

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
1	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>No, e-bikes are motorized vehicles driven by unlicensed and uninsured persons and pose a hazard to walkers. They need to be on roads, not on sidewalks, trails or elsewhere where they would create pedestrian/e-bike conflict. E-bike users need to be licensed and insured. Same with non-motorized bikes on MI.</p>
2	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>Thank you for inviting comments before introducing this new form of vehicle in our community of pedestrians and elderly, lack of sidewalks, constant construction blocked roads, etc:</p> <p>Electronic bicycles (e-bikes) have a potential impact on public safety. I would like to respectfully share some considerations regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • biker's liability (insurance to cover victims and other vehicular damage) • biker's accountability/restitution (regardless of age) to the victims • biker's mandatory requirements as required for auto vehicles: education (responsibility, other's safety, speed limits, vehicular regulations) and pass e-bike driving test to obtain e-bike driving license, • effective, enforceable laws for violators regardless of age • require biker helmet(s), limit number of riders on one bike each with helmet • require biker to secure ebike from being stolen by irresponsible theft • illegal to modify the e-bike to exceed speed <p>While e-bikes offer many benefits, national data indicates a significant increase in e-bike-related injuries, which are often more severe than standard bicycle accidents. Several key factors contribute to these risks:</p> <p><u>Speed and Classifications:</u> E-bikes (Class 3 models (which would likely change to push sales; circumventing existing laws) capable of speeds up to 28 mph. Can be significantly faster than traditional bicycles. Even traditional bikers do not abide vehicle right of way laws at intersections and blocking roads biking side by side. Many e-bikes are easily modified to exceed legal speed limits, posing a danger on shared pathways and crowded areas. Countries in Europe and Asia often treat high-speed versions as mopeds, requiring licenses, registration, and insurance.</p> <p><u>Lack of Licensing and Age Restrictions:</u> Most e-bike classes do not require a driver's license, insurance, or a passing of a skills test. Nationally, a high percentage of injuries involve adolescents and riders with limited experience. While state law may set some parameters, relying solely on state-level rules may be insufficient to address local safety concerns. Liability and Public Space: In the event of an accident involving an e-bike, determining liability can be complex and may involve the rider, a manufacturer, or the municipality itself, especially if inadequate infrastructure or enforcement is a factor. Clear local rules help mitigate the town's potential liability and ensure all parties are aware of their responsibilities. To address these issues proactively,</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>I urge the Council to consider adopting specific local regulations and enforceable regulations to protect the public. Some potential measures include:</p> <p><u>Designated Riding Areas:</u> Restrict higher-speed e-bikes to roadways and prohibit them from shared-use paths, trails, and sidewalks, parking lots as some cities and states have already done.</p> <p><u>Enforceable Speed Limits:</u> Empower law enforcement to issue citations for e-bike speeding in areas with lower speed limits, particularly near parks, schools, parking lots, and on shared pathways.</p> <p><u>Mandatory Age and Equipment:</u> Require that riders of all classes of e-bikes be a minimum of 16 years old. Additionally, consider mandating helmet (bikers and riders) use for all e-bike classes, not just the higher-speed ones, as head injuries are common.</p> <p>By implementing thoughtful and effective regulations, our town can embrace the benefits of e-bikes while safeguarding the well-being of all residents, including pedestrians, children, automobiles, and other cyclists. Thank you for your time and for your consideration of this important community safety matter for all citizens and visitors.</p>
3	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>I'm a MI resident. I'm not an e-biker - however it seems clear that e-bikes are becoming a standard issue. I support keeping class 1 and class 2 e-bikes on trails and in parks on Mercer Island and aligns to regional regulations.</p> <p>These e-bikes are used by a wide range of users, and it would be an unfortunate to see them not allowed on Mercer Island trails and parks. E-bikes can keep aging bikers going so let's not tell folks to stay home or worse yet force them to contend with auto traffic.</p> <p>I'm an avid cyclist biking over 5000 miles per year and my contention is rarely an e-biker, but more often conflicts with cars or other trail users who are tuned out to other users. I often ride trails on our island and would be very disappointed to see e-bikes get excluded.</p>
