridor between Island Park and 68<sup>th</sup>?
- Put flashing pedestrian lights on 84<sup>th</sup> & 71<sup>st</sup> street by IMS. Signs are hard to see and kids use this corridor to walk to school.
- Do not put gravel next to bike paths. Cyclists will ride in the center of the path to avoid it and avoiding slipping on the gravel.
- Is there some economically feasible way to use stormwater runoff to water beach areas (grass) at Groveland Park. - Need reservoir and pipes.
- We need fiber internet on the Island. We should add piping + potential conduit every time we replace utility pipes going forward.
- Increase public charging stations!
- Bike Lanes – They aren't used on the Mercers because materials that cause flats and accidents are in them. - Bike lanes on 84<sup>th</sup> are never used. People (Adults) ride in street. Youth drive on sidewalks. This is a waste of funds.
- Commercial Office Zone – The City lacks the infrastructure needed (broadband) to attract companies to Mercer Island.
- By alerting the community of counting you can skew the results. What is your control group reason for communication was to reduce calls. How many calls do you receive?
- Do not remove trees on the west side of ICW between Island Park Elementary and 68<sup>th</sup>. These provide a barrier between cars and pedestrians.
- Something has to be done to stop all the mature trees from being cut down for development and there should not be allowed a fee-in-lieu for being allowed to remove trees and the penalty + fees need to be in the 1000s no 100s.
- Nine signed copies of a form letter were submitted that states:

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat,

and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as a part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

## Key Observations

Comments were wide ranging, from the 25 submissions placed in the Comment Box at the Open House, which had a total of 38 signed-in attendees. Several key observations were noted that highlight the attendees' priorities and concerns, providing insights to City officials and staff in their decision-making process.

### Housing & Zoning

- **Support for Multifamily Housing:** Some comments expressed interest in and the need for more multifamily housing options and increased density, near the new light rail station and bus interchange but also diversification within single family zones.

Several comments emphasized the need for diversification of multifamily housing options throughout the island, including suggesting increasing the density, particularly near transit and amenities, allowing multifamily housing in single family neighborhoods, not locating all new multifamily next to the I-90, to consider taller multifamily buildings in some areas (5-8 stories), and ensuring mixed use zoning.

- **Preservation of Single-Family Zones:** Some commentators strongly advocate for maintaining what they describe as the rural character of the existing single-family zones, emphasizing retaining the existing zoning will provide environment protection such as tree preservation and keeping existing single-family neighborhood character.

The form letter signed by 9 individuals expressed strong sentiments about the importance of preserving existing regulations and maintaining a rural character of single-family zones keeping minimum lot sizes, height limits, as well as the retention of mature trees.

### Public Amenities & Infrastructure

- **Broadband and Internet Access:** There is a call for improved internet infrastructure, including extending fiber internet access throughout the city.

Several comments highlighted the need for better internet infrastructure in the City, including fiber internet for the entire island, not just schools. The lack of high-speed internet may deter businesses from locating there.

- **Public Amenities:** There was one request for more electric vehicle charging stations and several that touched on the need for bike lane improvements and pedestrian safety.

### Environmental Concerns

- **Tree Preservation:** High level of importance placed on protecting mature trees to maintain the existing character of the island.

Several comments mentioned the importance of protecting mature trees and landscaping for both the environmental benefits as well as maintaining the island's existing character. Suggestions included imposing higher penalties and fees for tree removal and to prevent development related removal of mature trees and landscaping.

- **Sustainable Practices:** Community support for sustainable environmental practices.

One comment asked for the City to explore economically feasible ways to use stormwater runoff for watering park areas. One comment urged the City to be aware of and stop the use of toxic herbicides.

### **Multimodal Transportation**

- **Nonmotorized Travel safety:** Interest in improved safety measures to benefit pedestrians and bicyclists.

Several comments focused on improvements needed for safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, most focused on the Island Crest corridor. Suggestions included installing flashing pedestrian lights, not placing gravel on the shoulders of bike paths and addressing maintenance issues in bike lanes to prevent accidents.

- **Public Transit and Infrastructure** Some comments addressed the importance of improving infrastructure to support public transit and ensure it aligns with the location of future growth.

### **Community Outreach**

- **Community Participation and Communication:** Desire to better understand decision making processes. Some comments appeared to focus on data collection and decision-making processes relating to bike lane improvements on Island Crest Way Corridor related projects.

# Survey

The City of Mercer Island conducted an online survey to assess the community’s insight on issues related to the Periodic Update of the Comprehensive Plan. The survey was available from May 1 to May 20 on the City’s online public engagement platform [Let’s Talk Mercer Island](#) and gathered responses from 87 participants. Survey questions invited opinions about housing affordability, city investment priorities, and transportation planning.

This summary provides brief descriptions of the results for the survey’s eighteen questions, including bar charts with the number of responses received (N= #) for each question, as some questions were optional. For a comprehensive view of all survey responses, refer to Appendix F which includes more details.

## Survey Participant Demographics


Respondents were mostly older, nearly all residents of Mercer Island, wealthier, and most respondents own their homes.

## Survey Reponses Summary

*Question 1. What best describes your relationship with Mercer Island? Use all that apply.*

The majority of respondents, approximately 83%, live on Mercer Island. See Exhibit 16.

**Exhibit 16: Respondents’ Relationship with Mercer Island (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

Question 2. What best describes your current living situation? Select the best fit.

92% of survey respondents own a home in Mercer Island. See Exhibit 17.

**Exhibit 17: Respondents' Current Living Situation (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

Question 3. How long have you lived in Mercer Island?

Approximately 51% of the respondents have lived in Mercer Island for over 20 years. However, 29% of the respondents have lived in Mercer Island for 10 years or less. See Exhibit 18.

**Exhibit 18: Respondents' Length of Time Living in Mercer Island (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.



*Question 4. What part of Mercer Island do you spend the most time in?*

The largest portion of survey respondents, approximately 44%, frequently access the north end of Mercer Island. However, 39% of respondents frequently access the mid-island, located between SE 40<sup>th</sup> and SE 68<sup>th</sup> Street. See Exhibit 19.

**Exhibit 19: Respondents' Most Frequented Part of the Island (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 5. What is your age?*

The age distribution of respondents skews older. 71% of respondents are age 45 or older, with 22% of respondents 65 years of age or older. Based on [census data](#), the survey's distribution is comparable to the overall Mercer Island age distribution. See Exhibit 20.

**Exhibit 20: Respondents' Age (N=81)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 6. Which of the following best describes your household income last year?*

The respondents' household income skews wealthier, with approximately two-thirds of respondents earning \$200,000 or more a year. 48.3% of [census](#) respondents report household income over \$200,000. For the survey respondents, 43% report income within that same bracket. 30% of total respondents earn \$400,000 or more. Approximately 11% of respondents earn less than \$90,000 a year. However, some respondents chose to skip this question. See Exhibit 21.

**Exhibit 21: Respondents' Income (N=86)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 7. What do you love most about Mercer Island? Pick your top three.*

Among the 8 options, 28% of respondents love Mercer Island due to its safety. 24% of respondents also value its central location and 19% of respondents value the City's sense of community, as well as its parks and recreation opportunities. Several respondents also mentioned the good schools, while a couple of respondents also mentioned the quiet neighborhood character. See Exhibit 22.

**Exhibit 22: Mercer Island Most Loved Aspects (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

Question 8. Mercer Island strives to be Puget Sound's most livable residential community. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements

**Mercer Island is a good place for my household to live**

Respondents consider Mercer Island to be a good place to live, with more than three-fourths of the respondents definitely agreeing with this statement. See Exhibit 23.

**Exhibit 23: Results to "Mercer Island is a good place for my household to live" (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**I have housing that meets my needs.**

88% of respondents have housing that meets their needs. Only 8% of respondents do not have housing that meets their needs. See Exhibit 24.

**Exhibit 24: Results to "I have housing that meets my needs" (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

***I have housing that is comfortable for me to live in long term.***

83% of respondents have housing that is comfortable for them in the long term. However, 14% of respondents do not have housing that is comfortable in the long term for them. See Exhibit 25.

**Exhibit 25: Results to “I have housing that is comfortable for me to live in long term” (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

***I can access services for daily life, such as grocery stores, banks, and pharmacies.***

The vast majority of respondents (93%) can access the necessary services in the City. See Exhibit 26.

**Exhibit 26: Results to “I can access services for daily life, such as grocery stores, banks, and pharmacies” (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

***I have access to open space, parks, and outdoor environments***

Respondents overwhelmingly have access to open space, parks, and the outdoor environment, with 94% in definite agreement regarding access to these spaces. See Exhibit 27.

**Exhibit 27: Responding to “I have access to open space, parks, and outdoor environments.” (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

***I can safely walk around my neighborhood.***

95% of respondents feel safe walking around their neighborhoods, with 86% of all respondents definitely agreeing with feeling safe. See Exhibit 28.

**Exhibit 28: Responding to “I can safely walk around my neighborhood” (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

***I can safely bike through my community.***

71% of respondents can safely bike through the community, with 40% of total respondents definitely agreeing with the statement. However, 12% of respondents do not feel like they can safely bike through the community. See Exhibit 29.

**Exhibit 29: Responding to “I can safely bike through my community” (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

***If I have a problem, I know where to go for assistance.***

72% of respondents are aware of where they can go for help if there is a problem. See Exhibit 30.

**Exhibit 30: Responding to “If I have a problem, I know where to go for assistance.” (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 9. I plan to stay in my current Mercer Island home for*

Survey respondents plan to stay in their current homes for many years. 74% of respondents plan to stay in their homes for longer than five years, while 22% of total respondents plan to stay for more than 20 years. However, there are some respondents who are unsure about how long they plan to stay in their current home, with 13% of respondents feeling unsure. See Exhibit 31.

**Exhibit 31: Respondents’ Plans to Stay in Their Current Mercer Island Home (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 10. Do you foresee a time when you may need to sell your home or move out of your home and leave Mercer Island due to one or more of the following reasons? Choose all that apply.*

30% of respondents did not see a reason for why they would sell their current home. For those that did identify a reason, 17% of respondents referenced limited available housing, 16% of respondents referenced the high cost of owning a home, and 14% of respondents referenced incompatible housing size or layout. See Exhibit 32.

12 respondents did respond with “Other” Of these respondents, three respondents expressed concern about the quality of the education and public safety. Two respondents also noted an increased need for assisted living, and two respondents mentioned restrictive building codes.

**Exhibit 32: Respondents' Reasons for Why They May Need to Sell Current House (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

Question 11. Within the next 20 years, what type(s) of housing could you see your household living in? Select up to three options.

29% of respondents see themselves and their households living in a single-family home, while 19.5% see themselves similarly living in a single-family home that allows for aging in place. Senior housing was also a popular option, with 12% of respondents seeing this as a future housing type. See Exhibit 33.

**Exhibit 33: Future Housing Types Respondents Could Live in (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.




Question 12. As you anticipate your housing needs and how they may change over the next 20 years, please indicate the importance of the City addressing each of the following housing issues.

**Availability of different types of housing to purchase:** Single family detached house, townhouse, apartment/condominiums to purchase within my price range

Survey respondents were divided about the availability of a variety of housing types available for purchase. 45% of respondents find it important or very important to have different types of housing available for purchase within their price range. Meanwhile, 39% of respondents do not find this housing issue to be important. See Exhibit 34.

**Exhibit 34: Importance of the Availability of Different Housing Types (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Availability of rental housing:** Different types of homes such as single family house, apartment/condominiums to rent within my price range

The availability of rental housing is a less-important housing issue among survey respondents. Approximately 51% of respondents did not think the availability of rental housing is important, with 29% of the total respondents considering it very unimportant. Meanwhile, only 22% of respondents considered it important or very important. See Exhibit 35.

**Exhibit 35: Importance of the Availability of Rental Housing (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Proximity to Essential Amenities:** Housing options within walking distance to the light rail station, bus stops, work, shopping, restaurants, schools

The majority of respondents (60%) believe it is important or very important for housing options to be located near essential amenities. See Exhibit 36.

**Exhibit 36: Importance of Housing Options in Proximity to Essential Amenities (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Housing Options in Commercial Areas:** *Housing in mixed-use areas with shopping or restaurants*

Nearly half (49%) of respondents consider it important or very important for housing options to be in commercial areas. Only 30% of respondents do not consider it important. See Exhibit 37.

**Exhibit 37: Importance of Housing Options in Mixed-use Commercial Areas (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Right-sized Housing for Smaller Households:** *Availability of a range of housing options that are right-sized for smaller households*

The importance of housing for smaller households is somewhat divided among respondents. 48% of respondents consider it important or very important to have a range of housing options for smaller households, while 37% of respondents consider it unimportant or very unimportant. See Exhibit 38.

**Exhibit 38: Importance of Right-Sized Housing for Smaller Households (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Right-sized Housing for Larger or Growing Households:** Availability of a range of housing options that are right-sized for large or growing households

45% of respondents consider it unimportant or very unimportant to have housing options for growing households, while 31% of respondents consider it to be important or very important. One-fifth of respondents found it somewhat important. See Exhibit 39.

**Exhibit 39: Importance of Housing Options for Large or Growing Households (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Diversity of Housing Types Across Income Levels:** Availability of affordable housing for sale or rent across all income levels.

Nearly half of respondents (47%) found it unimportant or very unimportant to have a diversity of housing types across all income levels, while 31% found it important or very important. See Exhibit 40.

**Exhibit 40: Importance of Diversity of Housing Types Across Income Levels (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Housing close to Services:** Availability of affordable housing options close to public and social services

One-fourth of respondents find it somewhat important for affordable housing to be located near public and social services, with 39% of respondents considering it important or very important and 34% considering it unimportant or very unimportant. See Exhibit 41.

**Exhibit 41: Importance of Affordable Housing Options Services (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Housing close to Parks:** Availability of housing near parks and open spaces

Nearly half of respondents (48%) consider it important or very important for housing to be located near parks and open spaces. Nearly 30% of respondents did not consider it important. See Exhibit 42.

**Exhibit 42: Importance of Housing Near Parks and Open Spaces (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Off-Island Transportation Options:** Housing located near convenient options to access off-island transportation.

Nearly half of respondents (48%) consider it important or very important to have housing near off-island transportation options. 31% of respondents did not consider it to be an important housing issue. See Exhibit 43.

**Exhibit 43: Importance of Off-Island Transportation Options (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Nonmotorized Travel Options:** Safety and ease of walking and biking within and between areas of the City from where I reside.

Nonmotorized travel options are an important issue for survey respondents. Nearly 60% of respondents consider it important or very important, with 46% of total respondents considering it very important. In comparison, one-fifth of respondents consider it unimportant or very unimportant. See Exhibit 44.

**Exhibit 44: Importance of Nonmotorized Travel Options (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 13. As you envision middle housing development occurring in Mercer Island, what do you foresee being the most impactful?*

The factors that respondents find to be very impactful as a result of middle housing development are tree and landscape loss (62% of respondents), increased traffic and parked car impact on walkability (62%), reduction in parking requirements near transit zones leading to an increase in cars parking on the street (62%), and an overall increase in people parking on residential streets (52%).


In comparison, only 31% of respondents consider driveways and garages to be very impactful. However, respondents did consider it to be somewhat impactful (28%).

Respondents expressed a high level of neutrality regarding the impact of middle housing scale in comparison to existing residential development, with 45% of respondents feeling neutral or unsure.

**New middle housing will not be at the same scale as the existing residential development**

Survey respondents were divided regarding the impact of middle housing scale on the existing residential development. 32% of respondents consider it somewhat impactful or not at all impactful, while 23% of respondents consider it very impactful. 45% of respondents were either neutral or unsure about middle housing impact. See Exhibit 45.

**Exhibit 45: Middle Housing Scale Not the Same as Existing Residential Development (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Visual impacts from more driveways and garages facing the street**

31% of respondents consider the visual impacts of driveways and garages facing the street to be very impactful, while 28% consider it somewhat impactful, and 15% do not consider it impactful. 26% of respondents felt neutral or were unsure of the level of impact. See Exhibit 46.

**Exhibit 46: Visual Impacts from Driveways and Garages Facing the Street (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.



**More people parking on the residential street in my neighborhood**

More than half (52%) of respondents consider an increase of people parking on the street in their neighborhood to be very impactful, while 26% of respondents consider it somewhat impactful. Only 5% of respondents thought that people parking on the street would have no impact. See Exhibit 47.

**Exhibit 47: Additional People Parking on the Residential Street in my Neighborhood (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Additional traffic and parked cars impacting the walkability of my neighborhood and making it less pedestrian-friendly**

62% of respondents consider increased traffic and parked cars to have a great impact on the neighborhood walkability, with 23% of respondents thinking the increased traffic and parked cars would affect walkability. See Exhibit 48.

**Exhibit 48: Additional Traffic Affecting Walkability in Neighborhoods (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Reduced parking requirements in areas close to transit causing more residents to park on the street**

62% of respondents consider reduced parking requirements and an increase in those parking on the street to be very impactful on their neighborhood. 19% of respondents also considered it to be somewhat impactful. See Exhibit 49.

**Exhibit 49: Parking Requirements Reduction in Areas Close to Transit (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Loss of mature trees and landscaping when new development occurs**

62% of respondents consider the tree and landscape loss because of development to be very impactful on their neighborhood. See Exhibit 50.

**Exhibit 50: Tree And Landscaping Loss as a Result of Development (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

Question 14. Mercer Island is committed to fostering a more diverse range of housing options that are affordable to households at all income levels. Below are potential strategies aimed at expediting the development of affordable housing for all economic segments of the community. Please select the top five strategies you believe the city should prioritize for implementation:

The top five strategies that survey respondents support to expediate affordable housing development include proximity to transit hubs (19%), multifamily in the C-O Zone (14%), focusing development in the Town Center (14%), a streamlined permitting process (10.5%), and mandatory inclusion of affordable housing in new development (7%).

Respondents did not favor applying a parking requirement reduction to expediate affordable housing, with only 2% of respondents selecting that as a strategy. See Exhibit 51.

**Exhibit 51: Respondents’ Preferred Strategies to Expediate Affordable Housing Development (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

Question 15. What are some of the barriers that prevent you from using transportation modes other than driving alone? Choose all that apply

The primary barriers related to using other transportation modes besides driving include frequency of service and the overall transit coverage area. Respondents also expressed concerns about safety.

21 respondents also selected “other” for this question. Seven respondents stated convenience and time as the primary factors for driving or not choosing alternative transportation modes. Similarly, four respondents referenced needing to transport their children via car. Five respondents did not want to use alternative transportation forms, preferring to travel by car. Respondents also expressed further safety concerns related to public transit. See Exhibit 52.

*“With three kids, adding a bus schedule into family logistics would be inconvenient and impractical.”*

*“I can get to my destination much faster than taking public transit, plus it is safer to take my own vehicle.”*


*“I do not enjoy public transportation.”*

*“Transit to anywhere meaningful takes far longer than driving by car. Additionally, there are health and safety concerns when taking public transit off-island.”*

*“I can get to where I want to go quicker than I could with any public transit, not to mention, you take Bellevue and Issaquah, I can park for free when I shop and wouldn't have to wait for a bus or trudge from the transit stop to the mall/shops/restaurants.”*

*“I drive, walk and take the bus. This island is built for cars and nothing else.”*

**Exhibit 52: Barriers Preventing Respondents' from Using Transportation Modes Other than Driving (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 16. A goal for traveling in the Central Puget Sound Region is to increase options so more people can safely choose walking, biking, or taking transit to the places they want to go. In your opinion, how impactful would the following strategies be to improve transportation in Mercer Island?*

Overall, survey respondents feel that improving bicycle and pedestrian routes, including safe routes to school, would be the most impactful strategy, with 52% of respondents saying it would be very impactful and 11% saying it would have some impact. Survey respondents also think improving the last-mile transportation options to be impactful, with 47% of respondents considering it to be very impactful and 21% of respondents considering it to have some impact. Respondents also favored providing added parking with 47% of respondents considering it very impactful and 38% of respondents considering it to have some impact.


Respondents responded in a more neutral way to the impact of enforcement (traffic laws, parking enforcement), and a more equitable distribution of transportation impacts.

Respondents are relatively evenly split on the impacts of street calming methods.

**Improve maintenance of existing streets before investing in other transportation projects**

One-third of respondents think that improving maintenance of existing streets would be very impactful on improving transportation and one-third of respondents think that it would be somewhat impactful, while one-fourth of respondents do not think it would be impactful. 31% of respondents felt neutral or were unsure. See Exhibit 53.

**Exhibit 53: Prioritizing the Improvement of Existing Streets Before Investing in Other Transportation Projects**  
(N=87)




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Increase public education programs about buses, light rail, and other transportation options, in conjunction with the opening of the Mercer Island light rail station**

Approximately one-third of respondents do not think that increasing public education around transportation options would have an impact on improving transportation in Mercer Island, with only 16% of respondents considering it to be very impactful and 25% of respondents considering it to have somewhat of an impact. One-fourth of respondents felt neutral or were unsure about the impact of increasing public education programs. See Exhibit 54.

**Exhibit 54: Increasing Public Education about Transportation Options in Mercer Island (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Improve and expand safe pedestrian and bicycle routes, including safe routes to school**

Approximately half of the respondents (51%) think that improving and expanding the pedestrian and bicycle routes would improve transportation in Mercer Island, with 20% of respondents thinking that it would be somewhat impactful. Only 10% of respondents did not think it would be impactful at all. See Exhibit 55.

**Exhibit 55: Improving Safe Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes, Including Safe Routes to School (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Improvements to the “last mile” transportation options to the Town Center and Transit Station**

Survey respondents think that improvements to the “last mile” transportation options would be impactful, with 47% of respondents considering it to be very impactful and 18% of respondents considering it to be somewhat impactful. Approximately 23% of respondents felt neutral or were unsure of its impacts. See Exhibit 56.

**Exhibit 56: “Last Mile” Improvements to the Town Center and Transit Station (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Use street calming methods to reduce vehicle speed in residential areas**

Respondents were divided about the impacts of applying street calming methods to reduce vehicle speeds. Approximately one-fourth of respondents consider it to be very impactful and 22% of respondents consider it to be somewhat impactful. However, one-third of respondents felt neutral or unsure about the impacts of these methods. See Exhibit 57.

**Exhibit 57. Street Calming Methods to Reduce Vehicle Speeds (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Improve enforcement of traffic laws**

Respondents felt relatively neutral regarding the impact of improved enforcement of traffic laws. One-third of respondents felt neutral or were not sure about the impact. However, 26% of respondents thought that it might be very impactful and 21% of respondents thought it would have somewhat of an impact. See Exhibit 58.

**Exhibit 58: Improved Enforcement of Traffic Laws (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.



**Provide more public parking in the Town Center for patrons and commuters**

Respondents considered providing additional parking in the Town Center to be impactful, with nearly half (47%) of respondents believe it to be very impactful and 38% of respondents consider it to have some impact. See Exhibit 59.

**Exhibit 59: Providing Additional Parking in Town Center (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Parking Enforcement**

Respondents primarily felt neutral about the impact of increasing parking enforcement. Half of respondents felt neutral or unsure about its impact. Meanwhile, respondents were evenly divided on if it would be very impactful or not impactful at all. 17% of respondents considered it to be somewhat impactful. See Exhibit 60.

**Exhibit 60: Parking Enforcement (N=87)**




Source: BERK, 2024.

**Ensure transportation projects equitably distribute disruption, burdens, and benefits**

Respondents primarily felt neutral about the impact of equitable distribution of transportation impact. 52% felt neutral or unsure about its impact. Meanwhile, respondents were fairly divided regarding if it would be very impactful (20%) or not impactful at all (22%). 7% of respondents considered it to be somewhat impactful. See Exhibit 61.

**Exhibit 61: Equitable Transportation Projects Impact (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 17. As the City of Mercer Island strives to foster a robust economic environment and enhance the commercial areas to attract people, entrepreneurs, businesses, and investment, we would like your input on how you would prioritize the following economic initiatives. Please order each from 1 to 10, with 1 being the top priority (most important)*

Respondents closely ranked the priority for the city’s economic initiatives. Though, partnering with community organizations, periodically distributing business newsletters, and studying the feasibility of moving City Hall ranked the highest. On the other hand, attracting high-wage employers, partnering with affordable housing community-based organizations (CBOs), and developing an entrepreneurial guide ranked the lowest. See Exhibit 62. Related quotes are below:

*“They all should get “10” on a scale, not make us have to put in a number in order of how important. We are losing so much commercial retail and restaurants and bars in the Town Center in exchange for multifamily residential buildings with no on-street parking which no-one wants and which goes against what we want. There is a push for micro-housing and co-sharing housing, just make sure that there is something in The Comprehensive Plan which makes it that there is a limit on density. We want affordable housing, but not at the cost of making people live like sardines all packed into small units to make it look like they are affordable.*

**Exhibit 62: Economic Initiatives Prioritization (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 18. What improvements and investments should the City of Mercer Island prioritize in the next 10 years? Please select your top three priorities from the list below*

Survey respondents would primarily like the City to prioritize maintaining city services. Other top priorities include adding more variety of retail and other businesses, ensuring there is quality infrastructure, and protecting the natural resources in Mercer Island. See Exhibit 63. Related quotes are below:

*“Design a town center that is actually usable by the residents of Mercer Island. Inconvenient and restrictive parking has forced us and neighbors to take our business off island. It is a frequent point of discussion.”*

*“Pretty much everything in question 18 should be on the list! Please make it easier to get around the island quickly.”*

**Exhibit 63: City Improvements and Investments Prioritization (N=87)**



Source: BERK, 2024.

*Question 19. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?*

This open-ended question received 47 responses from participants. The themes that emerged most prominently are summarized below.

- Keep the City’s Character and Single-Family Housing:** One-fourth of the 47 respondents wrote comments related to maintaining Mercer Island’s character, which was frequently described as small suburban, and single-family bedroom community. Respondents also described the City’s character as unique, safe and quiet, with a high quality of life. The respondents voiced concerns about how the growth would affect the City’s residential character.

*“Please do not destroy the single family neighborhoods of Mercer Island. That and its parks are what make it unique. Any mandated increase in density or creation of affordable units should be limited to the Town Center and existing multifamily areas and near the Light Rail Station.”*

*“Keep the single-family characters and don’t turn Mercer Island into Capitol Hill, where I moved from.”*

*“Mercer Island’s high value to me is totally associated with its uniform Single Family nature and its commitment to safety.”*

*“Do not destroy our Single Family Neighborhoods chasing a pipe dream. It is okay that Mercer Island is a suburb and not an urban center. It is ok that it is a bedroom community with walkable, safe, single family neighborhoods with abundant tree cover.”*

*“Protecting our single family neighborhoods is key to the city’s continued success and those neighborhoods are the majority of the island and why many moved here.”*

- Increase Affordable Housing Options:** Another top common theme focused on increasing affordable housing, specifically for upper-class families and those who work in Mercer Island like teachers. Those in support often focused on increasing affordable housing options for upper-class households, such as increasing condominiums, townhouses, and infill housing options.

*“We love it here and are committed to staying here for my son’s top-notch education. We live in an apartment and have no chance of getting a condo here with HOA fees, etc. A small 2-bedroom condo that is affordable on a teacher’s salary would be a game changer for us.”*

*“If there is a way to supporting housing for educators particularly those teaching at our schools that would have a strong positive multiplier on many aspects of Mercer island life.”*

*“Mercer Island is a unique community positioned between two major cities. I would love to see a community plan that reflects inclusion, diversity and equitable solutions. We should be caring for all of our neighbors and be an inviting place for all (not just those who can afford to live here), and there are residents like myself who do want change in my own backyard. The housing crisis is real and as a community, we can be part of incremental change. Thank you for taking time to collect input from the residents.”*

*“There is very little available land for development of smaller homes. Of there are places that can infill smaller affordable homes that would be great.”*

*“Growth is necessary and inevitable, and we need some more affordable housing for those who otherwise have to commute.”*

*“We NEED more affordable housing. note, I don’t want low-income housing. I don’t want rental assistance. I just want us to Build more dense units downtown. Condos, townhouses, etc. The entry level house on Mercer Island shouldn’t be \$2mn. There are reasons why our elementary school attendance is down. People want to live here! Approve buildings that work for Upper class families with young kids.”*

- **Increase Density:** Respondents also showed support for increasing density. However, some respondents had thoughts on where the density ought to go, with many favoring increased density in the Town Center compared to the CO zone. Overall, there was a strong sentiment to increase density in a smart, “right” way

#### Town Center Support

*“Increase density & height limits in the town center to increase housing supply and attract more businesses- and move city hall there rather than rebuilding it in place. Open up the rest of the island to higher density housing options, including ADUs and fourplexes, with reduced or eliminated parking minimums.”*

*Please do not encourage multi-family housing development in the C-O zone. Traffic is already troublesome there and there are no public transit options. Keep multifamily development in and around the Town Center where it already exists and where public transportation options already are present. This concentration of housing in Town Center will support retail.*

*“Implement climate action! Increase density in the town center, accommodate multi-modal transportation options.”*

*“The only place affordable housing makes any sense is in the town center, but even then with the cost of land and construction developers can't go below 80% AMI for affordable housing or they won't build. Increased density does not benefit existing residents.”*

*“Any mandated increase in density or creation of affordable units should be limited to the Town Center and existing multifamily areas and near the Light Rail Station.”*

*“The CO zone by the JCC and French School already has bad traffic and no high speed transit options - it is NOT the place to encourage multifamily housing. Multifamily housing should be limited to the Town Center, existing zones, and areas near the light rail - this will provide the density that will foster a revitalized retail environment.”*

### CO Zone Support

*“The proposed C-O zone should be for multi family housing and the city should not make it nearly impossible to build there because of the proximity to single family housing. More townhomes, condos, and affordable single family homes are needed.”*

### Practice Smart Growth

*“PLEASE keep the investments, safety, peace, and overall quality of life needs of those who have already lived and supported MI for years at the forefront of decisions made. There's no putting the toothpaste back in the tube once we've made these very important and impactful decisions. Over the past 10-15 years, there have been a number of MI development decisions made that have weakened, rather than strengthened, our position and desirability relative to some of our neighboring cities. In many ways, MI is unique and it's difficult to compare. Residents would like to keep it that way, but for the right reasons, positive reasons.”*

- **Expand Multimodal Infrastructure.** 15% of the respondents who provided open-ended responses also showed interest in expanding the multimodal infrastructure. Respondents were particularly interested in expanding the sidewalk infrastructure and streetlights, and others expressed support for expanding the bicycle infrastructure, particularly in relation to providing safe routes to school.