4	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>I won't be able to attend this meeting due the schedule conflict. I would like to express my concern about a couple of young teens riding E bikes and racing with each other on First Hill where I live.</p> <p>They rode without helmet, were oblivious about cars on the road, cut in front of me, did not slow down for pedestrians around First Hill Park, specially children and adults pushing strollers.</p> <p>I haven't seen these young E bike riders since school started last month but I hope the City is able to come up with rules to deter parents for allowing their children to use the streets for their E-bike playground.</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
5	E-Bikes / E-Motos	PRC Inbox	<p>Regrettably, I cannot attend the meeting but appreciate the opportunity to submit comments.</p> <p>I am an Island resident who owns multiple ebikes and uses them almost daily on the roads, paths, and trails of the Island. I also walk, run, and drive; so certainly appreciate the various conflicts that arise. I believe ebikes offer an excellent and necessary mode of transportation, given the suburban, hilly nature of our community. They should be supported and encouraged preferentially to larger motor vehicles, as they contribute far less to the congestion and parking challenges faced by the island. I don't think we should ban ebikes from parks/paths generally, especially as such a ban would not be followed or enforced in practice. Parks, and the paths through them, provide key safe connectivity - and ebikes should be allowed.</p> <p>However, many of the things people lump into "ebike" are better described as electric motorcycles or electric dirt bikes. There is no place on Mercer Island where these things should be legal to ride. The canonical example is Surron, which sells something it calls an "electric bike" that is "everything an Ebike should be". Many people would not be able to distinguish this from something that truly is a statutory Class 1/2/3 ebike. A Surron-like "electric bike" is for all intents and purposes a motorcycle; it should require a driver's license. Riding one on paths, trails, sidewalks, etc should be a crime, just as if someone drove a gas-powered motorcycle. And as these aren't in fact regulated or registered motorcycles either, they should also be banned from our roads.</p> <p>https://sur-ronusa.com/</p> <p>Banning these outright from operation anywhere on the Island, including parks and paths, is the best option. Enforcement will be more practical; with a total ban, there is no room for misunderstandings about which path or trail this is allowed on. If it has wheels assisted by a motor, goes more than 15 mph, and not a statutory motor vehicle or class 1/2/3 ebike - it is illegal to ride anywhere - fullstop.</p> <p>I hate to undercut other emobility devices - such as eletric scooters, skateboards, unicycles, etc - but I think a conservative speed limitation is a good compromise until there is a regulatory framework for these sorts of devices that at higher speeds.</p>
6	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>I think allowing e-bikes to use our parks is wonderful and appropriate. Just like with any bike I think there should be rules about using them responsibly, but let's not punish those who use them responsibly for the few that don't as there will always be people that break the rules. As someone that rides an ebike almost everyday with my daughters we follow the rules. We ride safely and slowly through the parks and share the spaces respectfully. Just like dogs being allowed in our parks we don't ban all dogs because of a few bad apples. We need to have open spaces for all to enjoy. I know there are people that complain about e-bikes,</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			but to be honest it seems like the same people that always are finding a reason to complain on nextdoor and facebook. I love that our kids (and adults) are outside being active. Let's do our best to keep that the case as so many are just hiding behind screens nowadays. Ebikes can be used responsibly. Bikes can use our parks and can get going just as fast as my ebike in certain cases. It is all about using them responsibly so let's push that rather than just banning them.