*“Please add sidewalks and please add street lights for safety purposes in neighborhoods”*

*“Bike lanes and pedestrian paths are really needed from Lakeridge Elem. all the way to the new light rail station! Currently, Bike lanes are hit and miss and veer off towards the high school- very dangerous for students on e-bikes and scooters. Don't stop the bike lane construction on mid-island like it is currently planned, continue the path all the way from Lakeridge elem to the new light rail station. Bike lane path should start at Lakeridge Elementary, go north past IMS, head east past the south end shopping center, north at Pioneer park on Island crest way, turn west onto 40th, then to north onto 80th Ave SE. We need a north to south bike/pedestrian path to connect all islanders. We desperately need a round-about at the pioneer park 4 way stop. With art in the middle of the round-about to welcome everyone to the south end. Plus, the south end doesn't have much public artwork, compared to the north end.”*

*“Implement climate action! Increase density in the town center, accommodate multi-modal transportation options.”*

*“I strongly support improving bicycle infrastructure, including the ICW corridor and through the town center.”*

*“Better street lighting coverage close to parks, more pedestrian sidewalks, Traffic lights on cross walks”*

*“A vibrant walkable, bikeable city core, with restaurants, galleries, light retail, is the most important function the comprehensive plan can serve. That means re-striping streets to accommodate angle parking and bike lanes, widening sidewalks to accommodate outdoor seating for restaurants and trees and plantings to make for an attractive pedestrian environment. The current downtown core is decrepit. 1950s-era strip malls surrounded by parking lakes is not a pleasant walking environment. Think about pedestrian-only options and modern, mixed-use urbanism. Provide central public parking in place of every strip mall having its own lot. Create 10-minute loading zones to drop off or pickup small loads, like dry cleaning or quick service restaurants. Rezone retail core as mixed use and delete the at-grade parking lots. Require adequate underground or otherwise integrated parking for residential buildings, not at-grade parking lakes. Limit heights and massing of multistory buildings, and set back upper stories to not intimidate pedestrians or create canyons. Maintain open space in and around buildings. Provide more bike parking.”*

**Concerns around Growth:** With the increased growth, respondents expressed concerns about how that might affect certain aspects of Mercer Island. Some respondents fear that increased density might result in losing the parks, tree cover, and open space. Other concerns with increased density included increased congestion, less parking, decreased safety, and increased noise.

#### Parks, Tree Cover, and Open Space:

*“Single family neighborhoods along with parks are the allure of MI.”*

*“Don’t reduce lot size, don’t increase permissible impervious surface area, and do preserve trees and parks.”*

*“Please maintain the single-family zones. This includes trees and house to lot size. Please don’t rezone or develop our parks.”*

#### Congestion and Parking

*“We don’t want to change our predominantly single family community into a crowded concrete jungle of high rise buildings, congested roadways and overtaxing our already aging infrastructure to allow for massive congestion.”*

*“Priority parking permits should be distributed to mercer island residents so they can use the parking facilities related to mass transit. It is too unpredictable to reliably use for commuting.”*

# Findings

Based on the survey and public open house, the following outreach findings are provided:

- **Mercer Island's Livability.** Respondents enjoy Mercer Island for being safe, centrally located, and having a sense of community. Most respondents agree that Mercer Island is a good place to live and have housing that meets their needs.
- **Enthusiasm for Parks and Trees.** Respondents enjoy the city's parks, open space, and outdoor environments. Additionally, they have concerns about loss of mature trees and landscaping when new development occurs. Nearly a half of respondents think that new housing should be near parks and open spaces.
- **Limited Housing Availability.** Many respondents agree that there is limited available housing to upsize or downsizing, and housing costs are high.
- **Future Housing Goals.** Many of respondents want to live in a single-family home in the future. Though, a sizeable number of respondents also want to live in senior housing, townhomes, and larger apartment buildings.
- **Diverging Results for Diverse Housing Types.** Respondents are split over the importance of availability of different housing types, with over half of respondents thinking that the availability of rental housing is unimportant. Respondents are also split over the importance of diversifying housing types across income levels. Some express support for allowing affordable housing types for the workforce but are less in favor of providing low-income housing.
- **Diverse Housing Supply in Mixed-Use Commercial Area.** The majority of respondents agree that it is important to have housing options in mixed-use commercial areas. However, respondents had varying opinions on where that housing could be located. Respondents' preferred strategies to expediate affordable housing development include allowing multifamily in C-O zones, while others strongly favor focusing multifamily housing in the Town Center. Additionally, respondents note that supporting proximity to transit hubs for affordable housing is important.
- **Middle Housing Concerns.** Respondents note that parking and walkability will become challenged if middle housing is built in their neighborhoods. Others also expressed that it may threaten the parks, tree canopy, and open space in residential neighborhoods.
- **Transportation.** More than half of respondents note that off-island transportation options is either very important or important. Additionally, for respondents who drive and do not use other transportation options, they cite frequency, transit coverage area, and safety as the barriers preventing them from adopting to other transportation options.
- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure.** Respondents note that nonmotorized travel options are important. They advocated for the increase of sidewalks and streetlights for safety, as well as the expansion of the bicycle infrastructure particularly along school routes and the "last-mile" to the light rail station



# Appendices

# Appendix A

## Comprehensive Plan Community Open House Sign in Sheets

# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE: SIGN IN



NAME	EMAIL
1 JOHN HALL	JKLDOCKE@COMCAST.NET
2 GARY ROBINSON	Dgarobinson@comcast.net
3 LORI ROBINSON	mrs.robinson@comcast.net
4 Daniel Baker	daniel@danielbaker.com
5 Olivia Baker	oliviabaker2@gmail.com
6 Boreth (Terry) Long	terry.long.re@gmail.com
7 Tara Senn	tana.senn@lp.wa.gov
8 Robert Lewandowski	robert@lewandowski.com
9 Ying Lei	ying.lei@live.com
10 Ryan Smith	rsmith@martinsmith.com
11 Michele Asmuth	MASMUTH12@gmail.com
12 LUCIA PIRZIO BIROLI	lucia@ectypos.com
13 PETER STRUCK	StruckMI@aol.com
14 Christa Nielsen	csnielsen@comcast.net
15 Kenneth Loen	loenk@hotmail.com
16 Tom Acker	<del>TomAcker</del> GNGUNDR@Comcast.net

# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE: SIGN IN



NAME	EMAIL
1 MATT GOLDBACH	BLKSHIP@YAHOO.COM
2 GREG TADLOCK	GT@TSRI.COM
3 Joanna Sheppard	jshppard@nwsheddards.com
4 Emily Tadlock	emily@newcastlelog.com
5 TED WEINBERG	tad.weinberg@mercerisland.gov
6 Dan Thompson	claniep@thompson@hrtwinc.com
7 SAUM NIGB	SACM.NIGB@MERCERISLAND.GOV
8 Kristyn Strauss	strauss.kristyn@gmail.com
9 Sarah Fletch	fletchsa@gmail.com
10 ASHLEY DIMICK	ashleytdimick@gmail.com
11 CONNOR DIMICK	connordimick95@gmail.com
12 Marie Bender	marie.bender@mbender.com
13 Ben Manger	mangerb@gmail.com
14 Bill Severson	bill.severson1120@gmail.com
15 Meredith Lehr	meredith.lehr@outlook.com
16 Cristina Martinez	cristina@famisanmar.com

# Appendix B

## Comprehensive Plan Open House Handout



Welcome to Tonight's Open House  
May 1, 2024 | 6:00-8:00 PM

**Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update**

Thank you for joining us tonight to learn about the **periodic review of Mercer Island's Comprehensive Plan**. Washington State's Growth Mangement Act(GMA) requires this periodic review every 10 years to ensure compliance with state law and reflect changes in the community. This periodic review updates must be completed by the end of 2024, with a new 20-year planning horizon extending to 2044.

Tonight is an opportunity to **learn about** the progress and findings of this periodic review and the **proposed amendments** updating existing elements, as well as the inclusion of **two new elements: Economic Development & Parks and Open Space**.

↩ Flip the page to explore the timeline of the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update!



Welcome to Tonight's Open House  
May 1, 2024 | 6:00-8:00 PM

**Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update**

Thank you for joining us tonight to learn about the **periodic review of Mercer Island's Comprehensive Plan**. Washington State's Growth Mangement Act(GMA) requires this periodic review every 10 years to ensure compliance with state law and reflect changes in the community. This periodic review updates must be completed by the end of 2024, with a new 20-year planning horizon extending to 2044.

Tonight is an opportunity to **learn about** the progress and findings of this periodic review and the **proposed amendments** updating existing elements, as well as the inclusion of **two new elements: Economic Development & Parks and Open Space**.

↩ Flip the page to explore the timeline of the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update!

**Have questions or want to learn more?**

Visit the Let's Talk Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review's webpage [letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update](http://letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update)

Find:

- **Public Review Drafts** of each amended element and the two new elements.
- **Technical Documents** containing analysis and supporting information developed during this periodic review, used to evaluate proposed updates
- **Take the Survey** open until May 8 & review prior surveys

We appreciate your time attending this Open House and completing the survey.

**Have questions or want to learn more?**

Visit the Let's Talk Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review's webpage [letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update](http://letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update)

Find:

- **Public Review Drafts** of each amended element and the two new elements.
- **Technical Documents** containing analysis and supporting information developed during this periodic review, used to evaluate proposed updates
- **Take the Survey** open until May 8 & review prior surveys

We appreciate your time attending this Open House and completing the survey.

**Scan to view the Project Website and Take the Survey**



**Have a Public Comment or Question?**

Email  
[Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov](mailto:Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov)

**Scan to view the Project Website and Take the Survey**



**Have a Public Comment or Question?**

Email  
[Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov](mailto:Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov)



# Appendix C

## Mercer Island City Staff Open House Presentation Slides



**MERCER ISLAND 2044  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**





**Open House**

May 1, 2024  
City of Mercer Island, WA  
Community Planning and Development






# Presentation Outline

-  Background and Project History
-  Updated Comprehensive Plan Elements
-  Next Steps
-  Open House Program



# Growth Management Planning Process



## What is a Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review?

- Cities and counties in Washington are required to adopt and periodically review a comprehensive plan under the Growth Management Act (GMA)
- Since the last update, the WA Legislature has established several specific requirements for local comprehensive plans.
- Periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan's 20-year horizon (2024-2044).
- Address new GMA requirements, particularly for housing.
- Periodic review must be completed by December 31, 2024.



## Mercer Island Growth Targets

- New growth targets established by King County in 2022 based on the projected 20-year population forecast.
- The Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan must accommodate these growth targets.

### 2044 GROWTH TARGETS




**1,239**  
new dwellings




**1,300**  
new jobs






# Public Participation To Date



# Plan Elements Updates




# New or Rewritten Plan Elements



**Economic Development (New)**

· June 2023-November 2023



**Parks and Open Space (New)**

· March-April 2024



**Housing (Rewritten)**

· January-March 2024








# Economic Development Element Drafting Process



**Public Input and Data Collection**

- Interviews, workshop, online survey
- Economic Analysis
- May 2022 – November 2022



**Economic Development Work Group Drafting**

- Joint PC/Council subcommittee prepared initial draft
- Oct. 2022 – June 2023



**Planning Commission Review**

- Refined the draft Element
- June-November 2023







## Housing Element: New Requirements




### **Statewide legislation and Countywide Planning Policies set new requirements:**

- The City is required to plan for nearly all its growth target (1,239 new housing units) to be affordable for people with incomes below the area median income (AMI).
- Therefore, new policies are focused on steps to increase the supply of affordable housing units.
- Cities must also conduct an RDI Evaluation, conduct a LCA supplement, and identify areas at risk of displacement.





# Housing Element Drafting Process

## Technical Reports

-  Housing Needs Assessment  
· June 2022-November 2022
-  Land Capacity Analysis Supplement  
· August 2023-January 2024
-  Racially Disparate Impacts Evaluation  
· August 2023 – January 2024

## Draft Preparation

-  Housing Work Group (HWG)  
· Joint PC/Council Subcommittee  
· January-March 2024
-  Planning Commission Review  
· Refine HWG Draft  
· March 2024

# Housing Element: Capacity

More multifamily/mixed-use development capacity is needed to accommodate affordable housing needs, prompting two changes directed by the City Council:

1. Allowing multifamily/mixed-use development in the Commercial Office Zone
2. Targeted increase to maximum building height in Town Center

**Commercial Office Zone**




Source: Title 19 Mercer Island City Code, Appendix D  
[https://library.municode.com/wa/mercer\\_island/codes/city\\_code?nodeId=CICCOOR\\_TIT19UNLADECO\\_UNLADEAP\\_APXDZOMA](https://library.municode.com/wa/mercer_island/codes/city_code?nodeId=CICCOOR_TIT19UNLADECO_UNLADEAP_APXDZOMA)



## Schedule and Next Steps

<b>May 8-29</b>	Planning Commission: Open Space Zone and Comprehensive Plan Tune Up
<b>May 29</b>	Public Hearing on Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review
<b>June 12</b>	Targeted conclusion of Planning Commission process and recommendation
<b>July 16</b>	City Council briefing on the Planning Commission recommendation
<b>Sept-Oct</b>	Council deliberation and adoption



# Open House Program



## **Topic-Specific Stations**

- Find out more about different topics in the Comprehensive Plan



## **Survey**

- Available here and on the project Website through May 10



## **Staff Available for Questions**

- City staff and consultants are available for questions at each station



## **Planning Commissioners and City Councilmembers**

- Available for questions and input



Post public comments on the project website




[letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update](http://letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update)



### Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review

[f](#) [t](#) [in](#) [e](#)



#### MERCER ISLAND 2044 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The WA State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the City of Mercer Island to review and update its Comprehensive Plan in a twenty-year periodic review process. This project is part of the Comprehensive Plan periodic review process.

The City's Comprehensive Plan is the City's primary focus for managing growth and development. The focus of this periodic review is to update the Comprehensive Plan for the period of 2044.

**Click Here to Post a Comment**

[What's Happening](#) [Ask a Question](#) [Post A Public Comment](#)

Comprehensive Plan Multifamily Housing Survey



# Thank You

More information  
on the project  
website



[letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update](http://letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update)



# Appendix D

## Comprehensive Plan Community Open House Comment Box Submissions

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is principally a single-family zone community. Large minimum lot sizes and a lower gross floor area to lot ratio with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones Islanders cherish, and the retention of mature trees and vegetation that allow carbon to be captured, limit solar heat, and provide homes for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process of citizen involvement and extensive public process, and those adopted regulatory limits including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums that preserve the rural character of our single family zone will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
Printed Name

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is principally a single-family zone community. Large minimum lot sizes and a lower gross floor area to lot ratio with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones Islanders cherish, and the retention of mature trees and vegetation that allow carbon to be captured, limit solar heat, and provide homes for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process of citizen involvement and extensive public process, and those adopted regulatory limits including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums that preserve the rural character of our single family zone will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
Printed Name

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that Islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat, and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
Printed Name

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is principally a single-family zone community. Large minimum lot sizes and a lower gross floor area to lot ratio with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones Islanders cherish, and the retention of mature trees and vegetation that allow carbon to be captured, limit solar heat, and provide homes for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process of citizen involvement and extensive public process, and those adopted regulatory limits including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums that preserve the rural character of our single family zone will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
Printed Name



Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that Islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat, and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

*Kyoko Matsuda*  
Printed Name

Something has to be done to stop all the mature trees from being cut down for development. And there should not be allowed a fee-in-lieu for being allowed to remove trees, and the the penalty & fees need to be <sup>in the</sup> 1000's not 100's

- Allow multifamily housing in more areas of the city
- Please don't place all multifamily housing directly adjacent to the highway.
- Consider at least 5 to 6 stories for multifamily housing, up to 8 stories would be ideal to allow affordability
- Ensure mixed-use zoning near new affordable housing for access to amenities
- Upzone more areas near transit. Especially 1/2 mile radius near light rail station.

- Kill the off-island PC  
idea!

- AB1110 needs to be considered  
as part of the growth targets  
while 1220 is the pacing item,  
we still need to plan for the  
end of single family zoning.

- Island Crest "missing link"  
is a TIP priority.

- I'd like to see pockets of  
multi-family to include townhouses  
and duplexes in the single family  
zones where it makes sense.

What type of data will inform your decision on the Island Crest Corridor between Island Park and 68<sup>TH</sup> ?

Put flashing pedestrian lights on 84<sup>TH</sup> & 75<sup>E</sup> by JMS. Signs are hard to see and kids use this corridor to walk to school

Is there some economically feasible way to use stormwater runoff to water beach areas (grass) at Cleveland Park. - Need Reservoir & pipes

Do not put gravel next to bike paths. Cyclists will ride in the center of the path to avoid it and avoiding slipping on the gravel



We need fiber internet on the Island. We should add piping + potential conduct ~~utility~~ <sup>everytime</sup> we replace utility pipes, going forward.

Increase public charging stations!

Bike Lanes

- They aren't used on the Mercers because materials that cause flats and accidents are in them.
- Bike lanes on 84th are never used. People (Adults) ride in Street. Youth drive on sidewalks. This is a waste of funds.

Commercial Office Zone

The city lacks the infrastructure needed (broad band) to attract companies to Mercer Island.


By alerting the community of counting - you can skew the results.

- What is your control group.
- Reason for communication was to reduce calls.
- How many calls do you receive?

Do not remove the trees on the west side of ICW between Island Park elementary and 68th. These provide a barrier between cars and pedestrians

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that Islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat, and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John Hall Printed Name

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that Islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat, and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CATHIE HARE Printed Name


Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that Islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat, and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

Please add this preamble to the Housing Chapter:

Mercer Island is primarily a single-family zoned community. Large minimum lot sizes and a low gross floor area to lot ratio, combined with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces, contribute to the rural character of the single-family zones that Islanders cherish. These regulations also support the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which capture carbon, limit solar heat, and provide habitats for birds and woodland animals. In 2017, new regulatory limits were adopted for our single-family zone after a years-long process involving extensive citizen participation and public processes. These adopted regulatory limits, including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums, preserve the rural character of our single-family zone and will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

For help setting the stage  
so people understand what  
AMI %s really mean, maybe we  
can call some of the multi-family  
"Teacher Housing"

You are not aware of toxic  
herbicides please do  
something Thank  
you

6

We should get fiber internet for the entire island, not just the middle + high school.

# Appendix E

## Comprehensive Plan Community Open House Display Boards



# 2024 - 2044 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update

## OPEN HOUSE

### May 1, 2024 | 6:00 - 8:00 PM

## Welcome!

Please sign in and fill out a nametag at the table.  
A brief presentation will begin at 6:20 PM.

**WHAT IS THIS ALL ABOUT?**

The City of Mercer Island has conducted a periodic review of its Comprehensive Plan to update information and comply with state laws. Updates proposed to the comprehensive plan will guide how the city will accommodate growth over the next 20 years.

Learn about the proposed updates and revisions to existing elements for the 2024-2044 Comprehensive Plan and the proposal to add two new elements.

**AGENDA**

6:00-6:20 PM: Welcome & Sign-In  
6:20-6:40 PM: Staff Presentation  
6:40-8:00 PM: Open House

City staff will be available at stations to answer questions and explain changes proposed in the Comprehensive Plan elements.

**LOOKING FOR MORE INFORMATION?**

Check out the project webpage


Take our Survey!



Have a public comment?  
Email [Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov](mailto:Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov)



## Growth Management & Comprehensive Plans



**WHAT IS THE GMA?**

The GMA, or Growth Management Act, is a state law that outlines strategies for managing growth and directing development in counties and cities. For cities like Mercer Island, it mandates the creation of a Comprehensive Plan with a 20-year planning horizon. This plan must undergo review and potential revision every decade to ensure alignment with any updates to the GMA and to stay current with evolving needs and priorities.

The GMA requires that certain elements be addressed in every Comprehensive Plan. For Mercer Island, those elements are:

- |                         |                      |                              |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Land Use                | Tranportation        | Parks and Recreation         |
| Housing                 | Economic Development | Shorelines                   |
| Capital Facilities Plan | Utilities            | Climate Change & Resiliency* |

\*The Climate Change and Resiliency element was added in 2023 as a mandatory element, the deadline for Mercer Island to add a climate change is June 30, 2029.

**WHAT IS VISION 2050?**

Vision 2050 is the plan for growth, in the Puget Sound region. Adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), it serves as the blueprint for growth and transportation investments across the four-county region. This plan provides guidance for countywide planning policies and regional allocation of growth. With the region's population projected to reach 5.8 million people by 2050, Vision 2050 will direct infrastructure investments and concentrate growth accordingly.

**WHAT IS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN?**

A Comprehensive Plan is the centerpiece of local long-range planning, projecting ahead over a 20-year planning horizon. It contains a vision, goals, objectives, policies, and implementation actions to guide decision-making by elected officials and staff. The GMA emphasizes implementation, recognizing that achieving a plan's objectives requires regulatory and financial support, including zoning regulations, program initiatives, and both capital and non-capital spending. Development regulations and capital budget decisions must align with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**HOW MUCH WILL MERCER ISLAND GROW BY 2044?**



By 2044, Mercer Island is expected to have **1,239 new households** and **1,300 new jobs** than in 2019.





# The Comprehensive Plan

## MERCER ISLAND'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TODAY

The GMA, or Growth Management Act, is a state law that outlines strategies for managing growth and directing development in counties and cities. For cities like Mercer Island, it mandates the creation of a Comprehensive Plan with a 20-year planning horizon. This plan must undergo review and potential revision every decade to ensure alignment with any updates to the GMA and to stay current with evolving needs and priorities.

The GMA requires that certain elements be addressed in every Comprehensive Plan. For Mercer Island, those elements are:

- Land Use
- Housing
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Capital Facilities
- Shoreline Master Program Policies

The individual elements of the Comprehensive Plan must align with each other; consequently, adjustments to one element to adhere to changes in state law may necessitate amendments in other elements to maintain internal consistency.

### WHAT'S NEW?


Washington State, the region, and Mercer Island are constantly changing and evolving, influenced by various influences and factors. As such, the City's Comprehensive Plan requires regular review and amendments to meet new state mandates, fulfill regional growth requirements set forth by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and align with the community's vision.

Mercer Island is required to periodically review and, if necessary, update its comprehensive plan every ten years, with the current deadline set for December 31, 2024.

During this Periodic Update, the City will introduce two new elements:

- Economic Development
- Parks and Open Space

Additionally, the existing Housing Element has undergone significant rewriting to ensure compliance with new state and regional requirements.



# Timeline

- Interviews
- City Council Presentation
- Planning Commission Review
- Survey
- Community Workshop Open House

Element	2022			2023				2024				
	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter
	Drafting Stage						Finalizing & Adopting Stage					
Economic Development												
Land Use												
Housing												
Other Elements - Transportation - Capital Facilities - Utilities - Parks & Recreation												
Comprehensive Plan		<b>Public Comments during Element Drafting and Review</b>										

**UPCOMING EVENTS**

- May 8 Planning Commission Open Space Zone Briefing
- May 29 Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing
- June 5 Planning Commission Recommendation to the City Council
- June 12 Planning Commission Recommendation to the City Council
- July 16 (tentative) City Council Briefing on the Planning Commission Recommendation
- Dec 31 Deadline to adopt the Comprehensive Plan





# Land Use Element

**THE LAND USE ELEMENT:**

- Provides direction for the city's land use and its physical development.
- Emphasizes and encourages a mix of land uses.
- Supports and accommodates future growth in a sustainable manner.
- Is consistent and interrelated with other Elements

**WHAT'S NEW IN KEY GOALS?**

Outside of the Town Center

**LU-15 & LU-16 Policies. UPDATED** to be consistent with substantially rewritten Housing Element.

**LU-17. UPDATED.** The allowed uses in commercial and mixed-use zones balance the City's economic development and housing needs.

**LU-19 Policies:** Amendments to be consistent with the Parks and Open Space Element.

**LU-20 Policies:** Policies either moved to other Land Use Goals or removed because they were addressed in the Parks and Open Space (PROS) Element.

**LU-26: Climate Change. UPDATED** to align with the Climate Action Plan.

**LU-27. NEW.** Reduce community-wide greenhouse gas emissions.

**LU-28. UPDATED** to align with the Climate Action Plan.


**LU-29 Policies. UPDATED** to describe the implementation process for the Land Use Element

**INTERCONNECTED**

The Land Use Map is interconnected with other elements in the Comprehensive Plan. Changes to land use affects those elements, including:



**\*COMING SOON\***  
The Land Use Map will see some minor changes and updates to align with the new Parks and Open Space Element.



# Housing Element Changes: HB 1220

**What is HB 1220?**

HB 1220 amended the Growth Management Act to require local governments to **“plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all income levels.”**

To comply, Mercer Island must make the following updates:

- **Plan for sufficient land capacity to address the housing needs** of all economic segments in the community.
  - identifying housing types and areas in the City with capacity to accommodate housing units at each affordability level
- **Incorporate provisions for moderate-density housing types** (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, townhomes).
- **Adopt policies, identify programs, and implement strategies** to support and enable the production of housing units to accommodate projected housing needs for all economic segments as allocated by income segments by King County to Mercer Island consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) VISION 2050 and the GMA.
- **Identify racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion** in housing policies and regulations and take steps to undo any impacts; and identify areas at higher risk of displacement and include anti-displacement policies.



**How is Mercer Island's housing growth target determined?**

King County developed Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), a shared framework for how to manage regional growth and its adopted growth targets for the region.

King County allocates these growth targets to each jurisdiction and directs each jurisdiction to address affordable housing needs and the condition of its existing housing supply.

Established by the King County CPPs, each jurisdiction must plan for and accommodate its allocated share of countywide future housing for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households.



# Housing Element

**PURPOSE**

- Provides the policy approaches the City will take to manage projected growth and accommodate its housing needs.

**WHY WAS IT REWRITTEN?**

Changes in state laws related to housing have resulted in redrafting this element to:


- **Comply with HB 1110.** Requires cities to allow multiple middle housing units on a single lot
- **Comply with HB 1220.** Requires cities to plan and accommodate housing that is affordable to all income levels. This includes:
  - Planning for sufficient land capacity for all economic segments,
  - Allowing for moderate density housing, and
  - Identifying racially disparate impacts (RDI), taking measures to address these impacts, and reduce the risk of displacement.

**KEY GOALS**

- **Overall: NEW.** Provide housing affordable for all income levels.
- **Affordable Housing: NEW.** Households of all income levels can afford to live in Mercer Island because of the housing mix.
- **Racially Disparate Impacts (RDIs): NEW.** Undo identified RDIs, avoid displacement, and eliminate exclusion in housing.
- **Anti-Displacement: NEW.** Reduce and mitigate displacement risk as regulations change and development occurs.
- **Residential Regulation:** Balanced regulations that safeguard public health, safety and welfare.
- **Implementation:** Implement the Housing Element in a timely & efficient manner.

**WHAT'S NEW?**

- Element completely rewritten due to Washington State HB 1110 and HB 1220.
- By 2044, an expected growth of **1,239 households**.
- Existing land capacity: **1,429 additional housing units**.



# Housing Element Changes: HB 1220


**WHAT IS HB 1220?**

“plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all income levels.”

- Plan for sufficient land capacity to address the housing needs of all economic segments in the community.
- Incorporate provisions for moderate-density housing types
- Adopt policies, identify programs, and implement strategies
- Identify racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing policies and regulations

**Land Capacity**  
 Citywide Capacity:  
 1,428 new units  
 Multifamily Capacity:  
 1,073 new units  
 Multifamily Need:  
 1,216 new units  
 Multifamily Deficit:  
 143 units

**CITY'S PERMANENT HOUSING NEW NET NEED 2019-2044**



Given high costs, affordable housing for households with income between 0 - 120% AMI are likely to be accommodated in zones that permit multifamily and mixed-use development.

To provide more capacity for multifamily dwelling units, the city must increase capacity in zones that permit multifamily housing units (Town Center, Commercial Office) or allow multifamily housing in other zones where it is not currently allowed.

**To address this shortfall, the city proposes:**

- allowing multifamily residential uses in the Commercial Office (C-O) Zone, and
- increasing the maximum building height in some Town Center subareas by an additional story.



**KEY FINDINGS FROM THE CITY'S RACIALLY DISPARATE IMPACTS EVALUATION**

- Renters have a 20 percent higher cost burden than homeowners, regardless of race.
- Households of color are 8 percent more likely to face housing cost burdens compared to White households.
- Black or African American households in Mercer Island are experiencing severe housing cost burden at more than double the rate of any other racial group.



# Housing Types & Needs

**1,239 new homes** are required to fulfill Mercer Island's housing growth targets from 2019 to 2044.

Mercer Island's housing needs are distributed among different income groups based on the area median income (AMI) and the # of dwelling units (DU) allocated for each income group.

**HOUSING NEED DISTRIBUTION BY INCOME GROUP**

0-30% AMI	31-50% AMI	51-80% AMI	81-90% AMI	91-100% AMI
517 DUs	202 DUs	488 DUs	5 DUs	4 DUs
39%	16%	42%	<1%	<1%

Source: King County 2022 Countywide Planning Policies Ordinance 19600 Public Hearing

**City of Mercer Island - Housing Costs**

Housing Type	Sale Price or Monthly Rent	Monthly Cost	Annual Income Needed
Single-Family	\$2.62 Million	\$15,867	\$634,680
Condominium	\$662,179	\$4,085	\$163,400
Apartment	\$2,578 / month	\$2,528	\$101,120

Source: Washington Center for Real Estate Research (WCRE), "Mercer Island Land Capacity Analysis (LCA) Supplemental" (AB 0395)

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY**

- 26% of the 9,758 households in Mercer Island are either cost burdened (1,114) or severely cost burdened (1,469). Households are generally considered cost burdened if housing expenses, including utilities, cost more than 30% of their income. Severe cost burden is when a household's housing costs are greater than 50% of their income.
- Renters experience higher rates of housing cost burden than owners. Severe cost burden is borne by both very low- and very high-income homeowners
- Mercer Island has 102 total rent-restricted units available.



Due to the high housing costs on Mercer Island, those who earn less than 120% of the Area Median Income (AMI) are likely to be accommodated in areas of the city where multifamily housing is permitted.

\*2024 Mercer Island Land Capacity Analysis (LCA)

**HOUSING SUPPLY**

- Almost two-thirds of Mercer Island's housing stock are detached single family units.
- Nearly half of the city's homes have 4+ bedrooms.
- Most of Mercer Island's homes are 40- to 60-years old.

**HOUSING MARKET TRENDS AND CONDITIONS**

- Home prices are near the highest in the region.
- The average sale price of condominiums and townhomes is affordable to households earning 112 percent of the area median income.
- Only 6% of housing units in Mercer Island are valued at less than \$500,000.
- Growth in home value outpaced growth in income.
- The average monthly rent is affordable to households earning around 70% of the AMI

The Area Median Income (AMI) for King and Snohomish Counties in 2024 is **\$147,400 for a family of four.**

**WHAT IS MODERATE DENSITY HOUSING?**

**DUPLEXES**

**TOWNHOUSES**


**COTTAGE HOUSING**

**COURTYARD APARTMENTS**

**STACKED FLATS**

**TRIPLEXES - SIXPLEXES**

**WHAT IS AFFORDABLE HOUSING?**



# Housing Types

**Single Family Home**

**Single Family Home with ADU**

**Duplex**

**Triplex**

**Fourplex**

**Five- to Sixplex**

**Cottage Housing**

**Townhouse**

**Courtyard Apartment**

**Stacked Flats**

**Condominium**

**DADU / Cottage**

**Directions**

- What kind of housing do you live in now? Place a **green dot**.
- What kind of housing would you consider living in the future? Place **1-3 orange dots**.