7	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>I understand there will be a joint meeting on November 12, 2025 that will include a discussion regarding whether e-bikes should be allowed in City parks and on trails, and additional considerations for their use.</p> <p>These bikes are very dangerous and should not be allowed in city parks, on trails or on sidewalks. They should be likened to motorbikes or motorcycles. They move too fast and are heavier than a bicycle. When approaching from behind, the riders rarely let you know in a timely fashion when and which side they are approaching (if at all). And e-bike collisions with pedestrians and dogs can cause serious injuries.</p> <p>Please keep parks safe for people and pets. Do not allow e-bikes in City parks or on trails. And please exclude them from sidewalks as well.</p>
8	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox	<p>I am unable to attend the open meeting this evening, so I wanted to submit my comments over email. I'm grateful that the Parks Department is evaluating the use of e-bikes in our parks. This has been an issue for our family since moving to Mercer Island about 1.5 years ago.</p> <p>I would like to strongly encourage the Parks Department to explicitly ban the use of all e-bikes in the Mercerdale Skatepark. The skatepark should be for small wheels only (skateboards, scooters, skates). There are so few skateparks for our kids who want to develop their skills as skaters. Mercer Island only has one skatepark, for example. If it is being improperly or unsafely used by others, then skaters have to leave. The only other option is to travel outside our city to use a different skatepark - to Seattle or east to Bellevue, Issaquah or further.</p> <p>It simply isn't safe to have big and heavy electric bikes in the Mercerdale Skatepark. The area is compact, which means that if one, let alone multiple, e-bikes are on the pavement, it is hard for others to also use the space. If an e-bike crashes into a skater, the skater is going to get hurt!</p> <p>I have asked teen e-bikers to leave the skatepark previously, when their use of the space prevented other kids from skating. They refused because, though the signage explicitly says "skateboards, skates, and scooters" (or something similar), it does not explicitly ban the use of bikes or e-bikes. We have had to leave the skatepark on multiple occasions because of the e-bike teens, which is always really disappointing to the skater in our family.</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>I want to clarify that I fully support the safe use of e-bikes in our city and on appropriately designated trails. For example, e-bikes are a great option for those traveling on the I-90 trail. I simply want to keep e-bikes off of the skatepark and playgrounds.</p> <p>If the City wants to create a space for e-bikes to practice jumps and tricks, I'm not against that. In fact, I would be happy to support it. It just doesn't make sense to have e-bikes share that space with small wheels. Thank you for your consideration!</p>
9	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After 11/12 Meeting)	<p>Thank you for hosting tonight's special session on e-bike regulations. While I was able to speak during the public comment period, I did not have the opportunity to contribute during the live discussion. I'm writing to share additional input for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education and Messaging for Youth The topic of outreach to middle schoolers was raised. While I understand the police spoke about e-bikes during a school assembly, effective communication requires repetition and diverse channels. Students and parents need to hear consistent messaging multiple times—in person, through newsletters, posters, and other mediums. Moreover, the rules were not clearly communicated during the initial training, as they were not yet finalized. I urge you to conduct additional outreach once regulations are in place. 2. Speed-Based Enforcement Is Impractical Enforcing e-bike rules based on speed is not feasible. The average citizen cannot accurately gauge how fast someone is going—we don't carry radar detectors. Enforcement should be based on location: e-bikes should either be allowed or prohibited in specific areas. Similarly, regulating by e-bike class is ineffective, as most people cannot distinguish between Class 1, 2, or 3 e-bikes. 3. Clarify the Rules Current messaging is ambiguous. For example, the presentation slide on Pioneer Park stated that motorized vehicles are prohibited, while bicycles are allowed on soft-surface trails. Where does that leave e-bikes? Are they considered motorized? The lack of clarity invites confusion and debate. Clear, simple rules and signage are essential. 4. Modified E-Bikes Pose Safety Risks It's worth noting that a modified Class 3 e-bike can exceed 40 MPH. This presents serious safety concerns, especially in shared public spaces 5. Class 1 E-Bikes Are Not Equivalent to Regular Bikes Class 1 e-bikes accelerate differently and pose greater risks to pedestrians and pets. Again, most people cannot identify an e-bike's class by sight; this underscores the need for thoughtful regulation.

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>6. Access Rules Should Be Simple E-bikes should not be allowed on grass. Period. They should also not be permitted on dirt trails, particularly narrow ones that are just for pedestrians and dogs. Sidewalk access should be clearly communicated and clearly marked—either permitted or prohibited—without ambiguity. Upon doing additional research this evening, I found other communities that do not allow e-bikes on sidewalks unless the motor is <i>*not*</i> engaged. I think that's a reasonable request and a good solution for the dilemma that was discussed this evening.</p> <p>7. Beyond King County Regulations We are part of King County and are therefore required to adopt its regulations. Therefore, I'm not even sure why adopting those regulations were being debated or discussed. As a small, close-knit community, we have the opportunity to be more agile and proactive (like Medina, which has outlawed e-bikes from all of their parks). Having rules that go beyond those of King County and that are pertinent to our community should be what's on the table.</p> <p>8. Key Priorities We shouldn't wait for unfortunate incidents to prompt action. Let's lead with clear, common sense rules that reflect our local needs and protect our residents now. To summarize, I urge the Trust Board, Commission, and City Council to focus on three pillars:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, enforceable rules 2. Robust communication, education, and signage 3. Practical enforcement mechanisms <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. I appreciate your efforts to keep our community safe for all.</p>
10	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After 11/12 Meeting)	<p>I was unable to attend the Nov 12 meeting about E-bikes in parks and trails, but I would like to share my comments.</p> <p>E-bikes should NOT be allowed in Mercer Island parks nor on trails. Multiple factors make E-bikes dangerous in parks and on trails: (1) they are near-silent, (2) they can travel at high rates of speed, (3) pedestrians do not expect to encounter anything like a fast E-bike in parks or on trails, and (4) E-bike drivers typically do not have much driving experience.</p> <p>Please prohibit E-bikes in parks and on trails. Thank you.</p>
11	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After 11/12 Meeting)	<p>We are writing on behalf of Neighbors in Motion (NIM) a Mercer Island non-profit dedicated to encouraging bicycle and pedestrian transportation and safety on the Island. We have approximately 100 members and have advised on bike related projects sponsored by the City including the Aubrey Davis Master Plan, shoulder</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>widening on the Mercers and the current effort to build a bike trail connecting the South and North commercial centers. We were unaware of the Parks Department meeting on Nov. 12 and have only recently reviewed the staff materials and video. Our interest relates primarily to rule changes that would impact the “I-90 Trail (also known as the Aubrey Davis Trail, the Lid Park Trail, the Mountains to Sound Trail), (hereafter, the “Trail”) but we also have thoughts on other elements of the study session. The following are our comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We should exercise great care before adopting changes to the use of the Trail across the Island. The I-90 Trail is a regional transportation corridor used by cyclists for commuting and essential travel, not solely for recreation. In addition, Mercer Island Station's design directly connects trails in Aubrey Davis Park (Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail) making it an integral part of the I-90 transportation corridor. 2. The Trail was initially built in 1992 and has served as a bicycle and pedestrian transportation corridor for over 30 years. According to WSDOT's tracking device, between 500 and 700 bicycles per day use the Trail for commuting or recreational purposes. This usage will grow with the opening of the light rail station. Any effort to restrict E-Bikes use of the Trail would have a profound negative effect on the transportation choices of cyclists throughout the region but especially those in Seattle, Bellevue and Mercer Island. Additionally: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. WSDOT would need to approve any changes to the Trail under the City and WSDOT operating agreement. Although we don't speak for WSDOT, we think it unlikely that WSDOT would approve of the changes given the impact it would have on Trail use flowing to both Seattle and Bellevue. b. It would be confusing to users of the Trail because regular bikes would not be impacted by the new rules, and c. It would be inconsistent with the City's commitment to environmental goals. After years of waiting for light rail and bike infrastructure (cages and lockers) to come to the Island we would now be telling E-Bike commuters that the most efficient way to get to the light rail station (the Trail) is no longer open to them. 3. <u>Washington Law</u>. E-Bike rule changes that would limit E-Bike access to the Trail would likely violate the Washington E-Bike statute. According to RCW 46.61.710, towns and cities may restrict Class 1 and 2 bike access to its shared used trails, however if the regulation is of a shared use path that “crosses jurisdictional boundaries of two or more local jurisdictions, [it] must be consistent for the entire shared use path in order for the local regulation to be enforceable.” Our reading of the law is that