Use **sticky notes** to write comments.

**Other Housing Types**

Place sticky notes below



# Transportation

## THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

- Ensures that planning for all modes of transportation in the City aligns with the broader, long-term goals and policies of the other elements with a focus on accommodating housing and job growth permitted in the Land Use Element.
- Reflects concurrency, a requirement that transportation facilities are consistent and adequate enough to serve new development based on level-of-service (LOS) standards for performance. As the City grows, the transportation facilities keep pace with changes in demand.
- Goals and policies include:
  - Land Use Assumptions for estimating travel patterns
  - Traffic Impacts for assessing traffic effects on I-90
  - Facilities and Services needs
  - Financial Plan
  - Intergovernmental Coordination efforts
  - Demand Management Strategies
  - Nonmotorized transportation components



## GOALS

- T-1.** Encourage the most efficient use of the transportation system through effective management of transportation demand and the transportation system.
- T-2.** Receive the maximum value and utility from the City's investments in the transportation system.
- T-3.** Minimize negative transportation impacts on the environment.
- T-4.** Provide transportation choices for travelers through the provision of a complete range of transportation facilities, and services.
- T-5.** Comply with local, regional, state and federal requirements
- T-6.** Ensure coordination between transportation and land use decisions and development.
- T-7.** Provide a safe, convenient, and reliable transportation system for Mercer Island.
- T-8.** Preserve adequate levels of accessibility between Mercer Island and the rest of the region.
- T-9.** Balance the maintenance of quality Island neighborhoods with the needs of the Island's transportation system.
- T-10.** Maintain acceptable levels of service for transportation facilities and services on Mercer Island.
- T-11.** Ensure parking standards support the land use policies in the Comprehensive Plan.
- T-12.** Promote bicycle and pedestrian networks that safely access and link commercial areas, residential areas, schools, and parks in the City

## UPCOMING PROJECTS

Check out the City's 2024-2029 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for upcoming transportation upgrades and improvements. Updated annually, it covers city roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation projects



Provide your feedback and comments through June 4.



# Utilities and Capital Facilities

**UTILITIES ELEMENT:** describes the general location, capacity, and provider of existing & proposed utilities.


**CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT:** catalogs current public facilities. The element includes strategies for capital planning, financing, and revenue sources to support growth.

## BOTH ELEMENTS:


- Assess capacity to meet the current and future needs based on planned growth out to 2044.
- Discuss existing "level of service" standards, and the investment needed to achieve or maintain them.

## WHAT'S NEW?

- Updated information on current services provided, level of service, and financial assumptions to support the 20-year growth forecast
- Signed a 20-year contract in 2020 with Puget Sound Energy for carbon-free wind power to operate all City government operations.
- Adopted the PROS (Parks, Recreation and Open Space) plan in 2022.



## CAPITAL FACILITIES BUDGET FORECAST



- Utilities
- Streets, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Facilities
- Buildings, Equipment, and Technology
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

## Includes

- Parks & Open Space
- Public Buildings
- Public Schools
- Telecommunications
- Public Streets & Roads
- Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities
- Water
- Sewer
- Solid Waste
- Electricity
- Natural Gas
- Stormwater



# Economic Development

**Directions**

- Place **green dots** on the goal you think should be top priorities.
- Use **sticky notes** to write comments.

**THE \*NEW\* ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT:**

- Articulates the City's strategy through 2044 for fostering and enhancing the local economy
- Sets goals and policy direction aimed at leveraging the city strengths, capitalizing on opportunities, and building resilience in the local economy to overcome challenges.

The Draft Element was prepared by the Economic Development Work Group (EDWG), comprising two Planning Commissioners and three City Councilmembers. The EDWG convened eleven times between June 2022 and June 2023 to develop the draft element, ultimately making a recommendation on the draft element and implementation plan on June 8, 2023.

**WHAT GOALS SHOULD THE CITY FOCUS ITS EFFORTS ON FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS?**

<b>SUPPORTING &amp; IMPROVING THE BUSINESS ECOSYSTEM</b>	The City of Mercer Island actively fosters a healthy business ecosystem.
	Mercer Island's healthy business ecosystem attracts entrepreneurs, businesses, and investment.
	Existing businesses thrive as the cornerstone of Mercer Island's business ecosystem.
<b>REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENTS</b>	The business ecosystem on Mercer Island is sustainable in that it meets the social, environmental, and economic needs of residents now and in the future.
	The City actively reduces the regulatory burden created by commercial development regulations and permitting processes to support a healthy business ecosystem, entrepreneurs, and innovation in business.
<b>BUSINESS ATTRACTION</b>	The Mercer Island business ecosystem includes a diversity of goods and services enjoyed by residents and visitors.
	The commercial areas in Mercer Island, and especially the Town Center, are lively, vibrant gathering places for the community and visitors.
<b>CUSTOMER ATTRACTION</b>	Commercial areas are attractive and inviting to the Mercer Island community and visitors.
	Public space in Town Center is plentiful, providing residents and visitors places to gather, celebrate, and socialize.
	Mercer Island residents and visitors can safely access commercial areas.




# Shoreline Master Program

**THE SHORELINE ELEMENT:**

- Contains the goals and policies of the City's approved Shoreline Master Program (SMP)
- The SMP was last updated in 2020, with modified standards regarding the repair of existing piers, no changes were made to the goals or policies since that last periodic update in 2015.

**GOALS**

- SMP-1 - Public Access:** Increase and enhance public access to and along the Mercer Island Shoreline where appropriate and consistent with public interest, provided public safety, private property rights, and unique or fragile areas are not adversely affected
- SMP-2 - Conservation and Water Quality:** The resources and amenities of Lake Washington are to be protected and preserved for use and enjoyment by present and future generations.
- SMP-3 - Specific Shoreline Uses and Activities:** Ensure that the land use patterns within shoreline areas are compatible with shoreline environment designations and will be sensitive to and not degrade habitat, ecological systems, and other shoreline resources.
- SMP-4 - Recreational Development:** Water-dependent recreational activities available to the public are to be encouraged and increased on the shoreline of Mercer Island where appropriate and consistent with the public interest.
- SMP-5 - Residential Development:** Existing residential uses are to be recognized, and new residential construction will be subject to certain limitations where applicable..
- SMP-6 - Transportation Facilities:** A balanced transportation system for moving people and goods is to be encouraged within existing corridors.



# Parks and Open Space


## THE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

- NEW element.
- Adopts the most recent version of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan by reference.
- Policy direction to establish an Open Space zone and Park zone.

**\*NEW\* Element!**  
Provide feedback on the proposed Open Space Zone at the Planning Commission briefing on May 8

## GOAL

- **P&OS – 1.** Continue to maintain the Island's unique quality of life through the stewardship, preservation, and maintenance of parks, open spaces, trails, and recreational facilities.



# Next Steps



**Find out more!**  
Check out our project website to view the latest drafts of the Comprehensive Plan and take our survey!

**Have questions or interested in learning more?**

Head to the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update's project webpage [letstalk.mercerisland.gov/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update](http://letstalk.mercerisland.gov/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update) to learn more about Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update process and other ongoing City projects at the City.

For background information and access to public drafts of new and amended Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, please visit the project website

Upcoming Events	
May 8	Planning Commission Open Space Zone Briefing
May 29	Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing
June 5 & June 12	Planning Commission Recommendation to City Council
July 16 (tentative)	City Council Briefing on the Planning Commission Recommendation
December 31	Deadline to adopt the Comprehensive Plan

**Have a Public Comment or Question?**  
Email: [Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov](mailto:Comp.Plan@mercerisland.gov)



# Appendix F

## Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update Survey Questions & Responses





# 2024 - 2044 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Survey

---

## SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT

30 April 2024 - 21 May 2024

**PROJECT NAME:**

Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review








SURVEY QUESTIONS





**Q1 What best describes your relationship with Mercer Island? Use all that apply.**




**Question options**

- I live in Mercer Island
- I work in Mercer Island
- I own a business in Mercer Island
- I visit Mercer Island for services and amenities
- Other (please specify)

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question

**Q2 What best describes your current living situation? Select the best fit.**



**Question options**


- Own home in Mercer Island
- Rent home in Mercer Island
- Rent home outside of Mercer Island
- Other (please specify)
- Own home outside of Mercer Island

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q3 How long have you lived in Mercer Island?**




**Question options**

- Over 20 years
- 11-20 years
- 5-10 years
- 3-4 years
- Less than 2 years
- I don't live in Mercer Island

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question

**Q4 What part of Mercer Island do you spend the most time in?**



**Question options**


- North-end: North of SE 40th Street
- Mid-Island: Between SE 40th & SE 68th Street
- South-end: South of SE 68 Street

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q5 What is your age? (optional)**



**Question options**


- Under 18
- 24 to 44
- 45 to 65
- 65 to 74
- Prefer not to answer
- 18 to 24

Optional question (81 response(s), 6 skipped)  
Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q6 Which of the following best describes your household income last year? (optional)**



**Question options**

- \$0 to \$19,999
- \$20,000-\$49,999
- \$50,000-\$89,999
- \$90,000-\$129,999
- \$130,000-\$149,000
- \$150,000-\$199,999
- \$200,000-\$279,999
- \$280,000-\$339,999
- \$340,000-\$399,999
- \$400,000+
- Prefer not to answer


*Optional question (86 response(s), 1 skipped)*

*Question type: Checkbox Question*





**Q7** What do you love most about Mercer Island? Pick your top three.



**Question options**

- Sense of community (caring neighbors, community, and cultural events)
- Quality public services
- Short commute time and access to employment
- Housing choices and prices
- Central location in the region
- Parks and recreation opportunities
- Safe place to live
- Good roads and travel corridors
- Other (please specify)

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))

Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q8 Mercer Island strives to be Puget Sound's most livable residential community. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree...**




Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Likert Question








**Q8** Mercer Island strives to be Puget Sound's most livable residential community.  
Please indicate whether you agree or disagree...
























**Q9 I plan to stay in my current Mercer Island home for:**




**Question options**

- I don't live in Mercer Island
- Unsure
- Over 20 years
- 11-20 years
- 5-10 years
- 3-4 years
- Less than 2 years

*Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question*



**Q10 Do you foresee a time when you may need to sell your home or move out of your home and leave Mercer Island due to one or mo...**



**Question options**

- Eviction or foreclosure
- Other (please specify)
- None of these
- Housing needs repairs I can't afford, or my landlord won't address
- Low quality of available housing
- Size or layout of available housing is not suitable for me or my family
- Housing not available in the areas I want to live
- High cost of renting a home
- Limited housing available that would allow me to upsize or downsize from where I currently reside
- High cost of owning a home

Optional question (87 response(s), 0 skipped)


Question type: Checkbox Question







**Q11** Within the next 20 years, what type(s) of housing could you see your household living in? Select up to three options.



**Question options**

- Triplex    ● Senior housing development
- Apartment or condominium located in a larger, mixed-use building (as found in the Town Center)
- Apartment or condominium in a smaller complex (five to twelve units)    ● Fourplex    ● Duplex    ● Cottage home
- ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) or backyard cottage    ● Townhome    ● Single family home retrofitted for aging in place
- Single family home

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q12 As you anticipate your housing needs and how they may change over the next 20 years, please indicate the importance of the ...**





Optional question (87 response(s), 0 skipped)  
Question type: Likert Question



**Q12** As you anticipate your housing needs and how they may change over the next 20 years, please indicate the importance of the ...


**Availability of different types of housing to purchase: Single family detached house, townhouse, apartment/condominiums to purchase within my price range**









**Proximity to Essential Amenities: Housing options within walking distance to the light rail station, bus stops, work, shopping, restaurants, schools**






**Housing Options in Commercial Areas: Housing in mixed-use areas with shopping or restaurants**













**Diversity of Housing Types Across Income Levels: Available of affordable housing for sale or rent across all income levels.**




2024 - 2044 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Survey : Survey Report for 30 April 2024 to 21 May 2024









**Off-Island Transportation Options: Housing located near convenient options to access off-island transportation.**








**Q13 As you envision middle housing development occurring in Mercer Island, what do you foresee being the most impactful?**




Optional question (87 response(s), 0 skipped)  
Question type: Likert Question





**Q13 | As you envision middle housing development occurring in Mercer Island, what do you foresee being the most impactful?**



















**Q14 Mercer Island is committed to fostering a more diverse range of housing options that are affordable to households at all in...**



**Question options**

- Allow Multifamily in C-O zone: Permit mixed-use and multifamily development in areas of the city zoned Commercial-Office (C-O) if they incorporate affordable housing units within the development.
- Town Center Focus: Concentrate the development of affordable housing units in Town Center zones by increasing the maximum allowable height for multifamily or mixed-use developments inclusive of affordable housing.
- Parking Requirement Reduction: Reduce parking requirements for affordable housing units.
- Fee Reduction for Affordable Units: Decrease or eliminate permit fees for developments with affordable housing units.
- Simplify Design Review: Simplify design review requirements and processes for multifamily and mixed-use developments that include affordable housing units.
- Bonuses for Affordable Housing: Allow height bonuses for developments that incorporate affordable housing units.
- Mandatory Inclusion in New Development: Require the inclusion of affordable housing units in all new multifamily or mixed-use development.
- Incentivize Affordable Housing Integration: Offer incentives that encourage the integration of affordable housing units within new construction.
- Develop Partnerships to Reduce Costs: Forge partnerships aimed at reducing the expenses associated with building and maintaining affordable housing in Mercer Island.
- Introduce Cost-Reduction Programs: Implement programs and incentives to lower the overall cost of building and preserving affordable housing.
- Streamline Permit Processes: Reduce permit review times and fees for new development that include affordable housing units.
- Support Proximity to Transit Hubs: Foster the development and preservation of affordable housing within walking distance of the Link Light Rail Station and the Mercer Island Transit Station.


Mandatory Question (87 response(s))

Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q15** What are some of the barriers that prevent you from using transportation modes other than driving alone? Choose all that ap...



**Question options**

- Other (please specify)
- Infrastructure (bike lanes, sidewalks, etc.)
- Transit coverage area
- Frequency of Service
- Safety
- Geography

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Checkbox Question





**Q16** A goal for traveling in the Central Puget Sound Region is to increase options so more people can safely choose walking, bik...



Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Likert Question






**Q16** | A goal for traveling in the Central Puget Sound Region is to increase options so more people can safely choose walking, bik...










**Increase public education programs about buses, light rail, and other transportation options, in conjunction with the opening of the Mercer Island light rail station**














2024 - 2044 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Survey : Survey Report for 30 April 2024 to 21 May 2024











**Q17 | As the City of Mercer Island strives to foster a robust economic environment and enhance the commercial areas to attract pe...**


OPTIONS	AVG. RANK
Attracting high-wage employers	4.28
Partnering with community organizations to market Mercer Island as a favorable place to do business	4.72
Developing a guide to doing business on Mercer Island to assist entrepreneurs in navigating city processes and finding additional resources for starting a new business	4.93
Conducting a food truck pilot program in the Town Center	5.22
Development of satellite offices and coworking spaces	5.39
Supporting the Chamber of Commerce to initiate a "Shop Mercer Island" marketing campaign aimed at attracting more people to the island's commercial areas	5.62
Facilitating a mentorship program to connect Island business owners, entrepreneurs, and retirees with individuals interested in starting a new business	5.79
Studying the feasibility of relocating City Hall facilities to the Town Center	6.08
Periodically distributing a business newsletter to local business owners and community organizations	6.33
Partnering with community organizations and developers to facilitate the construction of affordable housing for employees who commute to Mercer Island due to the unavailability of affordable housing on the island	6.63

*Mandatory Question (87 response(s))  
Question type: Ranking Question*





**Q18** What improvements and investments should the City of Mercer Island prioritize in the next 10 years? Please select your top three priorities from the list below:



**Question options**

- Other (please specify)
- Youth and Family Services –individual, couples, and family counseling, help with emergency rent, utilities assistance, access to food, senior services, etc.
- Transportation options – walking and bicycling paths
- Transportation options – increased transit access, improved bus service, protected bicycle lanes, etc.
- More sense of community (events, cultural awareness, etc.) ● Public safety
- Quality infrastructure (roads, sidewalks, streetlights, sewer, etc.)
- Design of buildings and public spaces (quality of materials, look of buildings, etc.) ● More variety of retail and other businesses
- Maintaining city services (police, fire, stormwater, water, sewer) ● Housing variety and affordability
- Protection of natural resources ● Parks and recreation opportunities ● Job opportunities and economic development

Mandatory Question (87 response(s))

Question type: Checkbox Question





Q19 | Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

Screen Name Redacted  
5/01/2024 07:47 PM

The proposed C-O zone should be for multi family housing and the city should not make it nearly impossible to build there because of the proximity to single family housing. More townhomes, condos, and affordable single family homes are needed. There is so much underutilized storefronts in the downtown core and the city needs to do more to attract businesses and make it easier to have a business on mercer island, it is sad to see it so empty.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/01/2024 08:31 PM

The recently passed housing legislation in WA state is absolutely bananas. It doesn't work for small suburban communities like ours, nor do we want to change our predominantly single family community into a crowded concrete jungle of high rise buildings, congested roadways and overtaxing our already aging infrastructure to allow for massive congestion. People move to MI for a reason and the cost to live here reflects that. Please don't ruin our beautiful haven by turning us into another ugly congested Seattle, Bellevue or Redmond.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/02/2024 04:46 PM

We love it here and are committed to staying here for my son's top notch education. We live in an apartment and have no chance of getting a condo here with HOA fees, etc. A small 2 bedroom condo that is affordable on a teacher's salary would be a game changer for us.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/03/2024 02:39 PM

please maintain single family neighborhood- limit density there- keep it in the town center

Screen Name Redacted  
5/04/2024 05:06 PM

I truly hope that Mercer Island continues to ground planning decisions on what is truly in the best interests for the overall community. Many of us moved here to be a safe place to raise our children. Let's keep Mercer Island that special place and not destroy it because folks got too greedy.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/05/2024 05:54 PM

Growth is necessary and inevitable, and we need some more affordable housing for those who otherwise have to commute - but PLEASE, keep the investments, safety, peace, and overall quality of life needs of those who have already lived and supported MI for years at the forefront of decisions made. There's no putting the toothpaste back in the tube once we've made these very important and impactful decisions. Over the past 10-15 years, there have been a number of





MI development decisions made that have weakened, rather than strengthened, our position and desirability relative to some of our neighboring cities. In many ways, MI is unique and it's difficult to compare. Residents would like to keep it that way, but for the right reasons, positive reasons. Not traffic/congestion, lack of parking and retail options, increased crime and noise pollution, cookie cutter neighborhoods lacking trees and open space, and a visually unappealing or uninviting town center.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/05/2024 05:58 PM

yes, on the economic survey -the whole scale, 1-10 was not available to choose. Some questions were limited to a couple of numbers which did not represent my choices.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/06/2024 07:28 AM

Develop a non biased survey - not aimed at density. Save the SFH neighborhoods.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/07/2024 10:05 AM

Please do not encourage multi-family housing development in the C-O zone. Traffic is already troublesome there and there are no public transit options. Keep multifamily development in and around the Town Center where it already exists and where public transportation options already are present. This concentration of housing in Town Center will support retail. Studying small-scale retail in residential zones is a horrible idea as retail needs density and single family neighborhoods along with parks are the allure of MI. Do not destroy our Single Family Neighborhoods chasing a pipe dream. It is okay that Mercer Island is a suburb and not an urban center. It is ok that it is a bedroom community with walkable, safe, single family neighborhoods with abundant tree cover.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/07/2024 01:25 PM

Keep the single-family characters and don't turn Mercer Island into Capitol Hill, where I moved from.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/07/2024 08:51 PM

As someone that has conducted surveys, I find that your paragraph about housing gap is non-objective and is pushing a progressive agenda. That is not good survey design and will likely skew/influence the results. In addition, studying small scale in single family neighborhoods is not something the city should be spending money on. Protecting our single family neighborhoods is key to the city's continued success and those neighborhoods are the majority of the island and why many moved here. Also, the CO zone by the JCC and French School already has bad traffic and no high speed transit options - it is NOT the place to encourage multifamily housing. Multifamily housing should be limited to the Town Center, existing





zones, and areas near the light rail - this will provide the density that will foster a revitalized retail environment.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/08/2024 06:07 PM

Increase density & height limits in the town center to increase housing supply and attract more businesses - and move city hall there rather than rebuilding it in place. Open up the rest of the island to higher density housing options, including ADUs and fourplexes, with reduced or eliminated parking minimums. Expand bike and walking paths and add shuttles to make it easy for people to get to transit without having to drive.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/09/2024 07:27 PM

The comprehensive plan must go farther on housing -- by adopting a limited, slow growth plan, we're harming the region by keeping housing prices high. If we allow more market-rate housing here, it will prevent gentrification and displacement in other areas. We should increase zoning beyond the minimum requirements mandated by the GMA and state legislation.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/09/2024 08:47 PM

Please restore lifeguards.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/10/2024 03:58 PM

Mercer Island's high value to me is totally associated with its uniform Single Family nature and its concomitant safety. The current Washington State assault on that (middle housing and other affordability mandates, and assault on Single family zoning broadly) is highly ideologically driven from the left. As a former planning manager for our largest city, I foresee ever increasing ideological pressure in that direction. I oppose this uniform mandate and our comprehensive plan should do everything to thwart these mandates and protect our current wonderful character. I have little faith that it will.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/10/2024 04:15 PM

Yes. My number one issue is we NEED more affordable housing. note, i don't want low income housing. I don't want rental assistance. i just want us to build more dense units downtown. Condos, townhouses, etc. The entry level house on Mercer Island shouldn't be \$2mn. There are reasons why our elementary school attendance is down. One big one is who can afford \$2+mn with young kids. Again, I'm not saying build low income housing. 2-3 bedroom condo units. \$1.2-1.5mn townhomes. People want to live here! approve buildings that work for Upper class families with young kids.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/10/2024 06:12 PM

There are too many car racing along the EMW during the summer time. Please make sure to police and issue tickets.





Screen Name Redacted  
5/10/2024 08:32 PM

Pretty much everything in question 18 should be on the list! Please make it easier to get around the island quickly.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 06:42 AM

Better street lighting coverage close to parks more pedestrian sidewalks Traffic lights on cross walks Stop increasing property taxes with double digits every year Distributed more funding in expanding tech and science education in public schools Attract more restaurants, family businesses offering kids services Offer more kids play and education programs options

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 12:11 PM

Mercer Island is a unique community positioned between two major cities. I would love to see a community plan that reflects inclusion, diversity and equitable solutions. We should be caring for all of our neighbors and be an inviting place for all (not just those who can afford to live here), and there are residents like myself who do want change in my own back yard. The housing crisis is real and as a community, we can be part of incremental change. Thank you for taking time to collect input from the residents.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 12:39 PM

Priority parking permits should be distributed to mercer island residents so they can use the parking facilities related to mass transit. It is too unpredictable to reliably use for commuting.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 12:46 PM

If there is a way to supporting housing for educators particularly those teaching at our schools that would have a strong positive multiplier on many aspects of Mercer island life.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 02:21 PM

More sidewalks

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 04:08 PM

Please gather as much research as possible about which strategies for affordable housing have measurable results. If a strategy hasn't been successful elsewhere we shouldn't try to make it work here.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/11/2024 05:51 PM

A vibrant walkable, bikeable city core, with restaurants, galleries, light retail, is the most important function the comprehensive plan can serve. That means re-striping streets to accommodate angle parking and bike lanes, widening sidewalks to accommodate outdoor seating for restaurants and trees and plantings to make for an attractive pedestrian environment. The current downtown core is decrepit.





1950s-era strip malls surrounded by parking lakes is not a pleasant walking environment. Think about pedestrian-only options and modern, mixed-use urbanism. Provide central public parking in place of every strip mall having its own lot. Create 10-minute loading zones to drop off or pickup small loads, like dry cleaning or quick service restaurants. Rezone retail core as mixed use and delete the at-grade parking lots. Require adequate underground or otherwise integrated parking for residential buildings, not at-grade parking lakes. Limit heights and massing of multistory buildings, and set back upper stories to not intimidate pedestrians or create canyons. Maintain open space in and around buildings. Provide more bike parking.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/12/2024 05:55 PM

Not everyone here has a multi-million dollar home and a Tesla, some of us are just getting by.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/12/2024 06:18 PM

There is very little available land for development of smaller homes. Of there are places that can infill smaller affordable homes that would be great.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/12/2024 06:24 PM

I am unhappy with the quality of this survey, particularly when I am required to choose options to complete questions when I am against all of the options. Particularly the question that required I endorse 5 housing options I opposed. Also question 17 required rankings and the software repeatedly rejected my rankings ....

Screen Name Redacted  
5/12/2024 08:04 PM

Bike lanes and pedestrian paths are really needed from Lakeridge Elem. all the way to the new light rail station! Currently, Bike lanes are hit and miss and veer off towards the high school- very dangerous for students on e-bikes and scooters. Don't stop the bike lane construction on mid-island like it is currently planned, continue the path all the way from Lakeridge elem to the new light rail station. Bike lane path should start at Lakeridge Elementary, go north past IMS, head east past the south end shopping center, north at Pioneer park on Island crest way, turn west onto 40th, then to north onto 80th Ave SE. We need a north to south bike/pedestrian path to connect all islanders. We desperately need a round-about at the pioneer park 4 way stop. With art in the middle of the round-about to welcome everyone to the south end. Plus, the south end doesn't have much public artwork, compared to the north end. Thank you for making Mercer Island a great community to live - both north, south east and west.

Screen Name Redacted

Implement climate action! Increase density in the town center,





5/12/2024 08:38 PM

accommodate multi-modal transportation options.

Screen Name Redacted

5/13/2024 08:34 AM

I strongly support improving bicycle infrastructure, including the ICW corridor and through the town center.

Screen Name Redacted

5/13/2024 09:20 AM

Focus on the basics, the very purpose of a city. Health, safety, & infrastructure. Clean water, clean streets, clean parks.

Screen Name Redacted

5/13/2024 02:31 PM

Please maintain the single-family zones. This includes trees and house to lot size. Please maintain parking minimums so cars don't park in the streets forcing kids and pedestrians into the street. Please don't rezone or develop our parks. The only place affordable housing makes any sense is in the town center, but even then with the cost of land and construction developers can't go below 80% AMI for affordable housing or they won't build. Increased density does not benefit existing residents. It only benefits builders, and strains our already strained infrastructure from water to sewer to roads to police to fire.

Screen Name Redacted

5/13/2024 05:21 PM

Yes, the rents are too high - both residential and retail. Older buildings should be grandfathered in, developers should not be allowed extra stories for nothing, and we don't want micro-housing or co-sharing opportunities anywhere on the island.

Screen Name Redacted

5/14/2024 08:39 AM

Town center development is a big challenge. We would like to have a better selection of retail, especially restaurant options. However, there is also a need for affordable housing and parking is severe problem. Lack of proper repair and maintenance in some existing apartment buildings in the town center is also a problem.

Screen Name Redacted

5/14/2024 09:56 AM

Yes, with regards to the questions in 17., I am sorry, but they all should get "10" on a scale, not make us have to put in a number in order of how important. What you are missing is the fact that we are losing so much commercial retail and restaurants and bars in the Town Center in exchange for multifamily residential buildings with no on-street parking which no-one wants and which goes against what we want. And the City are not listening to citizens even more, even with our filling out survey after survey. And there is a push for micro-housing and co-sharing housing, just make sure that there is something in The Comprehensive Plan which makes it that there is a limit on density. We want affordable housing, but not at the cost of making people live like sardines all packed into small units to make it







look like they are affordable.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/14/2024 01:19 PM

The biking community (including e-bikes and e-scooters) on Mercer Island is quite large. I'd like to see this group better represented when important planning decisions are made.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/14/2024 03:35 PM

Please do not destroy the single family neighborhoods of Mercer Island. That and its parks are what make it unique. Any mandated increase in density or creation of affordable units should be limited to the Town Center and existing multifamily areas and near the Light Rail Station. And for the love of God don't even entertain the idea of putting a parking garage in Mercerdale....that battle was already fought on Kite Hill - seriously!!!!

Screen Name Redacted  
5/14/2024 04:48 PM

I am concerned with the arrival of public transit to Mercer island that our Island will become less safe. Make sure this does not happen.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/14/2024 08:37 PM

This survey's wording leads to a bias toward a particular result. There is ambiguity of meaning in some groups of questions.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/16/2024 09:25 AM

Do not put the City Hall in Town Center. Putting the City Hall simply makes it more difficult for your customers to access City Hall and it displaces tax paying businesses with tax absorbing government there by transferring more tax burden on the SF residences there by making the Island less affordable.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/16/2024 02:02 PM

Yes engage with the community

Screen Name Redacted  
5/16/2024 03:33 PM

Section 17 is terrible. I don't want any time or money spent on ANY of these priorities, but I could not complete the survey without filling in all of the blanks. Finally I had to fill them in arbitrarily to get to through the survey. I think ALL of the results in section 17 are invalid for the reason that the results do not represent the true opinions of residents who do not want time or money spent on any of these options.

Screen Name Redacted  
5/16/2024 04:49 PM

The city should re-establish Citizen use of the Community Center without cost to citizen sponsors and users.

Screen Name Redacted

Completely tear down and rebuild CPD



2024 - 2044 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review Survey : Survey Report for 30 April 2024 to 21 May 2024



5/17/2024 11:37 AM

Screen Name Redacted

5/17/2024 12:11 PM

Please do nothing to change the character of the residential areas of the island. Don't reduce lot size, don't increase permissible impervious surface area, and do preserve trees and parks.

Screen Name Redacted

5/19/2024 09:55 PM

Allow homeowners to use more than 40% of their property to do home remodels. Please add sidewalks and please add street lights for safety purposes in neighborhoods

**Optional question** (47 response(s), 40 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question



Proposed amendments to the public hearing draft of the Comprehensive Plan

1. Transportation Element, Goal 12:

Promote bicycle and pedestrian networks that safely access and link commercial areas, residential areas, schools, ~~and~~ parks, and transit, within the City.

2. Land Use Element, text on page 5:

Beginning in 2022, the City began composing a Climate Action Plan. The Climate Action Plan establishes strategies for the City to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled to meet its adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals address climate change. Those strategies are an important step to move the City forward in its response to the changing climate. Where needed, goals and policies were amended or added to this Land Use Element to support the strategies in the Climate Action Plan, including amendments to the policies under goals 26, 27, and 28.

3. Housing Element Policy 1.4.M

1.4.M Neighborhoods in which environmental health hazards, including noise and light pollution, are minimized to the extent possible.

I proposed this policy in the Housing Work Group, which was included after I explained what it meant, but looking at it again, it would be better to not have a policy that doesn't come across easily, if you didn't have a career in environmental health, as I did. I think keeping the broad language is helpful for things that may come up in the future, but it would be more useful to include specific language as well in order to provide a policy basis for possible improvements in regards to light and noise pollution, which are problems now.

Here are several references to health impacts of exposure to light and noise pollution. I have mislaid reference to racial and income disparities in exposure to these source of pollution, but will forward prior to the meeting on May 29.

Here are references to health impacts of exposure to light pollution:

1. Dark Sky International quoting American Medical Association: "American Medical Association findings of an increasing body of scientific evidence that implicates exposure to blue-rich white light at night to increased risks for cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease."

<https://darksky.org/news/ama-report-affirms-human-health-impacts-from-leds/>

2. American Heart Association: "People continuously exposed to bright, artificial light at night may be at increased risk of developing conditions that affect blood flow to the brain and having a stroke

according to research published today in **Stroke**, the peer-reviewed scientific journal of the American Stroke Association, a division of the American Heart Association.”

<https://newsroom.heart.org/news/more-exposure-to-artificial-bright-outdoor-nighttime-light-linked-to-higher-stroke-risk>

Here are references to exposure to noise pollution:

1. Harvard Medicine: “They’ve shown that noise pollution not only drives hearing loss, tinnitus, and hypersensitivity to sound, but can cause or exacerbate cardiovascular disease; type 2 diabetes; sleep disturbances; stress; mental health and cognition problems, including memory impairment and attention deficits; childhood learning delays; and low birth weight. Scientists are investigating other possible links, including to dementia.”

<https://magazine.hms.harvard.edu/articles/noise-and-health>

2. EPA: “Noise pollution adversely affects the lives of millions of people. Studies have shown that there are direct links between noise and health. Problems related to noise include stress related illnesses, high blood pressure, speech interference, hearing loss, sleep disruption, and lost productivity. Noise Induced Hearing Loss (NIHL) is the most common and often discussed health effect, but research has shown that exposure to constant or high levels of noise can cause countless adverse health effects.”

<https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/clean-air-act-title-iv-noise-pollution>

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Carolyn Boatsman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 10:40 PM  
**To:** Adam Zack  
**Cc:** Alison Van Gorp  
**Subject:** Additional information re: light pollution and health effects

Hi Adam. Would you please pass on to Commissioners this additional reference re: light pollution? Thank you.

Commissioners: This reference describes how light pollution exposure is greater in poorer, non-white neighborhoods. This is easy to spot anecdotally when observing multifamily housing in mixed use areas. Most of Mercer Island's affordable housing is and will be located in the Town Center and Commercial Office Zone where the risk of light pollution is the greatest.

The policy language, however, is meant to highlight light pollution, in general, as an environmental health issue that may need attention.

<https://appliedsciences.nasa.gov/our-impact/story/brighter-neighborhoods-harm-human-health>



## Brighter Neighborhoods Harm Human Health | NASA Applied Sciences

A newly emerging field of study is connecting the bright lights of U.S. cities at night to poorer human health.

[appliedsciences.nasa.gov](https://appliedsciences.nasa.gov)

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Chris Goelz  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 1:54 PM  
**To:** Alison Van Gorp  
**Cc:** Adam Zack  
**Subject:** Re: 5/29 Agenda Packet timing

Hi Alison

I don't want to miss the deadline for submitting comments. So let's consider my draft F-3 submitted:

Try to mitigate through regulation any impacts of moderate density housing on traffic, on-street parking and pedestrian safety, especially in those areas close to transit.

Still open for suggestions. Just not sure when I'll be back on email.

Chris

---

**From:** Chris Goelz <Chris.Goelz@mercerisland.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 10:28 AM  
**To:** Alison Van Gorp <alison.vangorp@mercergov.org>  
**Subject:** Re: 5/29 Agenda Packet timing

Hi

Just a couple of typos if you think it's worth it --

in F-3 – "effecting" should be "affecting"

in F-6 – "commutes" should be "commuters"

Then there's this:

F-3: Identify regulations that can reduce the following impacts when establishing regulations for moderate density: • More people parking on neighborhood streets; • Traffic and parked cars effecting pedestrian safety; • Reduced parking requirements in areas close to transit causing more residents to park on the street; and • Loss of mature trees and landscaping when new development occurs

How about this instead?

Try to mitigate through regulation any impacts of moderate density housing on traffic, on-street parking and pedestrian safety, especially in those areas close to transit.

Any suggestions?

I'm thinking that the tree thing isn't really a thing. I don't have any reason to think that the new middle housing units will be bigger than the McMansions that we're currently building – so I don't see that they present a particular threat to mature trees. And I certainly don't think they should be encumbered with additional regulation re trees.

Thanks.  
Chris

---

**From:** Alison Van Gorp <[alison.vangorp@mercergov.org](mailto:alison.vangorp@mercergov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 24, 2024 4:16 PM  
**To:** Chris Goelz <[Chris.Goelz@mercerisland.gov](mailto:Chris.Goelz@mercerisland.gov)>  
**Cc:** Adam Zack <[adam.zack@mercerisland.gov](mailto:adam.zack@mercerisland.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: 5/29 Agenda Packet timing

Hi Chris – Happy to chat on Tuesday. I'm open 10-11 or 4-5.

-Alison

---

**From:** Chris Goelz <[Chris.Goelz@mercerisland.gov](mailto:Chris.Goelz@mercerisland.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 24, 2024 3:14 PM  
**To:** Alison Van Gorp <[alison.vangorp@mercergov.org](mailto:alison.vangorp@mercergov.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: 5/29 Agenda Packet timing

Hi Alison

I have a couple of questions about the process at the meeting. I'd like to see a softening on the parking mandates, but am trying to figure out if it's worth raising and, if it is, how best to do it. (Do you deal with the comment from WDFW that we should replace our making minimums with parking maximums?)

Maybe we can chat for a few minutes on Tuesday.

Thanks.  
Chris

---

**From:** Alison Van Gorp <[alison.vangorp@mercergov.org](mailto:alison.vangorp@mercergov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 17, 2024 4:30 PM  
**Subject:** 5/29 Agenda Packet timing

Planning Commissioners – I wanted to briefly follow up regarding the updated meeting schedule and timing of the next agenda packet. As you know, next Wednesday's meeting has been canceled. As such, the next packet will be for the 5/29 meeting, which we would typically send out by the end of next week. However, with the large volume of material that will be included in this packet, we are aiming to get it out as soon as possible to give you more time for review. We are working with our consultant teams

to complete the exhibits and we are planning to publish the packet by Tuesday at the latest. This will give you a full week in advance of the Public Hearing to review the materials. If you have questions during your review that you would like to discuss with staff prior to the hearing, please let us know. We can schedule one-on-one or small group meetings with commissioners if needed.

Thanks,  
Alison



**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Adam Ragheb  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 4, 2024 7:12 AM  
**To:** Adam Zack  
**Subject:** Re: Comments for Wednesday's Meeting Based on Received Public Comments

Hi Adam,

Thanks for the input and suggestions. Per your suggestions, I've reworded everything into a motion format. I've also attempted to split some things between revisions and findings. Please find my proposed motions below which can be considered to replace the comments distributed yesterday.

All proposed motions are based on public comments received for the 5/29 Public Hearing on the Transportation Element.

1. I move that we add to our findings: "Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.9 received two strong public comments. One comment mentioned the word socioeconomic as a possible alternative. During a brief discussion, it was brought up that key definitions related to this goal are not currently contained within the Comprehensive Plan document.
2. I move that we add to our findings: "Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.10 received three public comments asking that we note that off-street parking is important to families and those who are handicapped."
3. I move that we correct the phrase on Page 2, third paragraph from "The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I 90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists." to "The regional Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail runs along the I 90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists."
4. I move that we amend Transportation Element Policy 3.3 on Page 4 to add "and retain trees" per public comment. It currently reads "Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way." And as-amended would read "Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees and retain trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way."
5. I move that we add to our findings: "In relation to Transportation Element Policy Goal 12.4 on Page 10, the Council should consider this in conjunction with the trend of eBikes moving to personal ownership from organizational ownership since the technology's original inception and ensure no Sound Transit study efforts are being duplicated.
6. I move that we revise the second to last paragraph on Page 19 from "Link light rail runs through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. The light rail provides frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations." to "Link light rail is planned to run through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. It is planned for the light rail to provide frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.

7. I move that we revise the second to last paragraph of Page 21 of the Transportation element from “The Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays. A number of the users of this lot do not reside on the Island.” to “According to the Fourth Quarter 2017 Park and Ride Utilization Report prepared by King County, the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays although photographs and public testimony note that the lot is often less than full in 2024 post-COVID. A number of the users of this lot do not reside on the Island.”
8. I move that we revise the second paragraph of Page 23 from “The opening of the East Link light rail line provides an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations. “ to “The analysis assumes the opening of the East Link light rail line in 2023, which will result in an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.”

---

**From:** Adam Zack <adam.zack@mercerisland.gov>

**Sent:** Monday, June 3, 2024 10:27 AM

**To:** Adam Ragheb <adam.ragheb@mercerisland.gov>; Alison Van Gorp <alison.vangorp@mercergov.org>

**Subject:** RE: Comments for Wednesday's Meeting Based on Received Public Comments

Hi Adam,

Thanks for sending this in. I will forward your comments to the rest of the PC. A couple of suggestions for Wednesday:

- I recommend being prepared to propose each amendment by motion, like we did for Carolyn Boatsman’s amendments.
- Items labeled “goals” below are policies, so ideally you would phrase your motions something like “motion to amend Transportation Element *Policy X* as follows ...”
- If you’re proposing edits to other text within the element, please identify the page and line number from in the motion if possible. (“Motion to amend the Transportation Element text on page X, line X, as follows ...”) This will help keep the direction and record clear as to what should be amended.
- Other requests of staff such as drafting new or alternate language can be made by motion so they PC can indicate they are interested in a staff drafted alternative before we put time into preparing an alternative. The PC can then consider the staff draft at the next meeting.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or comments. See you on Wednesday!

Thanks,

**Adam Zack**

Senior Planner

City of Mercer Island – Community Planning and Development

206-275-7719 | [www.mercerisland.gov](http://www.mercerisland.gov)

*Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW).*

*The City of Mercer Island utilizes a hybrid working environment. Please see the City’s [Facility and Program Information](#) page for City service hours of operation.*

---

**From:** Adam Ragheb <adam.ragheb@mercerisland.gov>

**Sent:** Sunday, June 2, 2024 9:35 PM

To: Adam Zack <adam.zack@mercerisland.gov>; Alison Van Gorp <alison.vangorp@mercergov.org>

Subject: Comments for Wednesday's Meeting Based on Received Public Comments

Hello,

I've pasted my comments for Wednesday's meeting below (none on Utilities and Capital Facilities).

- Goal 4.9 -- Based on a public comment and a commenter's use of the word "socioeconomic," and absent a specific definition of a number of related terms from the city to be included in the documents and future code, I would like to see Staff propose language that uses the word "socioeconomic." It is more inclusive, less ambiguous, and appears to be closer to the intent of the King County Planning Policy guidance.
- Goal 4.10 – We received 3 out of 6-7 written public comments noting the importance of off-street parking for handicapped and families. Based on this and previous parking discussions, I propose the following new goal to immediately follow Goal 4.10 – "4.11 Address the needs of people who drive, either not by choice or required by circumstances (e.g., those working multiple jobs, persons with disabilities, families with children, and their passengers), in the development of programs and policy that relate to off-street parking."
- Based on a public comment, revise "The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs" to "The regional Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail." This is the terminology present on the official website
- Goal 2.6 – Add "and retain trees" per public comment
- Goal 12.4 – We received two written public comments on this that raised good points – we should discuss this as a Commission through the lens of eBikes moving to personal ownership from organizational ownership with the same shift in charging infrastructure. Also, weren't similar programs already studied by the City? What does Sound Transit do regarding studying this, if anything?
- Can Staff give a detailed answer/response to the public comment regarding Town Center Intersections? From what I recall this comment has popped up a number of times so I think we owe the member(s) of the public a definite response/clarification of intent.
- Per public comment let's revise "Link light rail runs through Mercer Island" to "Link light rail is planned to run through the Mercer Island." I know we discussed this as a Commission a while ago, but since then progress on the I-90 bridge has gone backward. Let's stick to facts in the narrative sections of the documents.
- A public comment stated that Park n Ride utilization numbers are "completely false" (their words, not mine). Let's refrain from removing the source of the data as it originally stood (the 2017 KC report). We also now have photographs showing and a statement articulating less than 100% utilization from a nearby resident who is quite active with providing public comment – we ought to acknowledge those data, dated 2024. As edited to remove the now 7-year old source of those data, the statement is misleading to the public.
- Public comment regarding keeping "analysis assumes the opening of the East Link" ought to be incorporated. When performing analyses it is important to note assumptions and this assumption is particularly important as it turned out to be incorrect. The wording as currently proposed states that the line is open on MI, which is patently false!

Thanks,

-Adam Ragheb

## Exhibit 3 – Public Comments Received as of June 7

<b>Log #</b>	<b>Received From</b>
<b>PUB-1</b>	Sarah Fletcher
<b>PUB-2</b>	Jeffrey Weisman
<b>PUB-3</b>	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior
<b>PUB-4</b>	John Hall
<b>PUB-5</b>	Sarah Fletcher
<b>PUB-6</b>	Sarah Fletcher
<b>PUB-7</b>	Sarah Fletcher
<b>PUB-8</b>	Daniel Thompson
<b>PUB-9</b>	Matthew Goldbach
<b>PUB-10</b>	Traci Granbois
<b>PUB-11</b>	Gary Robinson
<b>PUB-12</b>	Sarah Fletcher
<b>PUB-13</b>	Chris Goelz
<b>PUB-14</b>	Meg Lippert
<b>PUB-15</b>	Sarah Fletcher
<b>PUB-16</b>	Sarah Fletcher

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletcha1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 9:04 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate; Patrick Yamashita  
**Subject:** The Comprehensive Plan - Transport Element - My extensive comments  
**Attachments:** DSCN2451.JPG; DSCN2447.JPG; DSCN2453.JPG; DSCN2452.JPG; DSCN2446.JPG

Hello, first of all, may I remind you that you are not Transport experts.

Before I go into detail with regards to the Comprehensive Plan comments, someone needs to do something about the dangerous bike path on the sidewalk by the Park and Ride bus stop on the north side of North Mercer Way. Would someone like to let me know, who was responsible for the sloshed green paint signs on the sidewalk by the bus stops on the north side of North Mercer Way? I am sorry, but that was the most stupid thing anyone could have come up with.

Let me explain.

For the bicyclists and pedestrians coming from 80th Ave SE towards 77th Ave SE, there is a sign up which as a pedestrian makes it look like pedestrians must walk behind the bicyclists, then, as you enter the area by the bus stops, there are signs painted on the sidewalk which if one were to follow what is on the signs, it would have that the bicyclists are to ride in the center of the sidewalk going both eastbound and westbound. And then, coming from the other direction, just by the bike path, there is a sign which directs bicyclists to either use the bike path which leads from North Mercer Way to 24th St which route is what every bicyclist should be using, they should not be cycling on the sidewalk which is not marked as the green paint has rubbed off and by having the bicyclists ride on the sidewalk which is meant for pedestrians in the path where people are standing waiting for the bus is just stupid. No-one can read the signs on the sidewalk.

See photographs of what it is looking like. Pedestrians are getting shouted at by bicyclists and it is just a matter of time before there is an incident and normally, I ask that the City be protected should there be any accident, but in this instance, I hope there is an incident and I hope the City is sued for millions. That is the only thing that will teach them a lesson as my emails to date have gone on deaf ears.

I have gone through the document and I will add my comments.

For the life of me, "Mountains to Sound Trail," for a start, it is Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust which is what they do:

"The Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust is a coalition-based organization that leads and inspires action to conserve and enhance this special landscape, ensuring a long-term balance between people and nature." It is meaningless. Please remove it from page 2:

I do not believe owns any property on Mercer Island and they don't provide any trails whatsoever on Mercer Island.

~~the vision and development of the Town Center. The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I-90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.~~

And please remove this: The Temple Herzl, for example, want to build a building and not provide one parking, not one, but have shared parking with the synagogue and the French American School, is that what we want? No, we do not want shared parking, so remove this goal:

- 1.2 Encourage businesses and residential areas to explore opportunities for shared parking and other parking management strategies.

I have absolutely no idea what you mean by this, would you like to give an example:

- 2.6 Prioritize transportation investments in the Town Center that promote mixed-use and compact development and provide multi-modal/multimodal access to regional transit facilities.

And I want you to add the wording "and retain trees" to read: "Encourage programs that retain trees encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of rights-of-way."

3.3 Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.

And would someone like to explain how anyone thinks that you could build a parking lot which would be for Mercer Islanders only. I don't know if you are aware, but pre-covid, Sound Transit were offering permits for people to park in the Park and Ride for \$120 a month on a first come, first serve basis. It was not exclusive to Mercer Islanders. Business is business and if someone from Bellevue, for example, wanted to purchase a permit for the MI Park and Ride, how do you think you are going to tell them that it is "for Mercer Islanders only?" It is not, so take this language out.

4.4 Investigate opportunities for operating, constructing and/or financing park and ride lots for Mercer Island residents only.

And why are you wasting our money on this? Light rail is Sound Transit's project, not Mercer Island's project, if they want to make it safe to get to their light rail (that is even if it should work), let them study opportunities and besides, it is up to WSDOT to approve, so take this out:

4.6 Study opportunities to provide innovative last-mile solutions serving the Town Center, light rail station, and park and ride.

And just remove this section. This is up to Metro King County. All you need to say is that Metro, Sound Transit and the City will look at various transportation options, that should be good enough:

4.9 Implement transportation programs and projects that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups.

I have never heard of the Eastside Partnership, King County Metro are the ones who schedule the bus routes, so shouldn't you be coordinating planning with them?

5.5 Work with the participants of the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) to coordinate transportation planning for the Eastside subarea.

And what on earth do you mean by this?:

6.2 Develop strategies to manage property access along arterial streets in order to preserve their function.

And again, this is up to Sound Transit, not the City of MI, let ST study opportunities:

4.2-4.12.4 Study opportunities to expand electric bicycle facilities that serve the Town Center, light rail station, and park and ride.

I have never heard of a Level of Service for pedestrians. What on earth do you mean by this?:

12.56 Prioritize areas near schools and commercial areas for a higher level of service for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.

AND FINALLY, IT HAS TAKEN ME 5 YEARS TO GET YOU TO CORRECT THE INFORMATION WITH REGARDS TO THIS:

You had 80th Ave SE and North Mercer Way and 77th Ave SE and North Mercer Way as being "Town Center Intersections" which they never were, but you refused to correct it, and finally, you have to make the heading Town Center and Adjacent Town Center with an LOS of C which is all I wanted you to do.

Table 1. 2018 Existing Intersection Operations

Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
<b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b>		
SE 24th St/76th Ave SE	B	B
N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE	A	A
N Mercer Way/Park & Ride/80th Ave SE	C	C

And there is an assumption that light rail will work, but it is not a given. The first engineering company who were asked to look at light rail on the I-90 bridge said it wouldn't work which was not what Sound Transit wanted to hear so fired that engineering company, so do not make out that light rail "runs through", we don't know yet if it will be operational, plus I have never heard of the buses deemed "fixed route service"

Link light rail runs through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. The light rail provides frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.

Local fixed route service operates on the arterial roadway system, and provides public transit service connecting residential and activity areas.

And I am sorry, but this is COMPLETELY FALSE:

~~According to the Fourth Quarter 2017 Park and Ride Utilization Report prepared by King County, the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays. A number of the users of this lot do not reside on the Island.~~

The Mercer Island Park and Ride is not full at all, not at all and certainly not "typically fully occupied. Since covid, you can always get parking, so please remove that statement. I live right opposite and keep monitoring the Park and Ride. If you want photos of any given day after 9am, i can provide them to you to show you the empty parking lot.

I don't know for the rest of the parking lots, but please amend this from 100% to 50% occupied:

**Table 2: Mercer Island Park and Ride Locations and Capacities**

Lot	Location	Capacity	Cars Parked	% Spaces Occupied
Mercer Island Park and Ride	8000 N Mercer Way	447	447	100%

And keep the wording "analysis assumes the opening of the East Link", we don't know if it is going to actually work:

~~The analysis assumes the opening of the East Link light rail line in 2023, which will result in providing an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.~~

And none of these two projects should be done if there is going to be a lot of construction in the Town Center because all those construction trucks are going to damage the roadway:

ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)
<b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b>				
NM-1	80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP136)	1,376,000
NM-2	78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP137)	779,488

And I am getting annoyed. I have told you dozens of times that it is not up to the City of Mercer Island to remove the bus bay and to widen the trail, it is not your project, nor are you transport experts, not to mention it is a lot of money. And like I keep telling you, having bicyclists on the sidewalk no matter how wide is a disaster and it is just a matter of time before there is an accident. Who can make it that the signs tell bicyclists to use the bike trail leading to 24th St to 84th Ave SE and to not have bicyclists riding on the sidewalk which by definition is for pedestrians, not bicyclists?

NM-8	North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements	Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.	2023-2028 TIP (SP144)	1,203,081
------	---	--	-----------------------	-----------

And I am sorry, but the trees are not damaged adjacent to Mercerdale Park:

NM-10	SE 32nd St Sidewalk Replacement (77th Ave SE - 78th Ave SE)	Replace sidewalk and trees adjacent to Mercerdale Park due to tree damage.	2023-2028 TIP (SP147)	324,719
-------	---	--	-----------------------	---------

And as a pedestrian, putting a traffic light at the intersection of 28th Ave SE and 80th Ave SE is going to be the worst possible thing, not to mention that it is not going to work and it is going to cause more backups so please remove this, not to mention the high costs. And what about the plan to make a one-way street where Tully's is? Some new person in the city came up with the terrible idea to get rid of a section of Greta Hackett park in order to add parking, what is happening with that plan? So in addition to your



wanting to add a traffic signal there, you want to add a one-way street next to the traffic light, how is going to look and how will it work?

I-2	<u>SE 28th St/80th Ave SE</u>	<u>Install traffic signal.</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Transportation</u> <u>Impact Fee (#1)</u>	<u>1,464,000</u>
-----	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------

And I don't understand, there is already a turn lane which has a left-turn light, so why are you spending all this money when there is already a left turning lane? Please explain:

I-3	<u>80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way</u>	<u>Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Transportation</u> <u>Impact Fee (#14)</u>	<u>754,000</u>
-----	-------------------------------------	---	---	----------------

And this is a WSDOT issue, not a MI issue and I don't understand how you could make it an "exclusive westbound left turn lane"

I-4	<u>North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way</u>	<u>Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Transportation</u> <u>Impact Fee (#15)</u>	<u>650,000</u>
-----	--	---	---	----------------

And you need to figure out the coordination and synchronization with WSDOT and with the City of MI. This is what I have observed. When the intersection leading from 27th St onto the I-90 going westbound is clogged, drivers are instead using the 28th St and Island Crest Way intersection to get onto the I-90 clogging up 28th St. Who is responsible for the synchronization and what happens if you come up with the traffic light at 27th St and 80th Ave SE and it makes the traffic conditions worse and more dangerous for pedestrians? What is the backup plan? Would you revert it back to a stop street?

R-2	<u>Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way – SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.</u>	<u>Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Transportation</u> <u>Impact Fee (#11)</u>	<u>690,000</u>
-----	---	--	---	----------------











**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Jeffery Weisman <jeffery.weisman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 10:18 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** The Public Hearing Comments on Select Comprehensive Plan Element

Hello Planning Commissioners,

I have read the draft Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review documents on MI's Let's Talk page and wish to submit the following comments on some of the elements for the 5/29 Public Hearing:

**Transportation**

Goal 4.9 - Was this specifically required by the new housing bills passed as law by the State? If I recall correctly, this came out of the King County Planning Policies document, which is \*guidance,\* not law. Please strike "Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color" from this goal. Differentiating programs and how we treat others based solely on skin color is racism and suggests that people are less well-off based solely on the color of their skin. Differentiating programs and resources based on needs relating to income or disability status is a good thing and is proper. Racism is not. Additionally, as a member of the Jewish community in this post-10/7 world, I am disappointed with the goal as-proposed, as it explicitly excludes the Jewish Community, among many others.

Goal 4.10 - Please articulate that off-street parking is a significant issue (read essentially necessary) for handicapped persons and families.

Goal 5.4 - Change equity to equality

Goal 7.3 - Nice idea, likely impossible unfortunately

Goal 12.4 - Post-COVID, e-bikes have really gravitated from rentals or city-owned to personally-owned. We should deploy city money in a more impactful way than this

Goal 14.6 - This was already studied. Surely there are better uses of city money post-COVID

**Housing**

Goal 1.7 - Remove this in its entirety. It is incompatible with Goal 1.9 and Goal 16.5 of the Land Use Element. It makes no sense to disperse affordable housing across the Island - access to existing high capacity transit is essential (i.e., locate it in the Town Center) and access to retail is a very good-to-have. Goal 1.9 – Housing choices for those earning lower wages should also be located in close proximity to retail.

Goal 1.10 - Change "encourage" to "continue to allow." ADUs are already allowed. Encouraging them implies financial incentives or regulation / permitting relief - we should let the market determine if ADUs need to be built and not create the justification for using City dollars to provide landlord incentives relating to ADUs.

Goal 2.1 - We shouldn't support construction near planned things, only ones that already exist; if a plan were to fall through or experience a multi-year delay, there is no benefit (except to developers) to encourage allegedly compatible construction next to it.

Goal 2.2.C - Revise "build and preserve affordable housing" to "renovate and preserve preexisting affordable housing." This is an important anti-displacement measure that should not be overlooked.

Goal 2.5.H - This is a \*bad\* one if you think about it; a cursory reading of this sounds good. It can be used to waive \*any\* building regulations not related to health and safety if marketed as income restricted

housing - Gross Floor Area Ratio, permeable surface, height/floor limits, facade height, parking requirements, and property line offset requirements, to name a few.

Goal 3.2 - This is purely performative - please remove it; if anything, talking about something fosters inaction on the topic as people can say they've done something (by only adding a sentence or two)

Goal 4.2.B - Who pays for this Relocation assistance? The city? The landlord? If the latter, that cost will indirectly be passed on to renters. Please remove this as implementation can be messy and will inevitably add bureaucracy and costs to all.

Goal 5.1.D - Please revert this to the original as proposed by the Housing Working Group. Unnecessarily is a qualitative definition and is subject to broad interpretation.

### **Economic Development Element**

Page 5, Lines 14-18 - See comment below. Remove "are more likely to choose not to own a car and" from Line 15...this is a postulation backed up by zero facts and a counterexample is presented in the following comment.

Page 12, Lines 16-20 - Residents of less expensive, multifamily housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend," "sports," or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership. Also, change "will be more likely to shop locally" to "may be more likely to shop locally" - this makes the statement consistent with Line 16 on Page 5 (i.e., it is a "may," not a "will.")

Page 12, Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?

Page 12, Line 17. Reword to read "Recent state legislation mandates encouraging" from "Recent legislation will encourage" We have no clue if the laws will work to encourage development, especially in such a high-cost part of the area as our city; it, however, is fact that state legislation has mandated encouraging, so lets state the facts, not the stated intent of the laws.

Goal 7.6 - Remove this entire goal. Small scale retail development "outside the existing commercial districts" is an under-the-radar method of saying "inside the residential zones" and is a bad idea. Living next to a 7-11, gas station, or pot shop would be a nightmare and is incompatible with our existing community. It is well-accepted that in US suburbs, retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale"

### **Land Use**

Overall - Do not remove mentions of "single family," "single-family" or permutations thereof. Except for Goal 16 on Page 23...achieving additional capacity in Town Center and multifamily zones should receive preference to single-family zones.

Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island \*is\* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable and bikeable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.



Goal 15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. A residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered as that "character" is less-pronounced and the amount of the city changed is smaller than that of our single-family neighborhoods and their special character.

Goal 15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMA requirements and/or statewide housing legislation

Goal 15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.

Goal 15.5 - This should be reverted enough to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element

Goal 16.5 - I like the preference to areas near HCT as it makes sense

Goal 17.3 - Please revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." This policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone appears to have been added at the last minute.

Goal 27.6.4 – Remove this goal, also added at the last minute. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element).

Warmest regards,

Jeff Weisman

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Alceu Spencer Peres Júnior <alceus1957@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 2:26 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate  
**Subject:** Comments to Comprehensive Plan Review

To whom it may concern,

Please see below my comments to tonight's public hearing. Thank you!

*Housing Element*

2.1: Only support construction near existing infrastructure. Plans change and large projects are inevitably delayed and sometimes cancelled.

2.2.C: From an environmental point of view, it is preferable to preserve and update affordable housing than to build new – you lose trees, discard building materials, need to cut down new wood for lumber, and concrete is very energy-intensive to produce. New “affordable” housing will be more expensive and contributes to displacement...update this goal accordingly.

2.5.H: Delete this. Building a six story box with no yard, no trees, and no permeable surfaces could be done with this goal as a justification. Having grass, having trees, having a short building, and having permeable surfaces can be considered to be non-safety related.

1.7: Get rid of this – it is inconsistent with the goal two steps down from it. Also dispersing makes it harder to benefit from existing transit options or makes it necessary to significantly grow the size and cost (and reduce the efficiency of) transit offerings.

1.9: Close to retail offerings is also an important thing to add

1.10: Encourage to me implies incentives which are usually financial or reduced permit review. We already have ADUs permitted by code, so let's just keep allowing them

5.1.D: The Housing Working Group-suggested language is preferable to what the Planning Commission came up with – trust the experience of the City Council members and go back to their words.

*Land Usage Element*

15.1: This should be going back to the original language "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. The change “All residential zones” weakens the goal in this paragraph. Single-family zones will be the most affected by not preserving the character – they have the most neighborhood character and this is a good thing. It is over 67% of our city and it looks like the goal of this recent revision is to destroy it.

15.5: As noted below, data in this plan says we have a single-family city..... Protect that, this unique to MI and develop the town center as needed since there is less character there" See again Table 2 of Housing Element

17.3: Undo the recent changes to this – what you had as a Commission a few months ago was just fine. This recent revision no longer protects residential areas from the likely-to-be expanded allowed uses in the Commercial Office zone.

Overall comment: it looks like your goal as a Commission/planning department is to remove the single-family character of our city. Is there a reason for that beyond ideology? That is the reason why people move here – Seattle is right across the bridge if you want density and less character.

- Please keep "single family," "single-family" or permutations thereof. Except for Goal 16 on Page 23...achieving additional capacity in Town Center and multifamily zones should receive preference to single-family zones.