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>Mercer Island may not limit or deny Class 1 and 2 E-Bike access to the Trail because it would be inconsistent with the preexisting Class 1 and 2 bike use on the Mountains to Sound trail on either side of Mercer Island.</p> <p><u>Other Comments Relating to the Meeting</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>E-Bike Rules</u>. The E-Bike rules adopted by Washington State arise from model legislation drafted by state legislatures and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) following years of study. It has in turn been adopted by 40 states and is the de-facto standard for E-Bike classifications and usage in America. 2. <u>Class 1 and 2 Trail Use</u>. Our reading of RCW 46.61.710 is that Class 1 and Class 2 bikes may ride shared use trails (e.g. the “Trail”) by default. The City may restrict or limit this access unless the restriction or limitation is inconsistent with the rules for connecting trails. Class 3 E-Bikes are treated the opposite and are denied access to shared use trails by default, although the City can vote to grant them access. 3. <u>Class 2 Throttle</u>. To correct a point made in the meeting, Class 3 E-Bikes do not have throttles (in Washington). They are like Class 1 E-Bikes except that Class 1 E-Bikes top out at 20 mph while Class 3 E-Bikes top out at 28 mph. <u>See</u> RCW 46.04.169. Class 2 E-Bikes are the only category that have a throttle. 4. <u>Speed Limits</u>. Seattle, Bellevue, King County (and other cities near Seattle) have adopted a 15 mile per hour speed limit on trails under their control. Mercer Island has not adopted a speed limit. It is our understanding that even though a portion of the Trail crossing Mercer Island is within King County, the County 15 mph speed limit does not apply to the Mercer Island Trails. If we were to adopt a speed limit, RCW 46.61.710 would require consistency across jurisdictional boundaries, meaning we would need to adopt limits that are the same as Seattle and Bellevue. Speed limits would also need to be approved by WSDOT. 5. <u>Recommendations</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. E-Bikes on Mercer Island should be regulated in the same manner as they are currently regulated:

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Descriptions and related definitions of Class 1,2 and 3 bikes as stated in RCW 46.61.710 would remain the same. ii. There would be continued default access to shared use trails and sidewalks for Class 1 and Class 2 E-Bikes iii. There would be continued default denial of access to shared use trails for Class 3 E-Bikes unless otherwise allowed by the City. iv. E-Bike and E-motorcycle rules should not be legally grouped together. E-motorcycles are not a super-set or a sub-set of E-Bikes and should be treated differently under the law. <p>b. The City should consider the establishment of a 15 mph speed limit on the Trails consistent with that adopted by neighboring cities.</p>
12	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After 11/12 Meeting)	<p>I am writing to urge you not to ban Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes in Mercer Island parks. I understand this topic is on the agenda for your upcoming Joint Meeting on January 8, and I am deeply concerned that a broad ban would be a reactionary step that harms responsible families rather than solving the specific safety issues at hand.</p> <p>As a parent whose children have safely operated legal e-bikes for five years, I believe preserving access to our parks is essential for the safety and mobility of Mercer Island youth.</p> <p>Here are the key reasons why I believe e-bikes should remain allowed in our public parks:</p> <p>1. The "E-Motorcycle" Issue Has Already Been Addressed</p> <p>The recent community concern regarding "e-bikes" has largely been rooted in the illegal operation of high-speed electric motorcycles (often Sur-Ron or Talaria style bikes) by minors. These vehicles are dangerous and have no place on our trails. Fortunately, the City Council recently passed Ordinance No. 25C-24, which explicitly bans these e-motorcycles from parks and requires licenses for their operation. This ordinance addresses the root cause of the complaints—speeding, reckless behavior, and wheelies. We should allow time for this new law to take effect and for enforcement to work before punishing responsible users of legal, pedal-assist e-bikes.</p> <p>2. Parks Provide the Only Safe Routes for Kids</p> <p>Mercer Island lacks adequate shoulders or sidewalks on a majority of its roads. For many children, riding through parks is not just recreational; it is a necessary safety measure to avoid riding in traffic on narrow, winding streets. Banning e-bikes in parks forces children onto dangerous roadways, significantly increasing the risk of vehicle-related accidents. My own children use parks to get to school safely—a ban would make their safe commute illegal.</p> <p>3. Topography Makes E-Bikes Essential</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>Mercer Island is incredibly hilly. For many children and families, "regular" bikes are simply not practical for transportation. My kids operate their e-bikes daily, whereas they rarely used traditional bikes. E-bikes open up our community and parks to people who otherwise wouldn't be able to enjoy them. Banning them effectively restricts access to our public spaces for a large portion of the community for whom parks are primarily intended, designed for and utilized by.</p> <p>4. Policy Should Not Be Based on Outliers</p> <p>To my knowledge, proponents of a ban often cite a single incident involving a dog as justification. While any accident is regrettable, it is unclear if that incident involved a legal pedal-assist e-bike or an illegal e-motorcycle. Furthermore, a single ambiguous incident that took place on a roadway (and not a park) should not dictate policy for thousands of residents who use these paths safely every day without issue.