Heading 15: delete "moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island \*is\* a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area). Like mentioned above, there is no reason to change that. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable and bikeable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.

27.6.4: Delete this in its entirety. We already have one of the lowest GFARs in the region. If I recall correctly, to explain why they supported this, a Commissioner mentioned that they know of families around the world that live in 2,000 sqft apartments; Mercer Island is not Hong Kong, London, or Tokyo. It is a suburb of a midsize US city that consists of at least 67% single family homes. There are many options across both bridges for smaller apartment or middle housing units that arguably are more convenient due to their proximity to existing transit, retail, and jobs.

#### *Economic Dev. Element*

Starting at line 16 on pp. 12: It is incorrect that car ownership is less likely in less expensive and/or multi-family housing. This assertion is false and should be removed.

(same location): there is nothing about housing on Mercer Island that is "priced in the middle range". Stick to the words used by Olympia – Middle Housing. It is about the size/capacity of the housing, not the cost.

Housing priced in the middle range could be Renton Highlands, Preston, or South Everett

7.6: Get rid of the goal. This is precisely why we have zoning. There are residential areas, there are commercial districts, there are mixed use areas, etc. "Studying" retail outside of districts that are zoned for commercial (and mixed use) breaks the residential zoning that makes Mercer Island so livable and unique for those who wish to live away from retail. This amounts to studying removal of residential-only zoning and should be avoided (beyond the small-scale home offices/business already allowed by code)

#### *Transportation Element*

4.9: This is really a socioeconomic issue and not a race issue as one Commissioner mentioned in a recent meeting. Injecting race into this goal muddies the water and diverges from the intent (helping those who need help through extra programs and resource allocation). As a person who would qualify as BIPOC, I also find that aspect of this goal to be quite patronizing.

4.10: Three Commissioners have noted in some form that guaranteed parking off of a street is necessary for families and those who are handicapped – these are solid points and important to note here

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** JOHN HALL <velooce@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 2:44 PM  
**To:** Alison Van Gorp; Planning Commission; Jessi Bon; Salim Nice; Jake Jacobson; Lisa Anderl  
**Cc:** John Hall  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Special Hybrid Meeting, Wed, May 29, 2024

Dear Planning Commission & CPD

I am sending this email because I have family obligations and cannot attend this meeting. I can't explain how disappointed I am in this process. Right before a holiday weekend, you send out a huge amount of information (which I'm sure no one has had a chance to completely digest) as well as this suggestion to change the CUP to commercial zoning which works against our neighborhoods. We have already seen how that worked with the CFZ, when the city spent half a million dollars to try to push the illegal spot zone. This behavior caused 6 neighbors to be overwhelmed trying to protect their homes and the tranquility of a quiet neighborhood, and ultimately, they left. Their frustration was the result of having to deal with 4 years of planning commission and council meetings, when they should be simply enjoying their family and children. All of this for a special interest. Residential zoning is designed to protect neighborhoods. This type of activity is abusive, and here we go once again, having our neighborhood left to defend ourselves.

Regards,

John Hall

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 1:31 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Plan Update Your housing units are way off

Hello, if you look at how many housing units you have down, when the Cty had an analysis done in 2021, they have more units than you have.

On page 2 of this: [Microsoft Word - 2024-05-20 Public Hearing\\_DRAFT LAND USE ELEMENT.docx \(usgovcloudapi.net\)](#)

Between 2001 and 2007, 510 new housing units, and 115,922 square feet of commercial area were constructed in the Town Center. Between 2007 and August 2014, 360 new housing units, and 218,015 square feet of new commercial area were constructed.

[CAI.Mercer Island Town Center Economic Analysis Summary Memorandum 2021 0406.pdf \(mercergov.org\)](#)

It has that 1,210 units were created:

**Multifamily**

**Exhibit 7** illustrates the change in Mercer Island's Town Center multifamily inventory since 2000. Inventory, as measured by units, has increased by 375 units since 2010 (from 835 to 1,210).

And Mercer Island's population has decreased by 1010 since 2020, so that needs to be discussed.

Sarah Fletcher

**Adam Zack**

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 1:38 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate; Patrick Yamashita  
**Subject:** Re: The Comprehensive Plan - Transport Element - My extensive comments  
**Attachments:** DSCN2456.JPG; DSCN2455.JPG; DSCN2457.JPG; DSCN2454.JPG

Hello, I just took some photographs from the P&R, it is not full. See attached.

On Tue, May 28, 2024 at 9:04 PM Sarah Fletcher <[fletchsa1@gmail.com](mailto:fletchsa1@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello, first of all, may I remind you that you are not Transport experts.

Before I go into detail with regards to the Comprehensive Plan comments, someone needs to do something about the dangerous bike path on the sidewalk by the Park and Ride bus stop on the north side of North Mercer Way. Would someone like to let me know, who was responsible for the sloshed green paint signs on the sidewalk by the bus stops on the north side of North Mercer Way? I am sorry, but that was the most stupid thing anyone could have come up with.

Let me explain.

For the bicyclists and pedestrians coming from 80th Ave SE towards 77th Ave SE, there is a sign up which as a pedestrian makes it look like pedestrians must walk behind the bicyclists, then, as you enter the area by the bus stops, there are signs painted on the sidewalk which if one were to follow what is on the signs, it would have that the bicyclists are to ride in the center of the sidewalk going both eastbound and westbound. And then, coming from the other direction, just by the bike path, there is a sign which directs bicyclists to either use the bike path which leads from North Mercer Way to 24th St which route is what every bicyclist should be using, they should not be cycling on the sidewalk which is not marked as the green paint has rubbed off and by having the bicyclists ride on the sidewalk which is meant for pedestrians in the path where people are standing waiting for the bus is just stupid. No-one can read the signs on the sidewalk.

See photographs of what it is looking like. Pedestrians are getting shouted at by bicyclists and it is just a matter of time before there is an incident and normally, I ask that the City be protected should there be any accident, but in this instance, I hope there is an incident and I hope the City is sued for millions. That is the only thing that will teach them a lesson as my emails to date have gone on deaf ears.

I have gone through the document and I will add my comments.

For the life of me, "Mountains to Sound Trail," for a start, it is Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust which is what they do:

"The Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust is a coalition-based organization that leads and inspires action to conserve and enhance this special landscape, ensuring a long-term balance between people and nature." It is meaningless. Please remove it from page 2:

I do not believe owns any property on Mercer Island and they don't provide any trails whatsoever on Mercer Island.

~~the vision and development of the Town Center. The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I-90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.~~

And please remove this: The Temple Herzl, for example, want to build a building and not provide one parking, not one, but have shared parking with the synagogue and the French American School, is that what we want? No, we do not want shared parking, so remove this goal:

- 1.2 Encourage businesses and residential areas to explore opportunities for shared parking and other parking management strategies.

I have absolutely no idea what you mean by this, would you like to give an example:

- 2.6 Prioritize transportation investments in the Town Center that promote mixed-use and compact development and provide ~~multi-modal~~ multimodal access to regional transit facilities.

And I want you to add the wording "and retain trees" to read: "Encourage programs that retain trees and encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of rights-of-way."

- 3.3 Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.

And would someone like to explain how anyone thinks that you could build a parking lot which would be for Mercer Islanders only. I don't know if you are aware, but pre-covid, Sound Transit were offering permits for people to park in the Park and Ride for \$120 a month on a first come, first serve basis. It was not exclusive to Mercer Islanders. Business is business and if someone from Bellevue, for example, wanted to purchase a permit for the MI Park and Ride, how do you think you are going to tell them that it is "for Mercer Islanders only?" It is not, so take this language out.

- 4.4 Investigate opportunities for operating, constructing and/or financing park and ride lots for Mercer Island residents only.

And why are you wasting our money on this? Light rail is Sound Transit's project, not Mercer Island's project, if they want to make it safe to get to their light rail (that is even if it should work), let them study opportunities and besides, it is up to WSDOT to approve, so take this out:

- 4.6 Study opportunities to provide innovative last-mile solutions serving the Town Center, light rail station, and park and ride.

And just remove this section. This is up to Metro King County. All you need to say is that Metro, Sound Transit and the City will look at various transportation options, that should be good enough:

- 4.9 Implement transportation programs and projects that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups.

I have never heard of the Eastside Partnership, King County Metro are the ones who schedule the bus routes, so shouldn't you be coordinating planning with them?

- 5.5 Work with the participants of the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) to coordinate transportation planning for the Eastside subarea.

And what on earth do you mean by this?:

- 6.2 Develop strategies to manage property access along arterial streets in order to preserve their function.

And again, this is up to Sound Transit, not the City of MI, let ST study opportunities:

- ~~4.12.4~~ Study opportunities to expand electric bicycle facilities that serve the Town Center, light rail station, and park and ride.

I have never heard of a Level of Service for pedestrians. What on earth do you mean by this?:

- ~~12.56~~ Prioritize areas near schools and commercial areas for a higher level of service for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.

AND FINALLY, IT HAS TAKEN ME 5 YEARS TO GET YOU TO CORRECT THE INFORMATION WITH REGARDS TO THIS:

You had 80th Ave SE and North Mercer Way and 77th Ave SE and North Mercer Way as being "Town Center Intersections" which they never were, but you refused to correct it, and finally, you have to make the heading Town Center and Adjacent Town Center with an LOS of C which is all I wanted you to do.

Table 1. 2018 Existing Intersection Operations

Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
<b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b>		
SE 24th St/76th Ave SE	B	B
N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE	A	A
N Mercer Way/Park & Ride/80th Ave SE	C	C

And there is an assumption that light rail will work, but it is not a given. The first engineering company who were asked to look at light rail on the I-90 bridge said it wouldn't work which was not what Sound

Transit wanted to hear so fired that engineering company, so do not make out that light rail "runs through", we don't know yet if it will be operational, plus I have never heard of the buses deemed "fixed route service"

Link light rail runs through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. The light rail provides frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.

Local fixed route service operates on the arterial roadway system, and provides public transit service connecting residential and activity areas.

And I am sorry, but this is COMPLETELY FALSE:

According to the Fourth Quarter 2017 Park and Ride Utilization Report prepared by King County, the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays. A number of the users of this lot do not reside on the Island.

The Mercer Island Park and Ride is not full at all, not at all and certainly not "typically fully occupied. Since covid, you can always get parking, so please remove that statement. I live right opposite and keep monitoring the Park and Ride. If you want photos of any given day after 9am, i can provide them to you to show you the empty parking lot.

I don't know for the rest of the parking lots, but please amend this from 100% to 50% occupied:

**Table 2: Mercer Island Park and Ride Locations and Capacities**

Lot	Location	Capacity	Cars Parked	% Spaces Occupied
Mercer Island Park and Ride	8000 N Mercer Way	447	447	100%

And keep the wording "analysis assumes the opening of the East Link", we don't know if it is going to actually work:

The analysis assumes the opening of the East Link light rail line in 2023, which will result in provides an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.

And none of these two projects should be done if there is going to be a lot of construction in the Town Center because all those construction trucks are going to damage the roadway:

ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)
<b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b>				
NM-1	80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP136)	1,376,000
NM-2	78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP137)	779,488

And I am getting annoyed. I have told you dozens of times that it is not up to the City of Mercer Island to remove the bus bay and to widen the trail, it is not your project, nor are you transport experts, not to mention it is a lot of money. And like I keep telling you, having bicyclists on the sidewalk no matter how wide is a disaster and it is just a matter of time before there is an accident. Who can make it that the signs tell bicyclists to use the bike trail leading to 24th St to 84th Ave SE and to not have bicyclists riding on the sidewalk which by definition is for pedestrians, not bicyclists?

NM-8	North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements	Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.	2023-2028 TIP (SP144)	1,203,081
------	---	--	-----------------------	-----------

And I am sorry, but the trees are not damaged adjacent to Mercerdale Park:

NM-10	SE 32nd St Sidewalk Replacement (77th Ave SE - 78th Ave SE)	Replace sidewalk and trees adjacent to Mercerdale Park due to tree damage.	2023-2028 TIP (SP147)	324,719
-------	---	--	-----------------------	---------

And as a pedestrian, putting a traffic light at the intersection of 28th Ave SE and 80th Ave SE is going to be the worst possible thing, not to mention that it is not going to work and it is going to cause more backups so please remove this, not to mention the high costs. And what about the plan to make a one-



way street where Tully's is? Some new person in the city came up with the terrible idea to get rid of section of Greta Hackett park in order to add parking, what is happening with that plan? So in addition to your wanting to add a traffic signal there, you want to add a one-way street next to the traffic light, how is that going to look and how will it work?

I-2	<u>SE 28th St/80th Ave SE</u>	<u>Install traffic signal.</u>	<u>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)</u>	<u>1,464,000</u>
-----	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------

And I don't understand, there is already a turn lane which has a left-turn light, so why are you spending all this money when there is already a left turning lane? Please explain:

I-3	<u>80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way</u>	<u>Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.</u>	<u>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)</u>	<u>754,000</u>
-----	-------------------------------------	---	---	----------------

And this is a WSDOT issue, not a MI issue and I don't understand how you could make it an "exclusive westbound left turn lane"

I-4	<u>North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way</u>	<u>Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.</u>	<u>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)</u>	<u>650,000</u>
-----	--	---	---	----------------

And you need to figure out the coordination and synchronization with WSDOT and with the City of MI. This is what I have observed. When the intersection leading from 27th St onto the I-90 going westbound is clogged, drivers are instead using the 28th St and Island Crest Way intersection to get onto the I-90 clogging up 28th St. Who is responsible for the synchronization and what happens if you come up with the traffic light at 27th St and 80th Ave SE and it makes the traffic conditions worse and more dangerous for pedestrians? What is the backup plan? Would you revert it back to a stop street?

R-2	<u>Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way – SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.</u>	<u>Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.</u>	<u>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)</u>	<u>690,000</u>
-----	---	--	---	----------------









**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 5:18 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate; Council; Jeff Thomas; Adam Zack; Alison Van Gorp  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Plan Update - PSE

Hello, I am sorry, but I have not had enough time to review anything except the Transportation Element. I have glanced at a few of the other documents, but I need more time.

Just with regards to the survey, [ITEM-Attachment-001-cc036cc685874e0b85e0d600574bfc59.pdf](https://usgovcloudapi.net/ITEM-Attachment-001-cc036cc685874e0b85e0d600574bfc59.pdf) ([usgovcloudapi.net](https://usgovcloudapi.net))

I am sorry, but what PSE wants is so against any of our values when they want to add transmission lines to the Eastside. Look up "Energize Eastside," which is they want to shove massive transmission lines [Overview - Energize Eastside EIS](#)

Please see the video. It is a massive detriment to the environment:

I hope that you will make sure that Mercer Island will not receive their electricity through this Energize Eastside power lines. This is what they are asking for, please make sure that Mercer Island will not be behind this grid infrastructure, we don't want a part of it and you certainly won't be expediting any local permitting, that would be nuts to do so:

**Policy 8 - Grid Infrastructure**

Expedite the local permitting and approval process in order to maintain grid capacity and reliability. [Land Use Element]

**PSE Programs**

New regional transmission lines are needed to serve new utility scale clean energy resources, such as wind and solar.

New local transmission lines are needed to meet increasing local demand due to growth, EV's, and electrification of the heating sector (e.g., Sammamish to Juanita line in Kirkland).

Transmission upgrades are needed to meet increasing local demand (e.g., Energize Eastside line in Redmond, Bellevue, Newcastle, and Renton upgraded from 115kv to 230kv) due to growth, EVs, and electrification of the heating sector.

In order to assure continued capacity and reliability, new and larger substations will be needed to meet growing energy needs due to growth, EVs and electrification of the heating sector.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JPgTw1YBpvY>

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Dan Thompson <danielphompson@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 4:18 PM  
**To:** Council; Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate  
**Cc:** Jeff Thomas; Jessi Bon; Adam Ragheb; Ashley Hay; Ira Appelman; aql1@cornell.edu; Ray Akers; Thomas Acker; Matthew Goldbach; Elizabeth Buckley; Bob Harper; Lloyd Gilman; Matt Goldbach; Carv Zwingle; Traci Granbois; Michael Cero; fletchsa1@gmail.com; victor.raisys@gmail.com; Doris Cassan; Gary Robinson; Dan Glowitz; Dwight Schaeffer; Don Howard; Rob Dunbabin; Gary Robinson; John Hall; Joy Matsuura; jkennedy59@me.com; Isarchin@aol.com; Meg Lippert; Susan Lund; Mike Cero; Morrene Jacobson; Robert Medved; Mark Coen; Dave Oberg; olivialippens@gmail.com; Peter Struck; Robin Russell; Rebecca Wilson  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comments For May 29, 2024 Public Hearing On Update To Comprehensive Plan

Dear Planning Commission and CPD, please consider these my public comments for tonight's public hearing on the Comp. Plan update.

The PC agenda packet is 583 pages and was released on Thursday afternoon before the three-day holiday weekend. Here is a link to the agenda and agenda packet: [MEET-Packet-6f827fb3de734c159107786bf83dbfaa.pdf \(usgovcloudapi.net\)](https://usgovcloudapi.net/6f827fb3de734c159107786bf83dbfaa.pdf) The results of the citizen survey begin at page 262 but are not posted on Let's Talk.

### **1. CONSULTANT'S REPORT.**

The city has hired a consultant to prepare a report "to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented" with 19 identified "policy gaps" and 7 "Findings" that is attached to the agenda. It is also my understanding that certain planning commission members whose terms end tonight will propose even more amendments, and the planning commission will hold two more meetings. None of the consultant's gaps or findings address the planning commission's unauthorized amendments.

### **2. STANDING.**

I am a resident of Mercer Island and own property on Mercer Island and our law firm is in the town center. I have participated in this process since March 2022 and took the survey which I found biased. The unauthorized amendments by the planning commission in contradiction of Resolution 1621 adopted unanimously by the council in March 2022 will injure me and my property.

### **3. INCORPORATION OF PRIOR SUBMISSIONS.**

Attached at the bottom of this email and incorporated specifically is my email to the council dated May 20, 2024. Also incorporated by reference into these public comments are my prior submissions to the council and CPD on the update of the comp. plan including my email and public comments to the council on May 6.

### **4. LEGAL BASIS FOR OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT COMP. PLAN UPDATE.**

My emails of May 20 and May 6 and prior submissions outline my objections to this process, and specifically the planning commission's disregard of the Council's Resolution 1621. The specific legal bases are:

**a. RCW [36.70A.020](#). Goal 11: "(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process, including the participation of vulnerable populations and overburdened communities, and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts".** This is the most critical goal in the GMA, especially when it comes to the comprehensive plan. In my email of May 20, I recite the history of this process and how unfair it has been to the citizens due to lack of public notice and participation.

Now the citizens are being given a 583 page agenda packet no council member has read with a table prepared by an outside consultant to "to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented" on the Thursday afternoon before a three day weekend for tonight's public hearing.

I sympathize with the position the council and city were put in by the planning commission's disregard of Res. 1621 and release of the first public draft in April 2024, but since that time the city's actions have been even more in violation of its duty of notice and participation toward the citizens as it tries to mitigate or fix the problems created by the planning commission. This time table has ensured a citizen cannot meaningfully participate.

**b. RCW [36.70A.035](#) Public participation—Notice provisions.**

I am not sure I have ever seen such an unfair process, or one more in violation of 36.70A.035. There was almost no public participation at the May 1 public meeting in large part because the council told the citizens in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 there would be no changes to the Plan except those specifically required by state law, and there will be almost no public participation at the May 29 public hearing, because the planning commission has continued to amend the Plan, with no time for a citizen (or council member) to read 583 pages, the consultant's report and findings on "policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1", and to meaningfully participate.

**c. Lack Of Concurrent Development Regulations To Implement The Planning Commission's Proposed Amendments To The Plan.**

I was the attorney of record to the Growth Management Hearings Board in the appeal of the Community Facilities Zone, in which the appellants alleged failed to include the concurrent development regulations. The GMHB agreed with appellants, and upon remand the MICC was amended to require that any development regulations necessary to implement a Comp. Plan amendment must be drafted and adopted concurrently so the citizens know just what the comp. Plan amendment really means.

In this case, the planning commission has proposed sweeping changes to the single-family zone, including reducing minimum lot size, increasing or modifying regulatory limits including parking minimums, changing allowed uses including retail, none of which include the concurrent development regulations that would be necessary to implement the proposed Comp. Plan amendments, or within the purview of 1621.

To its credit, the CPD has identified some of the planning commission's unauthorized amendments. Either all of them must be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted, publicized, and adopted in the draft elements concurrently.

**5. REQUEST FOR OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT COUNCIL LEVEL.**



It is certain the council will make sweeping changes to the draft Comprehensive Plan based on the reconstitution process. The citizens should be allowed an open record hearing at the council level when the council’s approach is clearer and the planning commission is finally removed from this process.

**6. IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS OUTSIDE RESOLUTION 1621.**

Since the planning commission continued to amend the land use and housing elements *after* the May 1 public meeting and continues to do so today, and the outside consultant has now prepared a complex matrix of amendments the consultant and/or city believe "close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1" it is virtually impossible for any citizen to comment in real time on those amendments that are outside the scope of 1621, and that would need concurrent development regulations if adopted.

However here is a short list from before the consultant's report and the city's Table: **If there is one overall clarification that is needed, it is “affordable housing” must be in the Town Center and CO zones to meet County policies, and the council will not increase its GMPC future housing target of 1239 units. Therefore, upzoning the SFH zone is irrelevant.**

**Housing Element:**

- 1.4.D - (See CPD comment)
- 1.7 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)
- 1.8 – (What does this mean?)
- 1.9 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)
- 1.10 – (Does “encourage” mean GFAR bonuses? Mercer Island allows ADUs, but they are not affordable)
- 2.1 – (Clarify within Town Center and CO Zone)
- 2.3 – (How? Needs clarification)
- 2.4 – (See CPD comment. Clarify not in single family zone)
- 2.5 – (Must be limited to Town Center and CO Zone)
- 2.5.H – (See CPD comment)
- 3.1.C – (Needs clarification and zone)
- 3.2 – (Vague – specify)
- 5.1.D – (See CPD comment. 5.1.D must identify what is being balanced)
- 5.1.E – (Needs clarification of zone and whether incentives include regulatory limits)
- 5.2 to 5.5 – (Need concurrent development regulations)

**Land Use Element:**

**Needs a Vision Statement consistent with the City’s Vision Statement and Vision Statement in my May 20, 2024 email that Mercer Island is primarily a single family community and that all future affordable housing must go in the town center and CO zones per County policies.**

Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island \*is\* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.

15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered.

15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMPC requirements and/or statewide housing legislation, or the city's GMA future housing allocation.

15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.

15.5 - Should be amended to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element Goal 16.

Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible land use techniques and entitlement regulations.

16.1 - Mercer Island has lost over a 1,000 residents since 2020. In 2020, we were at 25,752 and in 2023, we were at 24,742 according to the latest US Census Bureau: [U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States](#) and King County's population has been flat over the past four years.

This goal needs to identify what "shared housing opportunities" means, and how they would achieve affordable housing in the single family zone when County policy states all affordable housing must be in the Town Center or CO zone.

16.2 - This goal is irrelevant. County policy mandates that all 1239 future housing units must be affordable and in the Town Center or CO zone.

16.4 - Mercer Island already allows accessory dwelling units on single family lots. This policy needs to state that current ADU regulations will not change.

16.5 – "Encourage" should be changed to "to allow".

16.6 – Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible residential development regulations and to further identify that the only other affordable housing recognized by County policy is in the Town Center and the CO zone.

17.3 - Revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." Commissioner Akyuz introduced this policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone.

Goal 27.6.4 – remove this goal. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element). This goal needs to be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted to identify how smaller housing units will be encouraged and needs to reflect that triplexes needs to be removed as not mandated by state law for Mercer Island.

29.1 Goal. This action plan needs to clarify how the "usability" of the Development Code will eliminate repetitious overlapping and conflicting provisions and to state nothing in this goal supports changing the Development Code for the single family zone.

### Economic Development:

7.6 - **Delete this.** Small scale retail development in the residential zones is a bad idea. Retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale".

Lines 16-20 - residents of middle-priced housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend" or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time

than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickup etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership. Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?

**Transportation Element:**

4.10 - Needs to articulate that off street parking is an issue (i.e., necessary) - especially for handicapped and families.

**7. CONCLUSION.**

Obviously, the city and council were as surprised as the citizens by the planning commission's unauthorized amendments, and the PC has been "reconstituted". However the process since the release of the April draft Comp Plan has not allowed the citizens to participate, and in fact the council told them to not participate in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 because there would be no changes to the Comp. Plan except those required by state law.

I believe at least a second public hearing will be necessary before the Council, and maybe a third, after the first or second removal of unauthorized amendments. At this time, it is a moving target, with the process before the same planning commission that was basically fired for its unauthorized amendments to the comp. plan.

The city's and council's initial actions since April 2024 have been productive, but at some point when a final draft is finally prepared the citizens are legally entitled to public notice and participation to review and object to those amendments still left they believe are inconsistent with their vision of the city.

Thank you.

**Daniel Thompson  
Thompson & Delay  
Attorneys at Law  
80th Avenue Professional Building  
2955 80th Ave SE, Suite 202  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
Phone: (206) 622-0670  
Fax: (206) 622-3965**

**From:** Dan Thompson <danielpthompson@hotmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 2:12 PM

**To:** council@mercergov.org <council@mercergov.org>

**Cc:** jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov <jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov>; jessi.bon@mercergov.org <jessi.bon@mercergov.org>; Adam Ragheb <adam.ragheb@gmail.com>; Ashley Hay <ashleyhay@outlook.com>; Ira Appelman <appelman@bmi.net>; aql1@cornell.edu <aql1@cornell.edu>; Ray Akers <ray@akerscargill.com>; Thomas Acker <tomacker1@comcast.net>; Matthew Goldbach <blkship@yahoo.com>; Buckley Elizabeth <mezzo@elizabethbuckley.com>; Bob Harper <robert.harper@comcast.net>; Lloyd Gilman <biznlloyd@gmail.com>; Matt Goldbach <matt@bitmax.net>; Carvz@yahoo.com <carvz@yahoo.com>; traci.granbois@gmail.com <traci.granbois@gmail.com>; Michael Cero <mikecero@miforss.com>; fletchsa1@gmail.com <fletchsa1@gmail.com>; victor.raisys@gmail.com <victor.raisys@gmail.com>; Doris Cassan <dc@dollarseattle.com>; docrobinson@comcast.net <docrobinson@comcast.net>; Dan Glowitz <daniel.glowitz@gmail.com>; Dwight Schaeffer <drschaeffer@comcast.net>; Don Howard <donhowardmd@gmail.com>; Rob Dunbabin <rob@cascadeyarns.com>; Gary Robinson <gdrobinsong@gmail.com>; John Hall <johnmhall@jmhcorp.net>; Joy Matsuura <jmatsu999@yahoo.com>; jkennedy59@me.com <jkennedy59@me.com>; lsarchin@aol.com <lsarchin@aol.com>; Meg Lippert <meg.lippert@gmail.com>; Susan Lund <srlund@aol.com>; Mike Cero <mscero@comcast.net>; Morrene Jacobson <morrene2000@gmail.com>; Robert A. Medved <robertamedved@msn.com>; Mark Coen <mscnb@msn.com>; obergcd@comcast.net <obergcd@comcast.net>; olivialippens@gmail.com <olivialippens@gmail.com>; Peter Struck <struckmi@aol.com>; Robin Russell <scubarobin@msn.com>; Rebecca Wilson <rebeccajwilson10@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Reconstitution of the Planning Commission. What Now?

Dear Council, I supported the ordinance reconstituting the planning commission and appreciate the council taking such quick action, but the question now is what do we do about the PC's draft elements in the Comprehensive Plan.

I think it might help to take a look at the history of this, and then the process going forward, and then my recommendation for a preamble or vision statement to the housing and land use elements.

## I. HISTORY OF THIS PROCESS.

**1. March 15, 2022.** The 8-year cycle update of the comp. plan was originally due in 2022 but extended to 2024 due to Covid. At its March 15, 2022 meeting the council adopted Resolution 1621 which limited the PC's review of the comp. plan to:

**“Scope of Work (Exhibit 1A)” “The scope of work proposes a focused “surgical” periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan. The concept is to have a narrow scope of work, primarily limited to only those updates required by state law. As such, the element-specific tasks for the Land Use, Utilities, Capital Facilities, and Transportation Elements are primarily constrained to only those updates required by the GMA and to account for recent planning actions”.**

[ITEM-Attachment-001-f8b71ddd8fb14da894f278ca49a885f1.pdf \(usgovcloudapi.net\)](#) (page 2).

**2. March 15, 2022 to April 2024.** The planning commission conducted its review of the comp. plan for two years. During this time there were no public meetings, and really no updates or any public notices from the city. The citizens had been told there would be no changes except those specifically required by state law so tuned out. I sent three emails during this time to the council, PC, and CPD noting concern that the PC was not following its mandate but nothing was ever done.

**3. April 2024.** In April 2024 the city published the first draft of the PC's amended Comp. Plan on Let's Talk, although the PC continued to amend the comp. plan. At this time, it became apparent to the council and citizens that the PC had buried in the draft dozens of amendments that sought to reduce minimum lot sizes in the SFH zone, increase regulatory limits in the SFH zone, reduce parking minimums, and in essence to eliminate the SFH zone. The dir. of the CPD even took the extraordinary action of noting in the elements themselves where the PC had gone beyond its mandate.

**4. April 2024 to May 2024.** The council "reconstituted" the PC.

**5. May 1, 2024.** The city puts together a hasty public meeting to review the comp. plan even though the second reading reconstituting the PC had not occurred, and the PC was still making major amendments, like Commissioner Goelz's amendment to reduce maximum house size in the SFH zone and increase regulatory limits for multi-family housing in the SFH zone buried in the climate section of the land use element, apparently not understanding that under ESB 1220 nothing in the SFH zone counts toward MI's affordability mandates, and that according to King Co. virtually all of MI's 1239 future housing targets must be affordable to those earning between 0% to 60% AMI and be in a dense zone near walkable transit.

Around 12 citizens attended the public meeting.

**6. May 9 to May 19, 2024.** After the public meeting the city throws together a hasty survey on the comp. plan, except it explains nothing, and many of the questions begin with statements about what the "city" values or prioritizes when the city is not a party to this process, which is between the citizens and their council. The city prioritizes what the citizens prioritize. Many citizens complain about the composition of the questions and required format of the answers when many disagree with all the proposed answers.

**7. May 29, 2024, two days after Memorial.** This is probably the most surreal part. Now the citizens are supposed to read and understand all the elements in the draft comp. plan that has continued to be amended, find the PC's buried unauthorized amendments that have no concurrent development regulations, and submit their written and/or oral comments to the PC on a draft comp. plan **that got the PC fired.**

How weird is that.

## II. NOW WHAT?

The reality is the citizens can't suddenly read and understand every element in the comp. plan by May 29 find the PC's buried amendments, and it is unfair to ask them to do it after the council **PROMISED** them there would be no amendments except those specifically required by state law, and my guess is most council members haven't read the entire draft comp. plan.

The very first two priorities in the Growth Management Act are public notice and public participation, especially when it comes to the comp. plan because that is the citizens' vision for their city, and should be a document and open process they can understand.

It is pretty pointless to ask the same PC to help with the rewrite.

So the council is going to have to do this on its own, with some help from the CPD. The problem IMO is Adam Zach was part of the problem, so this is where Jeff Thomas is going to have to step up, and because he knows where the buried amendments are.

I don't know what the actual process should be. The PC or its members should not be part of the process because they have proven they won't listen. I would imagine a council subcommittee that includes Salim Nice, and two other council members who voted to reconstitute the PC, Jeff Thomas and Jessi Bon since this happened on their watch, that goes through the elements line by line removing every PC proposed amendment.

**III. WHY A PREAMBLE OR VISION STATEMENT SHOULD BE PART OF THE LAND USE AND HOUSING ELEMENTS.**

The citizens can't possible read and understand the draft elements with such short notice, but the council can include a preamble or vision statement they can understand and follows through on the promises in Resolution 1621 (and the 2017 rewrite of the RDS).

The city has a vision statement, (although the PC was surprised to learn that). [Mercer Island's Vision Statement | Mercer Island, Washington](#). It states as its very first community value:

**Residential  
Community**

**Mercer Island is principally a single-family residential community, supported by healthy schools, institutions and recreational clubs.**

My suggestion is a preamble or vision statement for the land use and housing elements that the citizens can understand and will reassure them, and really is just consistent with Resolution 1621:

**"Mercer Island is principally a single-family residential community. Large minimum lot sizes and a lower gross floor area to lot ratio with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces contribute to the rural character of the single-family zone Islanders cherish, and the retention of mature trees and vegetation that allow carbon to be captured, limit solar heat, and provide homes for birds and woodland animals. In 2017**

**new regulatory limits were adopted for our single family zone after a years long process of citizen involvement and extensive public process, and those adopted regulatory limits including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums that preserve the rural character of our single family zone will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan."**

This way if we accidently miss one of the PC's unauthorized amendments, or a council in the future tries to claim an amendment that had no concurrent development regulations and was defined as "inspirational" now needs development regulations to implement it this vision or preamble would make it clear that was never the intent with this rewrite.

Thank you.

## Daniel Thompson

Thompson & Delay  
Attorneys at Law  
80th Avenue Professional Building  
2955 80th Ave SE, Suite 202  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
Phone: (206) 622-0670  
Fax: (206) 622-3965

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** blkship <blkship@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 4:39 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Jessi Bon; Salim Nice; Jeff Thomas; Lisa Anderl; Wendy Weiker; Craig Reynolds; Ted Weinberg; Jake Jacobson  
**Subject:** Comments to Planning Commission

**-594-**  
**pages**

Commissioner's

594 is the number of pages in tonight's packet.....594....

While I doubt any Commissioner has read all of the data provided....it is also very unlikely any resident has had a chance to read the materials and form opinions since it has only been available for three work days. Memorial day weekend got in the way.....

The City Council directed the CPD and Planning Commission to take a surgical approach to this Comp Plan update. Only make changes required by the State and County. If this was done a simple matrix of "what is proposed to be added, modified, removed" would provide the information that the residents need to participate in a serious discussion. A real "Public meeting".

This appears to be the same tactics used to push the CFZ. That didn't turn out to well.

I want to be on the record as **opposed** to moving forward without better resident participation.

Matt Goldbach  
9980 SE 40st  
Mercer Island, WA



**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Traci Granbois <traci.granbois@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 5:26 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Alison Van Gorp; Jeff Thomas; Salim Nice; Lisa Anderl; Jake Jacobson; Wendy Weiker; David Rosenbaum; Craig Reynolds; Ted Weinberg  
**Subject:** 5.29.24 PC meeting - SCOPE

Good evening Planning Commissioners,

Thank you for your service to our community and the time & expertise you volunteer.

In March 2022, our Mercer Island City Council unanimously adopted the following scope of work for the Planning Commission in regards to the legally required Comp Plan update:

« The scope of work proposes a focused “surgical” periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan. The concept is to have a narrow scope of work, primarily limited to only those updates required by state law. »

None of the proposed amendments fall within this very narrow scope of work. Because all proposed amendments exceed the authority of the Planning Commission, the City should stop further consideration of all of the Planning Commission's work on the Comp Plan update.

Thank you again for your time.

Best,  
Traci Granbois

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** docrobinson@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 5:44 PM  
**To:** Council; Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate  
**Subject:** Planning commission

Dear Planning Commission and CPD,

I associate myself with Dan Thompson’s remarks and include and add the following.

One of the qualities of good management is “customer.” It would appear that the Planning Commission is not customer-resident “in” but rather Planning Commission-in. Dan Thompson points out that The P.C. agenda packet is 583 pages and was released on Thursday afternoon before the three-day holiday weekend. The results of the citizen survey begin on page 262 **but are not posted on Let’s Talk. Please see the following and my additional comments.**

**1. CONSULTANT'S REPORT.**

The city has hired a consultant to prepare a report "to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented," with 19 identified "policy gaps" and 7 "Findings" that are attached to the agenda. I also understand that certain planning commission members whose terms end tonight will propose even more amendments, and the planning commission will hold two more meetings. None of the consultant’s gaps or findings address the planning commission’s unauthorized amendments. It appears that the Planning commission does not consider itself a staff–advisory function but rather an executive function with its own agenda.

**2. STANDING.**

I am a resident of Mercer Island, own property on Mercer Island, and we have a business on Mercer Island. I participated in this process and took the survey, which I found biased and not up to research standards. The written version, distributed at the community meeting, had errors that had to be brought to the staff's attention. I concur that the unauthorized amendments by the planning commission in contradiction of Resolution 1621, adopted unanimously by the Council in March 2022 will injure me and my property.

**3. INCORPORATION OF PRIOR SUBMISSIONS.**

Attached at the bottom of this email, which is explicitly incorporated, is Dan Thompson’s email to the Council dated May 20, 2024. Also incorporated by reference into these public comments are his prior submissions to the Council and CPD on the comp update. The Plan includes his email and public comments to the Council on May 6.

**4. LEGAL BASIS FOR OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT COMP. PLAN UPDATE.**

His emails of May 20 and May 6 and prior submissions outline his objections to this process, precisely the planning commission's disregard of the Council's Resolution 1621. The specific legal bases are:

- a. **RCW 36.70A.020. Goal 11: "(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process, including the participation of vulnerable populations and overburdened communities, and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts".** This is the most critical goal in the GMA, especially regarding the Comprehensive Plan. In my email of May 20, I recite the history of this process and how unfair it has been to the citizens due to lack of public notice and participation.

Now, the citizens are being given a 583-page agenda packet no council member has read, with a table prepared by an outside consultant to "close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented" on the Thursday afternoon before a three day weekend for tonight's public hearing.

I sympathize with the position the Council and city were put in by the planning commission's disregard of Res. 1621 and the release of the first public draft in April 2024. Still, since then, the city's actions have been even more in violation of its duty of notice and participation toward the citizens as it tries to mitigate or fix the problems created by the planning commission. This timetable has ensured a citizen cannot meaningfully participate.

**b. RCW 36.70A.035 Public participation—Notice provisions.**

I concur that I have never seen such an unfair process or one more violation of 36.70A.035. There was almost no public participation at the May 1 public meeting, mainly because the Council told the citizens in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 that there would be no changes to the Plan except those specifically required by state law. There will be almost no public participation at the May 29 public hearing because the planning commission has continued to amend the Plan, with no time for a citizen (or council member) to read 583 pages, the consultant's report and findings on "policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1", and to participate meaningfully.

**c. Lack Of Concurrent Development Regulations To Implement The Planning Commission's Proposed Amendments To The Plan.**

Dan Thompson was the attorney of record to the Growth Management Hearings Board in the appeal of the Community Facilities Zone, in which the appellants alleged failed to include the concurrent development regulations. The GMHB agreed with appellants, and upon remand, the MICC was amended to require any development regulations necessary to implement a Comp. Plan amendments must be drafted and adopted concurrently so the citizens know what the Comp. Plan amendment means.

In this case, the planning commission has proposed sweeping changes to the single-family zone, including reducing minimum lot size, increasing or modifying regulatory limits, including parking minimums, and changing allowed uses, including retail, none of which include the concurrent development regulations that would be necessary to implement the proposed Comp—plan amendments, or within the purview of 1621.

To its credit, the CPD has identified some of the planning commission's unauthorized amendments. Either all of them must be removed, or the concurrent development regulations must be drafted, publicized, and adopted in the draft elements concurrently.

**5. REQUEST FOR OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT THE COUNCIL LEVEL.**

The Council will undoubtedly make sweeping changes to the draft Comprehensive Plan based on the reconstitution process. ***The citizens should be allowed an open record hearing at the council level when the Council's approach is more transparent, and the planning commission is finally removed from this process.***

## 6. IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS OUTSIDE RESOLUTION 1621.

Since the planning commission continued to amend the land use and housing elements *after* the May 1 public meeting and continues to do so today, and the outside consultant has now prepared a complex matrix of amendments the consultant and/or city believe "close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1" it is virtually impossible for any citizen to comment in real-time on those amendments that are outside the scope of 1621, and that would need concurrent development regulations if adopted. This speaks to the apparent lack of sensitivity by the Planning Commission regarding residents' desires. The Planning Commission appears to have gone rogue.

Below is a short list from before the consultant's report and the city's Table: **If there is one overall clarification that is needed, it is that "affordable housing" must be in the Town Center and C.O. zones to meet County policies and the Council will not increase its GMPC future housing target of 1239 units. Therefore, upzoning the SFH zone is irrelevant.**

### Housing Element:

- 1.4.D - (See CPD comment)
- 1.7 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and C.O. zone)
- 1.8 – (What does this mean?)
- 1.9 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and C.O. zone)
- 1.10 – (Does "encourage" mean GFAR bonuses? Mercer Island allows ADUs, but they are not affordable)
- 2.1 – (Clarify within Town Center and CO Zone)
- 2.3 – (How? Needs clarification)
- 2.4 – (See CPD comment. Clarify not in single family zone)
- 2.5 – (Must be limited to Town Center and CO Zone)
- 2.5.H – (See CPD comment)
- 3.1.C – (Needs clarification and zone)
- 3.2 – (Vague – specify)
- 5.1.D – (See CPD comment. 5.1.D must identify what is being balanced)
- 5.1.E – (Needs clarification of zone and whether incentives include regulatory limits)
- 5.2 to 5.5 – (Need concurrent development regulations)

### Land Use Element:

**Needs a Vision Statement consistent with the City's Vision Statement and Vision Statement in my May 20, 2024 email that Mercer Island is primarily a single-family community and that all future affordable housing must go in the town center and C.O. zones per County policies.**

Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *\*is\** principally a low-density, single-family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a more significant portion of the land area), and it should remain so. ***These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.***

15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered.

15.2 - *Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMPC requirements and/or statewide housing legislation, or the city's GMA future housing allocation.*

15.3 - *Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.*

15.5 - Should be amended to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element

Goal 16.

Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible land use techniques and entitlement regulations.

16.1 - Mercer Island has lost over a 1,000 residents since 2020. In 2020, we were at 25,752 and in 2023, we were at 24,742 according to the latest U.S. Census Bureau: [U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States](#) and King County's population has been flat over the past four years.

This goal needs to identify what "shared housing opportunities" means, and how they would achieve affordable housing in the single family zone when County policy states all affordable housing must be in the Town Center or C.O. zone.

16.2 - This goal is irrelevant. County policy mandates that all 1239 future housing units must be affordable and in the Town Center or C.O. zone.

16.4 - Mercer Island already allows accessory dwelling units on single family lots. This policy needs to state that current ADU regulations will not change.

16.5 – "Encourage" should be changed to "to allow".

16.6 – Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible residential development regulations and to further identify that the only other affordable housing recognized by County policy is in the Town Center and the C.O. zone.

17.3 - Revert to original P.C. recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." Commissioner Akyuz introduced this policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded C.O. zone.

Goal 27.6.4 – remove this goal. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element). This goal needs to be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted to identify how smaller housing units will be encouraged and needs to reflect that triplexes needs to be removed as not mandated by state law for Mercer Island.

29.1 Goal. This action plan needs to clarify how the "usability" of the Development Code will eliminate repetitious overlapping and conflicting provisions and to state nothing in this goal supports changing the Development Code for the single family zone.

**Economic Development:**

7.6 - **Delete this!!**. Small scale retail development in the residential zones is a bad idea. Retail needs dens be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale".

Lines 16-20 - residents of middle-priced housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend" or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership.

Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?

#### **Transportation Element:**

4.10 - Needs to articulate that off street parking is an issue (i.e., necessary) - especially for handicapped and families.

#### **7. CONCLUSION.**

Obviously, the city and Council were as surprised as the citizens by the planning commission's unauthorized amendments, and the P.C. has been "reconstituted". ***However the process since the release of the April draft Comp Plan has not allowed the citizens to participate, and in fact the Council told them to not participate in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 because there would be no changes to the Comp. Plan except those required by state law.***

***I believe at least a second public hearing will be necessary before the Council, and maybe a third, after the first or second removal of unauthorized amendments.*** At this time, it is a moving target, with the process before the same planning commission that was basically fired for its unauthorized amendments to the Comp. plan.

The city's and council's initial actions since April 2024 have been productive, but at some point when a final draft is finally prepared the citizens are legally entitled to public notice and participation to review and object to those amendments still left they believe are inconsistent with their vision of the city.

Thank you.

Gary D. Robinson

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 7:10 PM  
**To:** Gary Robinson  
**Cc:** Council; Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate  
**Subject:** Re: Planning commission

I concur with Daniel and Gary.

You might all be interested to know that between 2013 and 2023, Mercer Island has only added **2,474 people**. In 2013, our population was 23,310, 10 years later, our population is 24,742 and between 2020 and 2023, we lost just over 1,000 people (1,010 to be exact.) Yet, we have added over 1,210 housing units in the Town Center so it is not like we don't have enough housing. We have plenty of housing.

So what is the point of updating The Comprehensive Plan with a full review and revision when we just have to update the critical areas regulations, capital facilities element and the transportation element and notify the department of our intention, that is it:

"A city or town that opts out of a full review and revision of its comprehensive plan must update its critical areas regulations and its capital facilities element and its transportation element."

(b)(i) A city or town located within [a] county planning under RCW **36.70A.040** **may opt out of a full review and revisions of its comprehensive plan** established in this section if the city or town meets the following criteria:

(A) Has a population fewer than 500;

(B) Is not located within 10 miles of a city with a population over 100,000;

**(C) Experienced a population growth rate of fewer than 10 percent in the preceding 10 years;** and

(D) Has provided the department with notice of its intent to participate in a partial review and revision of its comprehensive plan.

(ii) The department shall review the population growth rate for a city or town participating in the partial review and revision of its comprehensive plan process at least three years before the periodic update is due as outlined in subsection (4) of this section and notify cities of their eligibility.

(iii) A city or town that opts out of a full review and revision of its comprehensive plan must update its critical areas regulations and its capital facilities element and its transportation element.

On Wed, May 29, 2024 at 5:43 PM <[docrobinson@comcast.net](mailto:docrobinson@comcast.net)> wrote:

Dear Planning Commission and CPD,

I associate myself with Dan Thompson's remarks and include and add the following.

One of the qualities of good management is “customer.” It would appear that the Planning Commission not customer-resident “in” but rather Planning Commission-in. Dan Thompson points out that The P.C. agenda packet is 583 pages and was released on Thursday afternoon before the three-day holiday weekend. The results of the citizen survey begin on page 262 **but are not posted on Let’s Talk. Please see the following and my additional comments.**

### **1. CONSULTANT'S REPORT.**

The city has hired a consultant to prepare a report "to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented," with 19 identified "policy gaps" and 7 "Findings" that are attached to the agenda. I also understand that certain planning commission members whose terms end tonight will propose even more amendments, and the planning commission will hold two more meetings. None of the consultant’s gaps or findings address the planning commission’s unauthorized amendments. It appears that the Planning commission does not consider itself a staff–advisory function but rather an executive function with its own agenda.

### **2. STANDING.**

I am a resident of Mercer Island, own property on Mercer Island, and we have a business on Mercer Island. I participated in this process and took the survey, which I found biased and not up to research standards. The written version, distributed at the community meeting, had errors that had to be brought to the staff's attention. I concur that the unauthorized amendments by the planning commission in contradiction of Resolution 1621, adopted unanimously by the Council in March 2022 will injure me and my property.

### **3. INCORPORATION OF PRIOR SUBMISSIONS.**

Attached at the bottom of this email, which is explicitly incorporated, is Dan Thompson’s email to the Council dated May 20, 2024. Also incorporated by reference into these public comments are his prior submissions to the Council and CPD on the comp update. The Plan includes his email and public comments to the Council on May 6.

### **4. LEGAL BASIS FOR OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT COMP. PLAN UPDATE.**



His emails of May 20 and May 6 and prior submissions outline his objections to this process, precisely the planning commission's disregard of the Council's Resolution 1621. The specific legal bases are:

- a. **RCW [36.70A.020](#). Goal 11: "(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process, including the participation of vulnerable populations and overburdened communities, and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts"**. This is the most critical goal in the GMA, especially regarding the Comprehensive Plan. In my email of May 20, I recite the history of this process and how unfair it has been to the citizens due to lack of public notice and participation.

Now, the citizens are being given a 583-page agenda packet no council member has read, with a table prepared by an outside consultant to "close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented" on the Thursday afternoon before a three day weekend for tonight's public hearing.

I sympathize with the position the Council and city were put in by the planning commission's disregard of Res. 1621 and the release of the first public draft in April 2024. Still, since then, the city's actions have been even more in violation of its duty of notice and participation toward the citizens as it tries to mitigate or fix the problems created by the planning commission. This timetable has ensured a citizen cannot meaningfully participate.

- b. **RCW [36.70A.035](#) Public participation—Notice provisions.**

I concur that I have never seen such an unfair process or one more violation of 36.70A.035. There was almost no public participation at the May 1 public meeting, mainly because the Council told the citizens in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 that there would be no changes to the Plan except those specifically required by state law. There will be almost no public participation at the May 29 public hearing because the planning commission has continued to amend the Plan, with no time for a citizen (or council member) to read 583 pages, the consultant's report and findings on "policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1", and to participate meaningfully.

- c. **Lack Of Concurrent Development Regulations To Implement The Planning Commission's Proposed Amendments To The Plan.**

Dan Thompson was the attorney of record to the Growth Management Hearings Board in the appeal of the Community Facilities Zone, in which the appellants alleged failed to include the concurrent development regulations. The GMHB agreed with appellants, and upon remand, the MICC was amended to require any

development regulations necessary to implement a Comp. Plan amendments must be drafted and adopted concurrently so the citizens know what the Comp. Plan amendment means.

In this case, the planning commission has proposed sweeping changes to the single-family zone, including reducing minimum lot size, increasing or modifying regulatory limits, including parking minimums, and changing allowed uses, including retail, none of which include the concurrent development regulations that would be necessary to implement the proposed Comp—plan amendments, or within the purview of 1621.

To its credit, the CPD has identified some of the planning commission's unauthorized amendments. Either all of them must be removed, or the concurrent development regulations must be drafted, publicized, and adopted in the draft elements concurrently.

#### 5. REQUEST FOR OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT THE COUNCIL LEVEL.

The Council will undoubtedly make sweeping changes to the draft Comprehensive Plan based on the reconstitution process. ***The citizens should be allowed an open record hearing at the council level when the Council's approach is more transparent, and the planning commission is finally removed from this process.***

#### 6. IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS OUTSIDE RESOLUTION 1621.

Since the planning commission continued to amend the land use and housing elements *after* the May 1 public meeting and continues to do so today, and the outside consultant has now prepared a complex matrix of amendments the consultant and/or city believe "close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1" it is virtually impossible for any citizen to comment in real-time on those amendments that are outside the scope of 1621, and that would need concurrent development regulations if adopted. This speaks to the apparent lack of sensitivity by the Planning Commission regarding residents' desires. The Planning Commission appears to have gone rogue.

Below is a short list from before the consultant's report and the city's Table: **If there is one overall clarification that is needed, it is that "affordable housing" must be in the Town Center and C.O. zones to meet County policies and the Council will not increase its GMPC future housing target of 1239 units. Therefore, upzoning the SFH zone is irrelevant.**

Housing Element:

1.4.D - (See CPD comment)

1.7 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and C.O. zone)

1.8 – (What does this mean?)

1.9 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and C.O. zone)

1.10 – (Does “encourage” mean GFAR bonuses? Mercer Island allows ADUs, but they are not affordable)

2.1 – (Clarify within Town Center and CO Zone)

2.3 – (How? Needs clarification)

2.4 – (See CPD comment. Clarify not in single family zone)

2.5 – (Must be limited to Town Center and CO Zone)

2.5.H – (See CPD comment)

3.1.C – (Needs clarification and zone)

3.2 – (Vague – specify)

5.1.D – (See CPD comment. 5.1.D must identify what is being balanced)

5.1.E – (Needs clarification of zone and whether incentives include regulatory limits)

5.2 to 5.5 – (Need concurrent development regulations)

**Land Use Element:**

**Needs a Vision Statement consistent with the City’s Vision Statement and Vision Statement in my May 20, 2024 email that Mercer Island is primarily a single-family community and that all future affordable housing must go in the town center and C.O. zones per County policies.**

Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *\*is\** principally a low-density, single-family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a more significant portion of the land area), and it should remain so. ***These two words can***

*be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable neighborhoods and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.*

15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered.

15.2 - *Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMPC requirements and/or statewide housing legislation, or the city's GMA future housing allocation.*

*15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.*

15.5 - Should be amended to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element

Goal 16.

Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible land use techniques and entitlement regulations.

16.1 - Mercer Island has lost over a 1,000 residents since 2020. In 2020, we were at 25,752 and in 2023, we were at 24,742 according to the latest U.S. Census Bureau: [U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States](#) and King County's population has been flat over the past four years.

This goal needs to identify what "shared housing opportunities" means, and how they would achieve affordable housing in the single family zone when County policy states all affordable housing must be in the Town Center or C.O. zone.

16.2 - This goal is irrelevant. County policy mandates that all 1239 future housing units must be affordable and in the Town Center or C.O. zone.

16.4 - Mercer Island already allows accessory dwelling units on single family lots. This policy needs to state that current ADU regulations will not change.

16.5 – "Encourage" should be changed to "to allow".

16.6 – Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible residential development regulations and to further identify that the only other affordable housing recognized by County policy is in the Town Center and the C.O. zone.

17.3 - Revert to original P.C. recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." Commissioner Akyuz introduced this policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded C.O. zone.

Goal 27.6.4 – remove this goal. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element). This goal needs to be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted to identify how smaller housing units will be encouraged and needs to reflect that triplexes needs to be removed as not mandated by state law for Mercer Island.

29.1 Goal. This action plan needs to clarify how the "usability" of the Development Code will eliminate repetitious overlapping and conflicting provisions and to state nothing in this goal supports changing the Development Code for the single family zone.

### **Economic Development:**

7.6 - **Delete this!!**. Small scale retail development in the residential zones is a bad idea. Retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale".

Lines 16-20 - residents of middle-priced housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend" or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership.

Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?

**Transportation Element:**

4.10 - Needs to articulate that off street parking is an issue (i.e., necessary) - especially for handicapped and families.

**7. CONCLUSION.**

Obviously, the city and Council were as surprised as the citizens by the planning commission's unauthorized amendments, and the P.C. has been "reconstituted". ***However the process since the release of the April draft Comp Plan has not allowed the citizens to participate, and in fact the Council told them to not participate in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 because there would be no changes to the Comp. Plan except those required by state law.***

***I believe at least a second public hearing will be necessary before the Council, and maybe a third, after the first or second removal of unauthorized amendments.*** At this time, it is a moving target, with the process before the same planning commission that was basically fired for its unauthorized amendments to the Comp. plan.

The city's and council's initial actions since April 2024 have been productive, but at some point when a final draft is finally prepared the citizens are legally entitled to public notice and participation to review and object to those amendments still left they believe are inconsistent with their vision of the city.

Thank you.

Gary D. Robinson

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Chris Goelz <chrisgoelz455@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 2, 2024 9:56 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Alison Van Gorp; Adam Zack  
**Subject:** Comp plan comments

Hi there

I think the Comprehensive Plan suffers from its focus on providing free and abundant parking throughout the Island. In some places parking is treated as an end rather than a means to a more livable community. We all want to be able to find a parking space when we're looking for one and no one wants to try to navigate the streets packed with parked cars that we see in Seattle. But it's too easy to ignore the high costs of expensive parking mandates, which distort transportation choices, debase urban design, damage the economy, and degrade the environment. I'd suggest a couple of books that convincingly explain the problem:

<https://www.amazon.com/High-Cost-Free-Parking-Updated/dp/193236496X>

<https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/634461/paved-paradise-by-henry-grabar/>

It's critical that we plan for parking, but we must balance it against its costs. Expensive parking mandates substantially raise the cost of almost everything built on Mercer Island. Finding the proper parking balance is going to be critical to moving toward a more walkable, vibrant downtown and to making the brave new world of middle housing a success. Below, I'll make some specific suggestions re parking and the comp plan but before I do, I want to make a pitch for middle housing.

Personally, I welcome the new state legislation requiring middle housing. Without this change, almost every modest home on the Island was being replaced by a mega-house at the time of its sale. This is having a significant impact on the neighborhood character. Also, between the building materials and the lifetime cooling/heating demands, it works against our commitment to fight climate change.

People I've talked to in Kirkland – which is a few years ahead of us re middle housing – say it's been great. The number of duplexes and triplexes built in residential zones has been modest. And it's creating housing opportunities for city employees and teachers, kids moving back to their hometowns and seniors who want smaller homes without moving away from the community. I appreciate that not everyone is as sanguine about this change as I am, but ready or not, here it comes. I just hope we don't use parking to keep it from being as successful as it could be.

So here are my suggestions:

Findings – F-3: Try to mitigate through regulation any impacts of moderate density housing on traffic, on-street parking and pedestrian safety, especially in those areas close to transit.

Land use element – Goad 7: change “on street parking” to “parking.” I don't think we should decide from here where the parking should be.

Land use element – Goal 9: change “ample to adequate” and rework Goal 9 and it's policies as policies under Goad 8. Parking should not be an end in itself.

Land use policy 15.6.A: add “carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.”

Transportation element policy 6.9: change to “Seek to provide parking and other automobile facilities to meet anticipated demand generated by new development, carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.”

Transportation element – Goal 11: I’d omit this goal and incorporate policy 11.1 elsewhere. If it remains, it should be clear that we need to carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.

Economic element policy 12.2 – omit “without compromising existing available parking in commercial areas.” 12.4 covers this.

Economic element policy 12.4 – omit “Interpretation of the policies in this element should not lead to a reduction in parking.” If in the next 20 years we can figure out a way to provide sufficient parking downtown while reducing spaces, why not do it? This is a place where parking seems to be an end in itself.

Thanks for your consideration and your continued service.

Chris Goelz



**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Meg Lippert <meg.lippert@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 4, 2024 8:02 PM  
**To:** Council; Planning Commission; ComprehensivePlanUpdate  
**Cc:** Jeff Thomas; Jessi Bon; Adam Ragheb; Ashley Hay; Ira Appelman; aql1@cornell.edu; Ray Akers; Thomas Acker; Matthew Goldbach; Elizabeth Buckley; Bob Harper; Lloyd Gilman; Matt Goldbach; Carv Zwingle; Traci Granbois; Michael Cero; fletchsa1@gmail.com; victor.raisys@gmail.com; Doris Cassan; Gary Robinson; Dan Glowitz; Dwight Schaeffer; Don Howard; Rob Dunbabin; Gary Robinson; John Hall; Joy Matsuura; jkennedy59@me.com; Isarchin@aol.com; Susan Lund; Mike Cero; Morrene Jacobson; Robert Medved; Mark Coen; Dave Oberg; olivialippens@gmail.com; Peter Struck; Robin Russell; Rebecca Wilson; Dan Thompson  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comments For May 29, 2024 Public Hearing On Update To Comprehensive Plan

Dear Council, Planning Commission, and City Planning Department,

Although it is past the deadline for input for the public hearing on the Draft Comprehensive Plan Update, I hope that there will be further opportunity for citizens to comment on the document.

I have read the comments that Dan Thompson noted below, following his thoughtful, professional reading of the document, and I concur with his recommendations and conclusions. I hope that you will take them under advisement.

As this process moves along, I hope that in the future you will be providing ample time and opportunity for citizens to read, understand, analyze and respond to proposed updates and changes.

Thank you,  
 Meg Lippert

On Wed, May 29, 2024 at 1:18 PM Dan Thompson <[danielphompson@hotmail.com](mailto:danielphompson@hotmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Planning Commission and CPD, please consider these my public comments for tonight's public hearing on the Comp. Plan update.

The PC agenda packet is 583 pages and was released on Thursday afternoon before the three-day holiday weekend. Here is a link to the agenda and agenda packet: [MEET-Packet-6f827fb3de734c159107786bf83dbfaa.pdf \(usgovcloudapi.net\)](https://usgovcloudapi.net/MEET-Packet-6f827fb3de734c159107786bf83dbfaa.pdf) The results of the citizen survey begin at page 262 but are not posted on Let's Talk.

### 1. CONSULTANT'S REPORT.

The city has hired a consultant to prepare a report "to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented" with 19 identified "policy gaps" and 7 "Findings" that is attached to the agenda. It is also my understanding that certain planning commission members whose terms end tonight will propose even more amendments, and the planning commission will hold two more meetings. None of the consultant's gaps or findings address the planning commission's unauthorized amendments.

## 2. STANDING.

I am a resident of Mercer Island and own property on Mercer Island and our law firm is in the town center. I have participated in this process since March 2022 and took the survey which I found biased. The unauthorized amendments by the planning commission in contradiction of Resolution 1621 adopted unanimously by the council in March 2022 will injure me and my property.

## 3. INCORPORATION OF PRIOR SUBMISSIONS.

Attached at the bottom of this email and incorporated specifically is my email to the council dated May 20, 2024. Also incorporated by reference into these public comments are my prior submissions to the council and CPD on the update of the comp. plan including my email and public comments to the council on May 6.

## 4. LEGAL BASIS FOR OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT COMP. PLAN UPDATE.

My emails of May 20 and May 6 and prior submissions outline my objections to this process, and specifically the planning commission's disregard of the Council's Resolution 1621. The specific legal bases are:

**a. RCW [36.70A.020](#). Goal 11: "(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process, including the participation of vulnerable populations and overburdened communities, and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts".** This is the most critical goal in the GMA, especially when it comes to the comprehensive plan. In my email of May 20, I recite the history of this process and how unfair it has been to the citizens due to lack of public notice and participation.