</p> <p>5. Alignment with State Law</p> <p>Banning low-speed e-bikes puts Mercer Island at odds with Washington State Law, which generally classifies Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes as bicycles. These devices are quiet, speed-limited, and compatible with mixed-use trails.</p> <p>6. Unintended Consequences</p> <p>A ban will likely increase tension in our parks. It turns responsible children into rule-breakers and gives citizens cause to police one another, creating negative confrontations. It is far better to enforce speed limits and reckless riding rules for all users than to issue a blanket ban on the technology itself.</p> <p>Please vote to preserve access for Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes in our parks. Let the new e-motorcycle ordinance do its work, and keep our kids off the busy roads and responsibly enjoying our parks.</p>
13	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After 11/12 Meeting)	<p>My son in law and daughter asked me to write in on this.</p> <p>I have lived on MI 46 years and learned from them about banning bikes and e-bikes in the parks. I agree with Ben's statements below and would encourage you all to oppose any banning of bikes in parks.</p> <p>(See Log #12)</p>
14	E-Bikes	Parks Inbox (After 11/12 Meeting)	<p>I am sorry to have missed the meeting on Nov, 12th regarding the e-bike issue. I became aware of the meet as a result of reading an article in the MI Reporter. The article mentions the issue of signage to help make everyone more aware.</p> <p>I would like to point out that there is a sign posted on the entrance to the West end of the lid park. That sign says, "No Motorized Vehicles". There are no other signs anywhere that I am aware of. That sign makes it illegal to ride any e- bike or e-motor cycle or even e-scooter in the park according to the published statutes.</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>Without more and better signage people are not aware of the rules and restriction. This lack of signage leads to conflict.</p> <p>I have personally been involved in a situation where the MI police were called as a result of confusion over the rules. The incident involved kids riding their e-bikes on the fields and trails. Parents were called and they insisted that the kid's activity was legal.</p> <p>It seems like something simple that could be done immediately to post more signs where there are already existing rules in place.</p>
15	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	<p>As 40-year Mercer Island residents who raised three sons here, we are deeply concerned that the actions of a few "e-moto" riders may lead to a broad ban on bicycles and e-bikes in our parks. We should focus on reducing conflict among all users rather than simply restricting bike/e-bike access based on the actions of a few individuals.</p> <p>Our parks have more users and stakeholders than just pedestrians. They provide a safe alternative to our island's dangerous streets. For decades, these trails have allowed children to commute to school and recreate away from traffic—a need that has only grown as Mercer Island lags behind neighboring communities in bike-safe infrastructure. Banning bikes from trails doesn't solve a problem; it simply forces vulnerable riders, including students, back onto the roads.</p> <p>We support common-sense solutions to reduce trail conflicts, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing 15 mph speed limits and clear signage consistent with King County standards. • Designating a few trails as pedestrian-only while keeping general access open. • Paving more trails or better separating e-bikes from pedestrians. • Educating all users—including pedestrians who may be distracted by iphones, headphones or walking groups—on the importance of sharing the space. <p>My e-bike is my primary source of transportation and exercise. It allows me to stay active while avoiding risky roadways. Please do not penalize an entire segment of our community for the behavior of a few.</p> <p>We urge your committees to seek a balanced approach that preserves safety and accessibility for everyone.</p>
16	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	<p>While speed limits, signage, and limiting e-bike access to certain areas—such as the skateboard area in Mercedale Park or the new bike skills area near Island Park School—have merit, a total ban is overkill. Bikes have been ridden in MI parks for decades, and e-bikes are now the fastest-growing segment in cycling.</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			Mercer Island has done little, if anything, to develop safe alternatives to riding in parks. Our roads are dangerous, and there is still no safe route that connects neighborhoods with our schools or city center. Please dont ban ebikes from parks.
17	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	I have concerns about the proposed changes to use regulations in Mercer Island Parks. I do agree the limitation of Class 3 e-bikes is needed and also better policing of unlawful or unlicensed e-motorcycle use by under-aged or unlicensed individuals. However, limiting use of Class 1 or 2 e-bikes to paved paths isn't a reasonable solution since many people use those modes of transportation responsibly. There are limited and disconnected safe paved pathways south of SE 53rd PI for any type of bike user, either e-bike or conventional. Until this can be addressed, it is unusually restrictive to expect anyone to adhere to this proposal. I think education for safe e-bike use provided to schools and the community, in general, would be a better immediate solution until better paths can be provided.