Now the citizens are being given a 583 page agenda packet no council member has read with a table prepared by an outside consultant to "to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented" on the Thursday afternoon before a three day weekend for tonight's public hearing.

I sympathize with the position the council and city were put in by the planning commission's disregard of Res. 1621 and release of the first public draft in April 2024, but since that time the city's actions have been even more in violation of its duty of notice and participation toward the citizens as it tries to mitigate or fix the problems created by the planning commission. This time table has ensured a citizen cannot meaningfully participate.

**b. RCW [36.70A.035](#) Public participation—Notice provisions.**

I am not sure I have ever seen such an unfair process, or one more in violation of 36.70A.035. There was almost no public participation at the May 1 public meeting in large part because the council told the citizens in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 there would be no changes to the Plan except those specifically required by state law, and there will be almost no public participation at the May 29 public hearing, because the planning commission has continued to amend the Plan, with no time for a citizen (or council member) to read 583 pages, the consultant's report and findings on "policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1", and to meaningfully participate.

**c. Lack Of Concurrent Development Regulations To Implement The Planning Commission's Proposed Amendments To The Plan.**

I was the attorney of record to the Growth Management Hearings Board in the appeal of the Community Facilities Zone, in which the appellants alleged failed to include the concurrent development regulations. The GMHB agreed with appellants, and upon remand the MICC was amended to require that any development regulations necessary to implement a Comp. Plan amendment must be drafted and adopted concurrently so the citizens know just what the comp. Plan amendment really means.

In this case, the planning commission has proposed sweeping changes to the single-family zone, including reducing minimum lot size, increasing or modifying regulatory limits including parking minimums, changing allowed uses including retail, none of which include the concurrent development regulations that would be necessary to implement the proposed Comp. Plan amendments, or within the purview of 1621.

To its credit, the CPD has identified some of the planning commission's unauthorized amendments. Either all of them must be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted, publicized, and adopted in the draft elements concurrently.

## 5. REQUEST FOR OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT COUNCIL LEVEL.

It is certain the council will make sweeping changes to the draft Comprehensive Plan based on the reconstitution process. The citizens should be allowed an open record hearing at the council level when the council's approach is clearer and the planning commission is finally removed from this process.

## 6. IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS OUTSIDE RESOLUTION 1621.

Since the planning commission continued to amend the land use and housing elements *after* the May 1 public meeting and continues to do so today, and the outside consultant has now prepared a complex matrix of amendments the consultant and/or city believe "close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1" it is virtually impossible for any citizen to comment in real time on those amendments that are outside the scope of 1621, and that would need concurrent development regulations if adopted.

However here is a short list from before the consultant's report and the city's Table: **If there is one overall clarification that is needed, it is "affordable housing" must be in the Town Center and CO zones to meet County policies, and the council will not increase its GMPC future housing target of 1239 units. Therefore, upzoning the SFH zone is irrelevant.**

### Housing Element:

- 1.4.D - (See CPD comment)
- 1.7 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)
- 1.8 – (What does this mean?)
- 1.9 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)
- 1.10 – (Does "encourage" mean GFAR bonuses? Mercer Island allows ADUs, but they are not affordable)
- 2.1 – (Clarify within Town Center and CO Zone)
- 2.3 – (How? Needs clarification)
- 2.4 – (See CPD comment. Clarify not in single family zone)
- 2.5 – (Must be limited to Town Center and CO Zone)
- 2.5.H – (See CPD comment)
- 3.1.C – (Needs clarification and zone)

3.2 – (Vague – specify)

5.1.D – (See CPD comment. 5.1.D must identify what is being balanced)

5.1.E – (Needs clarification of zone and whether incentives include regulatory limits)

5.2 to 5.5 – (Need concurrent development regulations)

#### Land Use Element:

**Needs a Vision Statement consistent with the City’s Vision Statement and Vision Statement in my May 20, 2024 email that Mercer Island is primarily a single family community and that all future affordable housing must go in the town center and CO zones per County policies.**

Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island \*is\* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.

15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered.

15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMPC requirements and/or statewide housing legislation, or the city’s GMA future housing allocation.

15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.

15.5 - Should be amended to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element Goal 16.

Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible land use techniques and entitlement regulations.

16.1 - Mercer Island has lost over a 1,000 residents since 2020. In 2020, we were at 25,752 and in 2023, we were at 24,742 according to the latest US Census Bureau: [U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States](#) and King County’s population has been flat over the past four years.

This goal needs to identify what “shared housing opportunities” means, and how they would achieve affordable housing in the single family zone when County policy states all affordable housing must be in the Town Center or CO zone.

16.2 - This goal is irrelevant. County policy mandates that all 1239 future housing units must be affordable and in the Town Center or CO zone.

16.4 - Mercer Island already allows accessory dwelling units on single family lots. This policy needs to state that current ADU regulations will not change.

16.5 – “Encourage” should be changed to “to allow”.

16.6 – Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible residential development regulations and to further identify that the only other affordable housing recognized by County policy is in the Town Center and the CO zone.

17.3 - Revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." Commissioner Akyuz introduced this policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone.

Goal 27.6.4 – remove this goal. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element). This goal needs to be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted to identify how smaller housing units will be encouraged and needs to reflect that triplexes needs to be removed as not mandated by state law for Mercer Island.

29.1 Goal. This action plan needs to clarify how the “usability” of the Development Code will eliminate repetitious overlapping and conflicting provisions and to state nothing in this goal supports changing the Development Code for the single family zone.

### **Economic Development:**

7.6 - **Delete this.** Small scale retail development in the residential zones is a bad idea. Retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale".

Lines 16-20 - residents of middle-priced housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend" or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership.

Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?

### **Transportation Element:**

4.10 - Needs to articulate that off street parking is an issue (i.e., necessary) - especially for handicapped and families.

### **7. CONCLUSION.**

Obviously, the city and council were as surprised as the citizens by the planning commission's unauthorized amendments, and the PC has been "reconstituted". However the process since the release of the April draft Comp Plan has not allowed the citizens to participate, and in fact the council told them to not participate in March 2022 in Resolution 1621 because there would be no changes to the Comp. Plan except those required by state law.

I believe at least a second public hearing will be necessary before the Council, and maybe a third, after the first or second removal of unauthorized amendments. At this time, it is a moving target, with the process before the same planning commission that was basically fired for its unauthorized amendments to the comp plan.

The city's and council's initial actions since April 2024 have been productive, but at some point when a final draft is finally prepared the citizens are legally entitled to public notice and participation to review and object to those amendments still left they believe are inconsistent with their vision of the city.

Thank you.

**Daniel Thompson**  
**Thompson & Delay**  
**Attorneys at Law**  
**80th Avenue Professional Building**  
**2955 80th Ave SE, Suite 202**  
**Mercer Island, WA 98040**  
**Phone: (206) 622-0670**  
**Fax: (206) 622-3965**

**From:** Dan Thompson <[danielphompson@hotmail.com](mailto:danielphompson@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 2:12 PM  
**To:** [council@mercergov.org](mailto:council@mercergov.org) <[council@mercergov.org](mailto:council@mercergov.org)>  
**Cc:** [jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov](mailto:jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov) <[jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov](mailto:jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov)>; [jessi.bon@mercergov.org](mailto:jessi.bon@mercergov.org) <[jessi.bon@mercergov.org](mailto:jessi.bon@mercergov.org)>; Adam Ragheb <[adam.ragheb@gmail.com](mailto:adam.ragheb@gmail.com)>; Ashley Hay <[ashleyhay@outlook.com](mailto:ashleyhay@outlook.com)>; Ira Appelman <[appelman@bmi.net](mailto:appelman@bmi.net)>; [aql1@cornell.edu](mailto:aql1@cornell.edu) <[aql1@cornell.edu](mailto:aql1@cornell.edu)>; Ray Akers <[ray@akerscargill.com](mailto:ray@akerscargill.com)>; Thomas Acker <[tomacker1@comcast.net](mailto:tomacker1@comcast.net)>; Matthew Goldbach <[blkship@yahoo.com](mailto:blkship@yahoo.com)>; Buckley Elizabeth <[mezzo@elizabethbuckley.com](mailto:mezzo@elizabethbuckley.com)>; Bob Harper <[robert.harper@comcast.net](mailto:robert.harper@comcast.net)>; Lloyd Gilman <[biznlloyd@gmail.com](mailto:biznlloyd@gmail.com)>; Matt Goldbach <[matt@bitmax.net](mailto:matt@bitmax.net)>; [Carvz@yahoo.com](mailto:Carvz@yahoo.com) <[carvz@yahoo.com](mailto:carvz@yahoo.com)>; [traci.granbois@gmail.com](mailto:traci.granbois@gmail.com) <[traci.granbois@gmail.com](mailto:traci.granbois@gmail.com)>; Michael Cero <[mikecero@miforss.com](mailto:mikecero@miforss.com)>; [fletchsa1@gmail.com](mailto:fletchsa1@gmail.com) <[fletchsa1@gmail.com](mailto:fletchsa1@gmail.com)>; [victor.raisys@gmail.com](mailto:victor.raisys@gmail.com) <[victor.raisys@gmail.com](mailto:victor.raisys@gmail.com)>; Doris Cassan <[dc@dollarseattle.com](mailto:dc@dollarseattle.com)>; [docrobinson@comcast.net](mailto:docrobinson@comcast.net) <[docrobinson@comcast.net](mailto:docrobinson@comcast.net)>; Dan Glowitz <[daniel.glowitz@gmail.com](mailto:daniel.glowitz@gmail.com)>; Dwight Schaeffer <[drschaeffe@comcast.net](mailto:drschaeffe@comcast.net)>; Don Howard <[donhowardmd@gmail.com](mailto:donhowardmd@gmail.com)>; Rob Dunbabin <[rob@cascadeyarns.com](mailto:rob@cascadeyarns.com)>; Gary Robinson <[gdrobinsong@gmail.com](mailto:gdrobinsong@gmail.com)>; John Hall <[johnmhall@jmhcorp.net](mailto:johnmhall@jmhcorp.net)>; Joy Matsuura <[jmatsu999@yahoo.com](mailto:jmatsu999@yahoo.com)>; [jkennedy59@me.com](mailto:jkennedy59@me.com) <[jkennedy59@me.com](mailto:jkennedy59@me.com)>; [lsarchin@aol.com](mailto:lsarchin@aol.com) <[lsarchin@aol.com](mailto:lsarchin@aol.com)>; Meg Lippert <[meg.lippert@gmail.com](mailto:meg.lippert@gmail.com)>; Susan Lund <[srlund@aol.com](mailto:srlund@aol.com)>; Mike Cero <[mscero@comcast.net](mailto:mscero@comcast.net)>; Morrene Jacobson <[morrene2000@gmail.com](mailto:morrene2000@gmail.com)>; Robert A. Medved <[robertamedved@msn.com](mailto:robertamedved@msn.com)>; Mark Coen <[mscnb@msn.com](mailto:mscnb@msn.com)>; [obergcd@comcast.net](mailto:obergcd@comcast.net) <[obergcd@comcast.net](mailto:obergcd@comcast.net)>; [olivialippens@gmail.com](mailto:olivialippens@gmail.com) <[olivialippens@gmail.com](mailto:olivialippens@gmail.com)>; Peter Struck <[struckmi@aol.com](mailto:struckmi@aol.com)>; Robin Russell <[scubarobin@msn.com](mailto:scubarobin@msn.com)>; Rebecca Wilson <[rebecca.jwilson10@gmail.com](mailto:rebecca.jwilson10@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Reconstitution of the Planning Commission. What Now?

Dear Council, I supported the ordinance reconstituting the planning commission and appreciate the council taking such quick action, but the question now is what do we do about the PC's draft elements in the Comprehensive Plan.

I think it might help to take a look at the history of this, and then the process going forward, and then my recommendation for a preamble or vision statement to the housing and land use elements.

## I. HISTORY OF THIS PROCESS.

**1. March 15, 2022.** The 8-year cycle update of the comp. plan was originally due in 2022 but extended to 2024 due to Covid. At its March 15, 2022 meeting the council adopted Resolution 1621 which limited the PC's review of the comp. plan to:

**“Scope of Work (Exhibit 1A)” “The scope of work proposes a focused “surgical” periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan. The concept is to have a narrow scope of work, primarily limited to only those updates required by state law. As such, the element-specific tasks for the Land Use, Utilities, Capital Facilities, and Transportation Elements are primarily constrained to only those updates required by the GMA and to account for recent planning actions”.**

[ITEM-Attachment-001-f8b71ddd8fb14da894f278ca49a885f1.pdf \(usgovcloudapi.net\)](#) (page 2).

**2. March 15, 2022 to April 2024.** The planning commission conducted its review of the comp. plan for two years. During this time there were no public meetings, and really no updates or any public notices from the city. The citizens had been told there would be no changes except those specifically required by state law so tuned out. I sent three emails during this time to the council, PC, and CPD noting concern that the PC was not following its mandate but nothing was ever done.

**3. April 2024.** In April 2024 the city published the first draft of the PC's amended Comp. Plan on Let's Talk, although the PC continued to amend the comp. plan. At this time, it became apparent to the council and citizens that the PC had buried in the draft dozens of amendments that sought to reduce minimum lot sizes in the SFH zone, increase regulatory limits in the SFH zone, reduce parking minimums, and in essence to eliminate the SFH zone. The dir. of the CPD even took the extraordinary action of noting in the elements themselves where the PC had gone beyond its mandate.

**4. April 2024 to May 2024.** The council "reconstituted" the PC.

**5. May 1, 2024.** The city puts together a hasty public meeting to review the comp. plan even though the second reading reconstituting the PC had not occurred, and the PC was still making major amendments, like Commissioner Goelz's amendment to reduce maximum house size in the SFH zone and increase regulatory limits for multi-family housing in the SFH zone buried in the climate section of the land use element, apparently not understanding that under ESB 1220 nothing in the SFH zone counts toward MI's affordability mandates, and that according to King Co. virtually all of MI's 1239 future housing targets must be affordable to those earning between 0% to 60% AMI and be in a dense zone near walkable transit.

Around 12 citizens attended the public meeting.

**6. May 9 to May 19, 2024.** After the public meeting the city throws together a hasty survey on the comp. plan, except it explains nothing, and many of the questions begin with statements about what the "city" values or prioritizes when the city is not a party to this process, which is between the citizens and their council. The city prioritizes what the citizens prioritize. Many citizens complain about the composition of the questions and required format of the answers when many disagree with all the proposed answers.

**7. May 29, 2024, two days after Memorial.** This is probably the most surreal part. Now the citizens are supposed to read and understand all the elements in the draft comp. plan that has continued to be amended, find the PC's buried unauthorized amendments that have no concurrent development regulations, and submit their written and/or oral comments to the PC on a draft comp. plan **that got the PC fired.**

How weird is that.

## II. NOW WHAT?

The reality is the citizens can't suddenly read and understand every element in the comp. plan by May 29 to find the PC's buried amendments, and it is unfair to ask them to do it after the council **PROMISED** them there would be no amendments except those specifically required by state law, and my guess is most council members haven't read the entire draft comp. plan.

The very first two priorities in the Growth Management Act are public notice and public participation, especially when it comes to the comp. plan because that is the citizens' vision for their city, and should be a document and open process they can understand.

It is pretty pointless to ask the same PC to help with the rewrite.

So the council is going to have to do this on its own, with some help from the CPD. The problem IMO is Adam Zach was part of the problem, so this is where Jeff Thomas is going to have to step up, and because he knows where the buried amendments are.

I don't know what the actual process should be. The PC or its members should not be part of the process because they have proven they won't listen. I would imagine a council subcommittee that includes Salim Nice, and two other council members who voted to reconstitute the PC, Jeff Thomas and Jessi Bon since this happened on their watch, that goes through the elements line by line removing every PC proposed amendment.

## III. WHY A PREAMBLE OR VISION STATEMENT SHOULD BE PART OF THE LAND USE AND HOUSING ELEMENTS.



The citizens can't possible read and understand the draft elements with such short notice, but the council can include a preamble or vision statement they can understand and follows through on the promises in Resolution 1621 (and the 2017 rewrite of the RDS).

The city has a vision statement, (although the PC was surprised to learn that). [Mercer Island's Vision Statement | Mercer Island, Washington](#). It states as its very first community value:

**Residential  
Community**

**Mercer Island is principally a single-family residential community, supported by healthy sch  
institutions and recreational clubs.**

My suggestion is a preamble or vision statement for the land use and housing elements that the citizens can understand and will reassure them, and really is just consistent with Resolution 1621:

**"Mercer Island is principally a single-family residential community. Large minimum lot sizes and a lower gross floor area to lot ratio with yard setbacks and limits on impervious surfaces contribute to the rural character of the single-family zone Islanders cherish, and the retention of mature trees and vegetation that allow carbon to be captured, limit solar heat, and provide homes for birds and woodland animals. In 2017 new regulatory limits were adopted for our single family zone after a years long process of citizen involvement and extensive public process, and those adopted regulatory limits including minimum lot size, height limits, impervious surface limits, yard setbacks, gross floor area to lot area ratios, and onsite parking minimums that preserve the rural character of our single family zone will not be changed as part of these amendments to our comprehensive plan."**

This way if we accidentally miss one of the PC's unauthorized amendments, or a council in the future tries to claim an amendment that had no concurrent development regulations and was defined as "inspirational" now needs development regulations to implement it this vision or preamble would make it clear that was never the intent with this rewrite.

Thank you.

**Daniel Thompson**

Thompson & Delay  
Attorneys at Law  
80th Avenue Professional Building  
2955 80th Ave SE, Suite 202  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
Phone: (206) 622-0670  
Fax: (206) 622-3965

**Adam Zack**

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 5, 2024 1:30 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Photos of Park and Ride today for tonight's meeting  
**Attachments:** DSCN2462.JPG; DSCN2464.JPG; DSCN2463.JPG; DSCN2461.JPG

Hello, again, here are some more photos showing you the P&R is not full to capacity. If it were, you can be rest assured, Sound Transit would be implementing their \$120 a month parking pass which is what they had brought in pre-covid.

So please update the data which you are going off from 2017. Thank you.









## Adam Zack

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 6, 2024 1:51 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; Adam Zack; Jessi Bon; Council  
**Subject:** Re: This new Planning Commission, it is not working  
**Attachments:** DSCN2465.JPG; DSCN2466.JPG; DSCN2467.JPG

Hello, I just can't pinpoint the problem and who exactly is to blame, but I just don't think that some Planning Commission members are understanding how significant the Comprehensive Plan is and that you don't put false information in it, nor do you put outdated information in. So again, I have taken photographs of the Park and Ride until you get it that the Park and Ride is never 100% full. And based on Sound Transit's figures and my photographs as evidence, you will not not put that the P&R is full. It is like Sound Transit's Environmental Impact Statements where they read more like they wish that there were no environmental impacts and they will state that there are no environmental impacts, yet we are feeling the impacts of their supposedly no impacts.

And not only that, but I am sorry, if the Planning Commission are not following what is going on with Sound Transit and the City staff members are not informing the Planning Commission and you don't want to listen to citizens, then I am sorry, the system is not working.

And I don't know what was discussed last night with regards to the green paint on the sidewalk which I have warned you is a danger, what is happening with that?

I will be happy to meet with whoever wants to at the Park and ride and I will walk you all around. I get annoyed when you make out like I don't know what I am talking about when it comes to the Park and Ride and Sound Transit. I should be thanked for the work I am doing.

On Wed, Jun 5, 2024 at 11:19 PM Sarah Fletcher <[fletchsa1@gmail.com](mailto:fletchsa1@gmail.com)> wrote:

Here is the latest data for the 550 bus. Covid has been over for a while now and yet, ridership is still down 46%:

[Ridership | Ridership | Sound Transit](#)

So don't tell me that I don't know what I am talking about. You don't go and put incorrect information in The Comprehensive Plan. You have no right being advisors to the City if you are going to lie about the information. It seems that that is what has been happening in the past whenever we have had an Economical Analysis done or Transpo does their analysis. I thought that with the Planning Commission, things would be different, but it doesn't appear that it is if you are going to put incorrect information in The Comprehensive Plan.

In the meantime, I have reached out to the Sound Transit outreach person and will let him know about what latest information he has with regards to how full the park and ride is and I will continue taking photographs.

On Wed, Jun 5, 2024 at 10:58 PM Sarah Fletcher <[fletchsa1@gmail.com](mailto:fletchsa1@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello, there is a problem and you are the wrong people to be advising. I am sorry, but the problem is that none of you have a clue about Sound Transit's mitigation. And what's more, you don't put outdated data from 2017 in The Comprehensive and deem it "fact." When you state the Park and Ride is 100% full, but that it is not, and I keep proving to you that it is not, you should be acknowledging what

I am telling you. I will keep taking photographs every day and email them to you, but you have incorrect information. Fact. The Park and Ride is **never 100% full**.

And what's more, none of you should be advising the city on Sound Transit when you don't have a clue about the mitigation. Who on staff should be aware of what Sound Transit's mitigation is and I am not talking about the 2017 Settlement Agreement mitigation, but the other mitigation?

This is what it states:

"Hide-and-Ride: Mitigation for potential hide-and-ride activities near stations and the best ways to mitigate such activities are specific to each area surrounding a station. The station most likely to generate hide-and-ride impacts is the Rainier Station. At the Mercer Island and South Bellevue Stations the parking analysis determined a low potential for hide-and-ride impacts. However, given the locations of these stations, **Sound Transit will evaluate hide-and-ride impacts within one year of East Link commencing operations.** If impacts are determined, Sound Transit will implement appropriate mitigation measures as discussed in this section.

Prior to implementing any parking mitigation measures, Sound Transit will inventory existing on-street parking around the Rainier and Mercer Island stations up to one year prior to the start of light rail revenue service. For the South Bellevue station, inventory of existing on street parking will be conducted prior to closure to the South Bellevue park-and-ride lot. **These inventories will document the current on street parking supply within a one-quarter-mile radius of the stations. Based on the inventory results, Sound Transit and the local jurisdiction will work with the affected stakeholders to identify and implement appropriate mitigation measures,** if necessary.

Parking control measures would, when deemed needed and effective to address adverse impacts, consist of parking meters, restricted parking sign age, passenger and truck load zones, and residential parking zone (RPZ) sign age. Other parking mitigation strategies could include promotion of alternative transportation services (e.g., encourage the use of bus transit, vanpool or carpool services, walking, or bicycle riding). For parking controls agreed to with the local jurisdiction and community, Sound Transit will be responsible for the cost of installing the signage or other parking controls and any expansion of the parking controls for one year after opening the light rail system. The local jurisdictions will be responsible for monitoring the parking controls and providing all enforcement and maintenance of the parking controls. The local residents will be responsible for an RPZ-related costs imposed by the local jurisdiction."

This is the Sound and Transit parking pass program before covid. [New reserved permit-parking option available for Mercer Island Park-and-Ride lot and Issaquah Transit Center | Sound Transit](#)

Why do you think Sound Transit phased it out? Are you trying to tell me it is because the Park and Ride is 100% full? Well, it is not. All I asked is that you put accurate and more up-to-date information (not from 2017) in The Comprehensive Plan and stop wasting our time.

Sarah Fletcher









**Table 1. Land Use Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	Overall - Do not remove mentions of "single family," "single-family" or permutations thereof. Except for Goal 16 on Page 23...achieving additional capacity in Town Center and multifamily zones should receive preference to single-family zones.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *is* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable and bikeable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that broaden phrasing related to single-family were generally related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered as that "character" is less pronounced and the amount of the city changed is smaller than that of our single-family neighborhoods and their special character.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMA requirements and/or statewide housing legislation	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.6	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.5 - This should be reverted enough to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.7	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 16.5 - I like the preference to areas near HCT as it makes sense	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.8	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 17.3 - Please revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." This policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone appears to have been added at the last minute.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.9	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 27.6.4 - Remove this goal, also added at the last minute. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element).	Policy Choice*  See also the response to comment PUB-8.14 below.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	15.1: This should be going back to the original language "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. The change "All residential zones" weakens the goal in this paragraph. Single-family zones will be the most affected by not preserving the character – they have the most neighborhood character and this is a good thing. It is over 67% of our city and it looks like the goal of this recent revision is to destroy it.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	15.5: As noted below, data in this plan says we have a single-family city..... Protect that, this unique to MI and develop the town center as needed since there is less character there" See again Table 2 of Housing Element	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.3	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	17.3: Undo the recent changes to this – what you had as a Commission a few months ago was just fine. This recent revision no longer protects residential areas from the likely-to-be expanded allowed uses in the Commercial Office zone.	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.4	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	Overall comment: it looks like your goal as a Commission/planning department is to remove the single-family character of our city. Is there a reason for that beyond ideology? That is the reason why people move here – Seattle is right across the bridge if you want density and less character.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please keep "single family," "single-family" or permutations thereof. Except for Goal 16 on Page 23...achieving additional capacity in Town Center and multifamily zones should receive preference to single-family zones.</li> </ul>	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.5	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	Heading 15: delete "moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *is* a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area). Like mentioned above, there is no reason to change that. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable and bikeable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.6	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	27.6.4: Delete this in its entirety. We already have one of the lowest GFARs in the region. If I recall correctly, to explain why they supported this, a Commissioner mentioned that they know of families around the world that live in 2,000 sqft apartments; Mercer Island is not Hong Kong, London, or Tokyo. It is a suburb of a midsize US city that consists of at least 67% single family homes. There are many options across both bridges for smaller apartment or middle housing units that arguably are more convenient due to their proximity to existing transit, retail, and jobs.	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.1	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Needs a Vision Statement consistent with the City's Vision Statement and Vision Statement in my May 20, 2024 email that Mercer Island is primarily a single family community and that all future affordable housing must go in the town center and CO zones per County policies.	Policy Choice*  The scope of work as approved the by the City Council with <a href="#">Resolution No. 1621</a> and per the addendum approved by City Council with <a href="#">Resolution No. 1645</a> did not include tasks associated with amending the vision statement or developing a new vision statement for the Land Use Element. Amending an existing vision or developing a new vision statement would be a significant increase in the scope of work, particularly for the public participation aspect of that project. In general, vision statements require broad public participation to ensure that the updated statement reflects the broad public opinion about how the City should address growth.
PUB-8.2	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *is* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-8.3	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-8.4	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMPC requirements and/or statewide housing legislation, or the city's GMA future housing allocation.	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.5	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.6	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.5 - Should be amended to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.7	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Goal 16. Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible land use techniques and entitlement regulations.	Goal 16, as proposed, would state: "Achieve additional residential capacity in residential zones through flexible land use techniques and land use entitlement regulations."  This goal is not expected to oblige the City to adopt concurrent regulations. The City can implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as it has resources available, provided the implementation is consistent with the implementation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan and the processes and criteria established in the Mercer Island City Code.
PUB-8.8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.1 - Mercer Island has lost over a 1,000 residents since 2020. In 2020, we were at 25,752 and in 2023, we were at 24,742 according to the latest US Census Bureau: U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States and King County's population has been flat over the past four years.  This goal needs to identify what "shared housing opportunities" means, and how they would achieve affordable housing in the single family zone when County policy states all affordable housing must be in the Town Center or CO zone.	The GMA requires cities to plan using the Office of Financial Management (OFM) population forecast (RCW 36.70A.110(2)). The OFM population forecast is based on the April 1 Population Estimates, which estimate the City population slightly growing since from 25,748 in 2020 to 25,800 in 2023 (source: <a href="https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-estimates/april-1-official-population-estimates">https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-estimates/april-1-official-population-estimates</a> ).  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> ).
PUB-8.9	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.2 - This goal is irrelevant. County policy mandates that all 1239 future housing units must be affordable and in the Town Center or CO zone.	Policy Choice*  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ).
PUB-8.10	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.4 - Mercer Island already allows accessory dwelling units on single family lots. This policy needs to state that current ADU regulations will not change.	Policy Choice*  The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a> .
PUB-8.11	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.5 – "Encourage" should be changed to "to allow".	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.12	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.6 – Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible residential development regulations and to further identify that the only other affordable housing recognized by County policy is in the Town Center and the CO zone.	Policy 16.6 as proposed would read: "Explore flexible residential development regulations and entitlement processes that support, create incentives for, and encourage public amenities such as wildlife habitat, accessible homes, affordable housing, and sustainable development." This policy as drafted is not expected to obligate the City to adopt concurrent development regulations. The City can implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as it has resources available, provided the implementation is consistent with the implementation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan and the processes and criteria established in the Mercer Island City Code.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.13	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	17.3 - Revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." Commissioner Akyuz introduced this policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone.	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.14	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Goal 27.6.4 – remove this goal. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element). This goal needs to be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted to identify how smaller housing units will be encouraged and needs to reflect that triplexes needs to be removed as not mandated by state law for Mercer Island.	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>Many factors contribute to the production of greenhouse gases related to the construction and operation of residential housing, including type and source of materials, unit size and whether units are attached or detached. The City can research options for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting energy efficiency during the implementation of this policy.</p> <p>The City will be updating its development code to comply with <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> related to middle housing. RCW 36.70A.635(1)(a) requires Mercer Island to authorize the development of two units per lot on all lots zoned predominantly for residential use, as well as the development of four units per lot within one-quarter mile walking distance of a major transit stop and when at least one unit is affordable housing. Development consistent with RCW 36.70A.635(1)(a)(ii) and (iii) would include triplexes and quadplexes.</p> <p>Further, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> requires the City to adopt policies in the Housing Element specifically addressing triplexes, it states:</p> <p>(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that: [... ]</p> <p>(b) Includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences, and within an urban growth area boundary, moderate density housing options including, but not limited to, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes;</p>
PUB-8.15	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	29.1 Goal. This action plan needs to clarify how the “usability” of the Development Code will eliminate repetitious overlapping and conflicting provisions and to state nothing in this goal supports changing the Development Code for the single family zone.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.1	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Land use element – Goad 7: change “on street parking” to “parking.” I don’t think we should decide from here where the parking should be.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.2	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Land use element – Goal 9: change “ample to adequate” and rework Goal 9 and it’s policies as policies under Goad 8. Parking should not be an end in itself.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.3	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Land use policy 15.6.A: add “carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.”	Policy Choice*

\* Comments marked as “Policy choice” propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.



**Table 2. Housing Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 1.7 - Remove this in its entirety. It is incompatible with Goal 1.9 and Goal 16.5 of the Land Use Element. It makes no sense to disperse affordable housing across the Island - access to existing high capacity transit is essential (i.e., locate it in the Town Center) and access to retail is a very good-to-have	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>Proposed Housing Policy 1.7 states: "Strive to increase class, race, and age integration by equitably dispersing affordable housing opportunities."</p> <p>Policy 1.7 was drafted, in part, to respond to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policy (MPP) H-5, which states: "Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color."</p> <p>Policy 1.7 is also part of the City's response to Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) H-20 and H-21, which state:</p> <p><b>H-20</b> Adopt and implement policies that address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p> <p><b>H-21</b> Adopt policies and strategies that promote equitable development and mitigate displacement risk, with consideration given to the preservation of historical and cultural communities as well as investments in low-, very low-, extremely low-, and moderate-income housing production and preservation; dedicated funds for land acquisition; manufactured housing community preservation, inclusionary zoning; community planning requirements; tenant protections; public land disposition policies; and land that may be used for affordable housing. Mitigate displacement that may result from planning efforts, large-scale private investments, and market pressure. Implement anti-displacement measures prior to or concurrent with development capacity increases and public capital investments.</p>
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 1.9 – Housing choices for those earning lower wages should also be located in close proximity to retail.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 1.10 - Change "encourage" to "continue to allow." ADUs are already allowed. Encouraging them implies financial incentives or regulation / permitting relief - we should let the market determine if ADUs need to be built and not create the justification for using City dollars to provide landlord incentives relating to ADUs.	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a>.</p>
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 2.1 - We shouldn't support construction near planned things, only ones that already exist; if a plan were to fall through or experience a multi-year delay, there is no benefit (except to developers) to encourage allegedly compatible construction next to it.	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 2.2.C - Revise "build and preserve affordable housing" to "renovate and preserve preexisting affordable housing." This is an important anti-displacement measure that should not be overlooked.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires the City to plan for housing needs across all income segments ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)</a> ). According to the County's allocation of housing needs (CPP H-1), the City of Mercer Island must plan for 1,207 additional units affordable to households that earn 80 percent of the area median income or below.. This will likely necessitate both construction of new housing and preservation of existing housing along with requirements for covenants that require income-restricted rents long-term.
PUB-2.6	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 2.5.H - This is a *bad* one if you think about it; a cursory reading of this sounds good. It can be used to waive *any* building regulations not related to health and safety if marketed as income restricted housing - Gross Floor Area Ratio, permeable surface, height/floor limits, facade height, parking requirements, and property line offset requirements, to name a few.	Policy Choice*  See also the response to comment PUB-8.14 below.
PUB-2.7	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 3.2 - This is purely performative - please remove it; if anything, talking about something fosters inaction on the topic as people can say they've done something (by only adding a sentence or two)	Policy Choice*  Proposed Policy 3.2 would read: "Acknowledge historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color."  The policy was drafted based on the PSRC MPP H-5, which states: "Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color."
PUB-2.8	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 4.2.B - Who pays for this Relocation assistance? The city? The landlord? If the latter, that cost will indirectly be passed on to renters. Please remove this as implementation can be messy and will inevitably add bureaucracy and costs to all.	Policy Choice*  Relocation assistance costs are typically covered by the developer as part of the redevelopment process. It might be that those costs would be passed on to renters. Policy 4.2 states: "Evaluate the potential increased risk of displacement that could accompany any increase in development capacity concurrent with proposed zoning changes affecting a zone where multifamily or mixed-use development is allowed." This evaluation would take place at the time a zoning change is proposed. The applicant proposing the rezone would need to complete the evaluation.
PUB-2.9	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 5.1.D - Please revert this to the original as proposed by the Housing Working Group. Unnecessarily is a qualitative definition and is subject to broad interpretation.	Policy Choice*  Policy 5.1.D directs that when the City reviews the multifamily development standards (Policy 5.1) it should: "Ensure parking requirements do not unnecessarily restrict multifamily housing but rather carefully balance the need for parking and the cost of providing it." The City would determine how to apply this policy during its implementation.
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	2.1: Only support construction near existing infrastructure. Plans change and large projects are inevitably delayed and sometimes cancelled.	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	2.2.C: From an environmental point of view, it is preferable to preserve and update affordable housing than to build new – you lose trees, discard building materials, need to cut down new wood for lumber, and concrete is very energy-intensive to produce. New “affordable” housing will be more expensive and contributes to displacement...update this goal accordingly.	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.3	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	2.5.H: Delete this. Building a six story box with no yard, no trees, and no permeable surfaces could be done with this goal as a justification. Having grass, having trees, having a short building, and having permeable surfaces can be considered to be non-safety related.	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.4	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	1.7: Get rid of this – it is inconsistent with the goal two steps down from it. Also dispersing makes it harder to benefit from existing transit options or makes it necessary to significantly grow the size and cost (and reduce the efficiency of) transit offerings.	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>Proposed Housing Policy 1.7 states: “Strive to increase class, race, and age integration by equitably dispersing affordable housing opportunities.”</p> <p>Policy 1.7 was drafted, in part, to respond to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policy (MPP) H-5, which states: “Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color.”</p> <p>Policy 1.7 is also part of the City’s response to Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) H-20 and H-21, which state:</p> <p><b>H-20</b> Adopt and implement policies that address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p> <p><b>H-21</b> Adopt policies and strategies that promote equitable development and mitigate displacement risk, with consideration given to the preservation of historical and cultural communities as well as investments in low-, very low-, extremely low-, and moderate-income housing production and preservation; dedicated funds for land acquisition; manufactured housing community preservation, inclusionary zoning; community planning requirements; tenant protections; public land disposition policies; and land that may be used for affordable housing. Mitigate displacement that may result from planning efforts, large-scale private investments, and market pressure. Implement anti-displacement measures prior to or concurrent with development capacity increases and public capital investments.</p>
PUB-3.5	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	1.9: Close to retail offerings is also an important thing to add	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.6	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	1.10: Encourage to me implies incentives which are usually financial or reduced permit review. We already have ADUs permitted by code, so let’s just keep allowing them	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>“Encourage” can also mean reducing regulatory barriers. The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a>.</p>

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-3.7	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	5.1.D: The Housing Working Group-suggested language is preferable to what the Planning Commission came up with – trust the experience of the City Council members and go back to their words.	Policy Choice*  Policy 5.1.D directs that when the City reviews the multifamily development standards (Policy 5.1) it should: “Ensure parking requirements do not unnecessarily restrict multifamily housing but rather carefully balance the need for parking and the cost of providing it.” The City would determine how to apply this policy during its implementation.
PUB-8.1	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.4.D - (See CPD comment)	Staff is unsure which comment this refers to
PUB-8.2	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.7 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)	Policy Choice*  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance for complying with affordable housing requirements in House Bill 1220 indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ).
PUB-8.3	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.8 – (What does this mean?)	Policy Choice*  Housing Element Policy 1.8 states: “Discourage neighborhood segregation and the isolation of special needs populations.”  <a href="#">Oxford Languages</a> defines segregation as: “the action or state of setting someone or something apart from others.” The CPPs define special needs populations within the definition of special needs housing, as follows: “Housing arrangements for populations with special physical or other needs. These populations include the elderly, disabled persons, people with medical conditions, homeless individuals and families, and displaced people.”
PUB-8.4	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.9 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)	Policy Choice*  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance for complying with affordable housing requirements in House Bill 1220 indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ).
PUB-8.5	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.10 – (Does “encourage” mean GFAR bonuses? Mercer Island allows ADUs, but they are not affordable)	Policy Choice*  The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a> .
PUB-8.6	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.1 – (Clarify within Town Center and CO Zone)	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.7	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.3 – (How? Needs clarification)	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.4 – (See CPD comment. Clarify not in single family zone)	Staff is unsure which comment this refers to The City must adopt regulations permitting moderate density housing in the residential zones by June 30, 2025.
PUB-8.9	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.5 – (Must be limited to Town Center and CO Zone)	Policy 2.5 lays out the approaches to be used to encourage construction of new permanent income-restricted housing. Policy 1.11 and 1.12 provide the direction for increases in multifamily or mixed-use housing to take place in the Town Center and Commercial Office zones.
PUB-8.10	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.5.H – (See CPD comment)	Staff is unsure which comment this refers to
PUB-8.11	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	3.1.C – (Needs clarification and zone)	There are many policies throughout the Housing Element that provide more specific direction for how the City will incentivize affordable housing construction, including which zones it will focus on initially.
PUB-8.12	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	3.2 – (Vague – specify)	Policy Choice*  Proposed Housing Element Policy 3.2 states: “Acknowledge historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color.”  Policy 3.2 was drafted, in part, to respond to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policy (MPP) H-5, which states: “Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color.”
PUB-8.13	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	5.1.D – (See CPD comment. 5.1.D must identify what is being balanced)	Policy Choice*  Policy 5.1.D directs that when the City reviews the multifamily development standards (Policy 5.1) it should: “Ensure parking requirements do not unnecessarily restrict multifamily housing but rather carefully balance the need for parking and the cost of providing it.” The City would determine how to apply this policy and balance need for parking and the cost of providing it during its implementation.
PUB-8.14	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	5.1.E – (Needs clarification of zone and whether incentives include regulatory limits)	5.1 clarifies that policies 5.1.A-5.1.E would apply to the development regulations in multifamily zones, this would be the MF-2, MF-2L, and MF-3 zones.
PUB-8.15	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	5.2 to 5.5 – (Need concurrent development regulations)	Policies 5.2 to 5.5 as drafted are not expected to obligate the City to adopt concurrent development regulations. These three policies provide some direction for when the City prepares code amendments to address statewide middle housing and accessory dwelling unit legislation.  The City can implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as it has resources available, provided the implementation is consistent with the implementation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan and the processes and criteria established in the Mercer Island City Code.

\* Comments marked as “Policy choice” propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

**Table 3. Transportation Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-1.1	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	"The Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust is a coalition-based organization that leads and inspires action to conserve and enhance this special landscape, ensuring a long-term balance between people and nature." It is meaningless. Please remove it from page 2: I do not believe owns any property on Mercer Island and they don't provide any trails whatsoever on Mercer Island. And please remove this: <del>the vision and development of the Town Center. The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I-90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.</del>	Planning Commission addressed on 6/5/24
PUB-1.2	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And please remove this: The Temple Herzl, for example, want to build a building and not provide one parking, not one, but have shared parking with the synagogue and the French American School, is that what we want? No, we do not want shared parking, so remove this goal: <del>1.2 Encourage businesses and residential areas to explore opportunities for shared parking and other parking management strategies.</del>	Policy Choice* Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element
PUB-1.3	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And I want you to add the wording "and retain trees" to read: "Encourage programs that retain trees and encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of rights-of-way." <del>3.3 Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.</del>	Planning Commission addressed on 6/5/24
PUB-1.4	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And would someone like to explain how anyone thinks that you could build a parking lot which would be for Mercer Islanders only. I don't know if you are aware, but pre-covid, Sound Transit were offering permits for people to park in the Park and Ride for \$120 a month on a first come, first serve basis. It was not exclusive to Mercer Islanders. Business is business and if someone from Bellevue, for example, wanted to purchase a permit for the MI Park and Ride, how do you think you are going to tell them that it is "for Mercer Islanders only?" It is not, so take this language out. <del>4.4 Investigate opportunities for operating, constructing and/or financing park and ride lots for Mercer Island residents only.</del>	Policy Choice* Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element
PUB-1.5	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And why are you wasting our money on this? Light rail is Sound Transit's project, not Mercer Island's project, if they want to make it safe to get to their light rail (that is even if it should work), let them study opportunities and besides, it is up to WSDOT to approve, so take this out: <del>4.9 Implement transportation programs and projects that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups.</del>	Policy Choice* Can we add a reference to the CPPs to illustrate why this policy is needed?
PUB-1.6	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	I have never heard of the Eastside Partnership, King County Metro are the ones who schedule the bus routes, so shouldn't you be coordinating planning with them? <del>5.5 Work with the participants of the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) to coordinate transportation planning for the Eastside subarea.</del>	Policy Choice* Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element  The <a href="#">Eastside Transportation Partnership</a> was established by interlocal agreement in 1987 to provide a forum for cooperation between eastside jurisdictions to implement coordinated, prioritized transportation plans and programs through leadership, education and advocacy.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment															
PUB-1.7	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And what on earth do you mean by this?: 6.2 Develop strategies to manage property access along arterial streets in order to preserve their function.	Policy Choice*  Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element															
PUB-1.8	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And again, this is up to Sound Transit, not the City of MI, let ST study opportunities: 12.412.4 Study opportunities to expand electric bicycle facilities that serve the Town Center, light rail station, and park and ride.	Policy Choice*															
PUB-1.9	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	I have never heard of a Level of Service for pedestrians. What on earth do you mean by this?: 12.55 Prioritize areas near schools and commercial areas for a higher level of service for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.	Policy Choice*  Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element  <a href="#">This resource</a> from the National Association of City Transportation Officials provides more information on Level of Service for pedestrians.															
PUB-1.10	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	AND FINALLY, IT HAS TAKEN ME 5 YEARS TO GET YOU TO CORRECT THE INFORMATION WITH REGARDS TO THIS: You had 80th Ave SE and North Mercer Way and 77th Ave SE and North Mercer Way as being "Town Center Intersections" which they never were, but you refused to correct it, and finally, you have to make the heading Town Center and Adjacent Town Center with an LOS of C which is all I wanted you to do.  <table border="1"> <caption>Table 1. 2018 Existing Intersection Operations</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Intersection</th> <th>AM Peak Hour</th> <th>PM Peak Hour</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"><b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SE 24th St/76th Ave SE</td> <td>B</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Mercer Way/Park &amp; Ride/80th Ave SE</td> <td>C</td> <td>C</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	<b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b>			SE 24th St/76th Ave SE	B	B	N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE	A	A	N Mercer Way/Park & Ride/80th Ave SE	C	C	As communicated at the time this correction was initially requested, it was not possible to amend the comprehensive plan outside of the periodic update process. As promised, the requested change has been incorporated.
Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour																	
<b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b>																			
SE 24th St/76th Ave SE	B	B																	
N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE	A	A																	
N Mercer Way/Park & Ride/80th Ave SE	C	C																	
PUB-1.11	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And there is an assumption that light rail will work, but it is not a given. The first engineering company who were asked to look at light rail on the I-90 bridge said it wouldn't work which was not what Sound Transit wanted to hear so fired that engineering company, so do not make out that light rail "runs through", we don't know yet if it will be operational, plus I have never heard of the buses deemed "fixed route service"  <u>Link light rail runs through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. The light rail provides frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.</u>  Local fixed route service operates on the arterial roadway system, and provides public transit service connecting residential and activity areas.	Word Smithing**															

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment																				
PUB-1.12	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And I am sorry, but this is COMPLETELY FALSE:</p> <p><small>According to the Fourth Quarter 2017 Park and Ride Utilization Report prepared by King County, the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays. A number of the users of this lot do not reside on the Island.</small></p> <p>The Mercer Island Park and Ride is not full at all, not at all and certainly not "typically fully occupied. Since covid, you can always get parking, so please remove that statement. I live right opposite and keep monitoring the Park and Ride. If you want photos of any given day after 9am, i can provide them to you to show you the empty parking lot.</p> <p>I don't know for the rest of the parking lots, but please amend this from 100% to 50% occupied:</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Table 2: Mercer Island Park and Ride Locations and Capacities</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Lot</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Capacity</th> <th>Cars Parked</th> <th>% Spaces Occupied</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mercer Island Park and Ride</td> <td>8000 N Mercer Way</td> <td>447</td> <td>447</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>And keep the wording "analysis assumes the opening of the East Link", we don't know if it is going to actually work:</p> <p><small>The analysis assumes the opening of the East Link light rail line in 2023, which will result in provides an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.</small></p>	Lot	Location	Capacity	Cars Parked	% Spaces Occupied	Mercer Island Park and Ride	8000 N Mercer Way	447	447	100%	Word Smithing**										
Lot	Location	Capacity	Cars Parked	% Spaces Occupied																				
Mercer Island Park and Ride	8000 N Mercer Way	447	447	100%																				
PUB-1.13	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And none of these two projects should be done if there is going to be a lot of construction in the Town Center because all those construction trucks are going to damage the roadway:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Justification</th> <th>Cost (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="5"><b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NM-1</td> <td>80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)</td> <td>Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.</td> <td>2023-2028 TIP (SP136)</td> <td>1,376,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NM-2</td> <td>78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)</td> <td>Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.</td> <td>2023-2028 TIP (SP137)</td> <td>779,488</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)	<b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b>					NM-1	80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP136)	1,376,000	NM-2	78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP137)	779,488	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)																				
<b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b>																								
NM-1	80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP136)	1,376,000																				
NM-2	78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP137)	779,488																				
PUB-1.14	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And I am getting annoyed. I have told you dozens of times that it is not up to the City of Mercer Island to remove the bus bay and to widen the trail, it is not your project, nor are you transport experts, not to mention it is a lot of money. And like I keep telling you, having bicyclists on the sidewalk no matter how wide is a disaster and it is just a matter of time before there is an accident. Who can make it that the signs tell bicyclists to use the bike trail leading to 24th St to 84th Ave SE and to not have bicyclists riding on the sidewalk which by definition is for pedestrians, not bicyclists?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Justification</th> <th>Cost (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NM-8</td> <td>North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements</td> <td>Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.</td> <td>2023-2028 TIP (SP144)</td> <td>1,203,081</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)	NM-8	North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements	Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.	2023-2028 TIP (SP144)	1,203,081	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>										
ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)																				
NM-8	North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements	Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.	2023-2028 TIP (SP144)	1,203,081																				



Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment					
PUB-1.15	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And as a pedestrian, putting a traffic light at the intersection of 28th Ave SE and 80th Ave SE is going to be the worst possible thing, not to mention that it is not going to work and it is going to cause more backups so please remove this, not to mention the high costs. And what about the plan to make a one-way street where Tully's is? Some new person in the city came up with the terrible idea to get rid of a section of Greta Hackett park in order to add parking, what is happening with that plan? So in addition to your wanting to add a traffic signal there, you want to add a one-way street next to the traffic light, how is that going to look and how will it work?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>I-2</td> <td>SE 28th St/80th Ave SE</td> <td>Install traffic signal.</td> <td>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)</td> <td>1,464,000</td> </tr> </table>	I-2	SE 28th St/80th Ave SE	Install traffic signal.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)	1,464,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
I-2	SE 28th St/80th Ave SE	Install traffic signal.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)	1,464,000					
PUB-1.16	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And I don't understand, there is already a turn lane which has a left-turn light, so why are you spending all this money when there is already a left turning lane? Please explain:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>I-3</td> <td>80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way</td> <td>Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.</td> <td>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)</td> <td>754,000</td> </tr> </table>	I-3	80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way	Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)	754,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
I-3	80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way	Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)	754,000					
PUB-1.17	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And this is a WSDOT issue, not a MI issue and I don't understand how you could make it an "exclusive westbound left turn lane"</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>I-4</td> <td>North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way</td> <td>Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.</td> <td>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)</td> <td>650,000</td> </tr> </table>	I-4	North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way	Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)	650,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
I-4	North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way	Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)	650,000					
PUB-1.18	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And you need to figure out the coordination and synchronization with WSDOT and with the City of MI. This is what I have observed. When the intersection leading from 27th St onto the I-90 going westbound is clogged, drivers are instead using the 28th St and Island Crest Way intersection to get onto the I-90 clogging up 28th St. Who is responsible for the synchronization and what happens if you come up with the traffic light at 27th St and 80th Ave SE and it makes the traffic conditions worse and more dangerous for pedestrians? What is the backup plan? Would you revert it back to a stop street?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>R-2</td> <td>Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way - SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.</td> <td>Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.</td> <td>2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)</td> <td>690,000</td> </tr> </table>	R-2	Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way - SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.	Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)	690,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
R-2	Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way - SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.	Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)	690,000					
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	<p>Goal 4.9 - Was this specifically required by the new housing bills passed as law by the State? If I recall correctly, this came out of the King County Planning Policies document, which is *guidance,* not law. Please strike "Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color" from this goal. Differentiating programs and how we treat others based solely on skin color is racism and suggests that people are less well-off based solely on the color of their skin. Differentiating programs and resources based on needs relating to income or disability status is a good thing and is proper. Racism is not. Additionally, as a member of the Jewish community in this post-10/7 world, I am disappointed with the goal as-proposed, as it explicitly excludes the Jewish Community, among many others.</p>	<p>Proposed Transportation Policy 4.9 states: "Implement transportation programs that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups."</p> <p>This policy was drafted to align with the King County Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) T-9, which states: "Implement transportation programs and projects that prevent and mitigate the displacement of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low and no- incomes, and people with special transportation needs."</p>					

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	Goal 4.10 - Please articulate that off-street parking is a significant issue (read essentially necessary) for handicapped persons and families.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 5.4 - Change equity to equality	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 7.3 - Nice idea, likely impossible unfortunately	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 12.4 - Post-COVID, e-bikes have really gravitated from rentals or city-owned to personally-owned. We should deploy city money in a more impactful way than this	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.6	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 14.6 - This was already studied. Surely there are better uses of city money post-COVID	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	4.9: This is really a socioeconomic issue and not a race issue as one Commissioner mentioned in a recent meeting. Injecting race into this goal muddies the water and diverges from the intent (helping those who need help through extra programs and resource allocation). As a person who would qualify as BIPOC, I also find that aspect of this goal to be quite patronizing.	Proposed Transportation Policy 4.9 states: "Implement transportation programs that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups."  This policy was drafted to align with the King County Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) T-9, which states: "Implement transportation programs and projects that prevent and mitigate the displacement of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low and no- incomes, and people with special transportation needs."
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	4.10: Three Commissioners have noted in some form that guaranteed parking off of a street is necessary for families and those who are handicapped – these are solid points and important to note here	Policy Choice*
PUB-8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	4.10 - Needs to articulate that off street parking is an issue (i.e., necessary) - especially for handicapped and families.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.1	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Transportation element policy 6.9: change to "Seek to provide parking and other automobile facilities to meet anticipated demand generated by new development, carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it."	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.2	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Transportation element – Goal 11: I'd omit this goal and incorporate policy 11.1 elsewhere. If it remains, it should be clear that we need to carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.	Policy Choice*

\* Comments marked as "Policy Choice" propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

\*\* Comments marked as "Word Smithing" are comments proposing an alternate wording for non-policy and non-goal parts of the draft element. The Planning Commission can amend the text as proposed without changing the policy direction, but further consistency analysis would be required to ensure that the amendment does not conflict with policies elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Table 4. Capital Facilities Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment

**Table 5. Utilities Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-7	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>I am sorry, but what PSE wants is so against any of our values when they want to add transmission lines to the Eastside. Look up "Energize Eastside," which is they want to shove massive transmission lines <a href="#">Overview - Energize Eastside EIS</a> Please see the video. It is a massive detriment to the environment:                      I hope that you will make sure that Mercer Island will not receive their electricity through this Energize Eastside power lines. This is what they are asking for, please make sure that Mercer Island will not be behind this grid infrastructure, we don't want a part of it and you certainly won't be expediting any local permitting, that would be nuts to do so:</p> <p><b>Policy 8 - Grid Infrastructure</b>                      Expedite the local permitting and approval process in order to maintain grid capacity and reliability. [Land Use Element]</p> <p><b>PSE Programs</b>                      New regional transmission lines are needed to serve new utility scale clean energy resources, such as wind and solar.</p> <p>New local transmission lines are needed to meet increasing local demand due to growth, EV's, and electrification of the heating sector (e.g., Sammamish to Juanita line in Kirkland).</p> <p>Transmission upgrades are needed to meet increasing local demand (e.g., Energize Eastside line in Redmond, Bellevue, Newcastle, and Renton upgraded from 115kv to 230kv) due to growth, EVs, and electrification of the heating sector.</p> <p>In order to assure continued capacity and reliability, new and larger substations will be needed to meet growing energy needs due to growth, EVs and electrification of the heating sector.</p>	No Additional Comment

**Table 6. Economic Development Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 5, Lines 14-18 - See comment below. Remove "are more likely to choose not to own a car and" from Line 15...this is a postulation backed up by zero facts and a counterexample is presented in the following comment.	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 12, Lines 16-20 - Residents of less expensive, multifamily housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend," "sports," or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership. Also, change "will be more likely to shop locally" to "may be more likely to shop locally" - this makes the statement consistent with Line 16 on Page 5 (i.e., it is a "may," not a "will.")	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 12, Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 12, Line 17. Reword to read "Recent state legislation mandates encouraging" from "Recent legislation will encourage" We have no clue if the laws will work to encourage development, especially in such a high-cost part of the area as our city; it, however, is fact that state legislation has mandated encouraging, so lets state the facts, not the stated intent of the laws.	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 7.6 - Remove this entire goal. Small scale retail development "outside the existing commercial districts" is an under-the-radar method of saying "inside the residential zones" and is a bad idea. Living next to a 7-11, gas station, or pot shop would be a nightmare and is incompatible with our existing community. It is well-accepted that in US suburbs, retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale"	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	Starting at line 16 on pp. 12: It is incorrect that car ownership is less likely in less expensive and/or multi-family housing. This assertion is false and should be removed. (same location): there is nothing about housing on Mercer Island that is "priced in the middle range". Stick to the words used by Olympia - Middle Housing. It is about the size/capacity of the housing, not the cost. Housing priced in the middle range could be Renton Highlands, Preston, or South Everett	Word Smithing**
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	7.6: Get rid of the goal. This is precisely why we have zoning. There are residential areas, there are commercial districts, there are mixed use areas, etc. "Studying" retail outside of districts that are zoned for commercial (and mixed use) breaks the residential zoning that makes Mercer Island so livable and unique for those who wish to live away from retail. This amounts to studying removal of residential-only zoning and should be avoided (beyond the small-scale home offices/business already allowed by code)	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.1	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	7.6 - Delete this. Small scale retail development in the residential zones is a bad idea. Retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale".	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.2	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Lines 16-20 - residents of middle-priced housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend" or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the UDistrict are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership.	Word Smithing**
PUB-8.3	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing – even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?	Word Smithing**
PUB-13.1	6/4/2024	Chris Goelz	Economic element policy 12.2 – omit "without compromising existing available parking in commercial areas." 12.4 covers this.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.2	6/4/2024	Chris Goelz	Economic element policy 12.4 – omit "Interpretation of the policies in this element should not lead to a reduction in parking." If in the next 20 years we can figure out a way to provide sufficient parking downtown while reducing spaces, why not do it? This is a place where parking seems to be an end in itself.	Policy Choice*

\* Comments marked as "Policy choice" propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

\*\* Comments marked as "Word Smithing" are comments proposing an alternate wording for non-policy and non-goal parts of the draft element. The Planning Commission can amend the text as proposed without changing the policy direction, but further consistency analysis would be required to ensure that the amendment does not conflict with policies elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Table 7. General and Process-Related Comments.**

Log #	Date	Commenter
PUB-4	5/29/2024	John Hall
PUB-5	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-6	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson
PUB-9	5/29/2024	Matthew Goldbach
PUB-10	5/29/2024	Traci Grandbois
PUB-11	5/29/2024	Gary Robinson (note – this comment included the same policy comments as provided in PUB-8)
PUB-12	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-13	6/4/2024	Chris Goelz
PUB-14	6/4/2024	Meg Lippert
PUB-15	6/5/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-16	6/6/2024	Sarah Fletcher

**Note:** The full text of each general and process-related public comments is provided in PCB 24-16 Exhibit 2.



**MERCER ISLAND 2044  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**



**PCB 24-16  
Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review**

**Planning Commission  
Deliberations  
(Continued from June 5)**

June 12, 2024  
Adam Zack, Senior Planner  
Community Planning and Development



# Purpose



1. Deliberate the Planning Commission (PC) recommendation for the Land Use, Housing, and Economic Development elements; and
2. Complete the PC recommendation for the Comprehensive Plan update.

# Why Update the Comprehensive Plan?

- Adoption and periodic review of a comprehensive plan are required under the Growth Management Act (GMA).
- Update of the 20-year planning horizon (2024-2044) and growth projections
- Address new GMA requirements, particularly for housing, established by the WA Legislature in the last few years.
- Periodic review must be completed by December 31, 2024.



2023

**Economic Development**

- Economic development interviews

**Comprehensive Plan**

- Scope of Work
- Public Participation
- Master Schedule

Spring

Summer

Autumn

Winter

2022

**Economic Development**

- Community Workshop
- Online survey
- Work Group begins

**Housing**

- Housing Work Group (HWG) begin

**Planning Commission Review**

- Land Use
- Transportation

**City Council / Planning Commission**

- Presentations of Economic Analysis and Housing Needs Assessment

**Planning Commission Review**

- Land Use
- Transportation

**Economic Development**

- EDWG review of draft element

**Housing**


- Housing Needs Assessment presented to City Council & Planning Commission

**Economic Development**

- EDWG review of draft element
- Draft element refinement

**Planning Commission Review**

- Capital Facilities Element
- Utilities Element



2023

2025

**Planning Commission Review**

- HWG draft Housing Element
- Parks and Open Space Element
- Open Space Zone

**Housing**

- HWG recommended draft Housing Element

**Public Participation**

- May 1: Open House

We are here

**Legislative Process**

- May 29: Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing
- June 5 & 12: Planning Commission Recommendation to City Council

**City Council**

- Review and adopt the updated Comprehensive Plan
- Planning Commission Review**
- HWG recommended draft of implementing code amendments

Spring

Summer

Autumn

Winter

**City Council Review**

- Planning Commission recommended draft Comprehensive Plan update

**Housing Work Group**

- Develop a recommended draft of implementing code amendments

**City Council**

- Adopt the implementing code amendments
- Entire Comprehensive Plan update must be adopted by December 31, 2024.

2024

# June 5 Recap

- Several motions amending the Transportation Element and making findings were approved.
- One motion was tabled. A tabled motion requires a majority vote from the PC to resume consideration of this motion.
- Another option for addressing the tabled motion without further discussion is to make a motion to “lay on the table” which would call an immediate vote on the motion.
- The tabled motion was:

Add to the PC findings: “Transportation Element Policy Goal 4.9 received two strong public comments. During a brief discussion, it was brought up that key definitions related to this goal are not currently contained within the Comprehensive Plan document.



# Elements For Consideration Tonight



## Land Use (PCB 24-13 Ex. 2)

- Updated to remain consistent with changes to other elements



## Housing (PCB 24-13 Ex. 3)


- Repeal & Replace the Housing Element to be consistent with updated GMA requirements




## Economic Development (PCB 24-13 Ex. 7)

- New element to establish policy direction for the City's economic development efforts


# Staff Recommended Motions (PCB 24-13)



~~Motion to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in PCB24-13 Table 1 as presented.~~



~~Motion to make the staff recommended findings in PCB24-13 Table 2 as presented [or amended].~~



Motion to recommend adoption of the updated Comprehensive Plan as amended to the City Council.



# Schedule and Next Steps

<b>June 12</b>	Conclude deliberations Focus: Land Use, Housing, and Economic Development
<b>July 16</b>	City Council Briefing on PC Recommendation
<b>September</b>	PC Begin Reviewing Implementing Ordinance

# Thank You

More information  
on the project  
website

[letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update](http://letstalk.mercergov.org/comprehensive-plan-periodic-update)