18	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	<p>I am a long-time resident and cyclist on Mercer Island and participant in NIM. I ride recreationally from the Island both east or west on the I-90 trail typically on a traditional non-electric-assisted bike. As a senior I have also obtained an eBike that I use for commuting to appointments, events or visits both on and off Island. I prefer riding from the Park and Ride and using the I-90 trail for off-Island destinations.</p> <p>My eBike would be considered Class 3 although my use of power is to assist in keeping a steady pace on hills, not to achieve high speeds. I use conventional bike gearing, pedal propulsion otherwise.</p> <p>NIM has recommended establishing a 15mph limit on the I-90 trail and I support that proposal as it would apply to all bikes.</p> <p>I would also propose allowing class 3 eBikes on the I-90 trail which would subject them to the same 15mph speed limit as other bikes.</p> <p>Please retain the rules that allow conventional, non-electric bike use on park soft-surface trails.</p>
19	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	I am writing as a member of the Board of NIM (Neighbors in Motion) regarding the 1/8/26 Parks and Rec. Commission/Open Space Conservancy Trust meeting about e-bikes in public parks. (NIM, a 501c3 corporation, has been in existence about 20 years, advocating for safer bicycle and pedestrian routes on MI; see below* for further details.) We understand the meeting will consider limiting class 1 and 2 e-bikes in parks and open spaces (hereafter, "parks") to paved walkways only, and disallowing class 3 e-bikes from

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			<p>parks. Banning class 3 e-bikes in parks might make sense. But for numerous reasons the rest of this proposal should be voted down, or at a minimum, allowed further public comment and modification. Less restrictive alternatives should be considered before adopting a blanket proposal that addresses some issues by a few unruly riders, but severely restricts the large majority of the e-bike population.</p> <p>The stated problem is the speed of some e-bike riders. The solution should therefore focus on speed. But currently we are aware of no speed limit signs for any bikes in MI's parks. A 15 mph speed limit in the parks makes sense. Would you expect drivers to go under 35 mph on ICW if there were no speed limit signs? Posting a speed limit sign for all cyclists should be the first answer to a speeding bike problem. Of course a speed limit sign will not stop all speeders--car, e-bike or otherwise. But if some drivers went over the speed limit on ICW, would the first 'solution' be to ban all cars from ICW? The first option should not be the nuclear option. The large majority of e-bike riders who do not offend should not be penalized. Alternatives are proposed below.</p> <p>The Staff proposal would allow class 1 & 2 e-bikes only on paved surfaces in the parks. But bear in mind that there is precious little paved walkway in the parks. Most is in Aubrey Davis Park (which is a WSDOT transportation route), and a minimal amount is in other parks, such as Pioneer Park (only one path, a half mile or so in the NE quadrant), Island Crest park (giving credit for the to-be-constructed pathway from IP school to SE 60th), and in various ballfields/playgrounds.</p> <p>Safety is being compromised. For the intended benefit of protecting walkers in parks, the proposal would enhance the dangers of e-bike riding. Riders on class 1 and 2 e-bikes would be forced to use the roadway whenever there is no paved path, causing inevitable friction with motorists.</p> <p>Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Speed limits. Other than (recently installed at) AD park, we are unaware of any signage limiting the speed of e-bikes. NIM has often supported a 15 mph limit for all bikes in congested areas. --Better signage. Signs in parks should direct bicyclists to verbally warn pedestrians when passing. Similarly, pedestrians should be alerted that bicycles are allowed, and that dogs, strollers, etc., should be controlled so as not to take up the pavement. "Share the walkway." --Better enforcement. Currently MIPD has few options to stop scofflaws. A speed limit would be readily enforceable. --Education programs in the schools could emphasize safety concerns.

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
20	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	<p>I'm writing to express my opinion on potential e-bike regulations. I live on SE 53rd Place near Lansdowne Lane, just south of Island Park. I frequently use the trails through Island Park and Pioneer Park for walking, jogging and biking (on a conventional pedal bike). I specifically use the trail connecting Lansdowne Lane to 84th Ave SE to access the Southend commercial center (QFC, etc.) The trail access from Lansdowne Lane is a convenient connection to the Southend commercial center, the Country Club, Islander Middle School and Lakeridge Elementary. Restricting bike access to the trail would require a very steep climb up SE 53rd to Island Crest Way or accessing a heavy traffic West Mercer Way via the short trail at the bottom of SE 53rd and then back up SE 56th or SE 70th for a long round-about access the Southend schools and commercial center.</p> <p>I support the promotion of walking and biking on the Island for transportation, fitness and leisure on all public rights-of-way. To improve the safety of trail users, I propose limiting the speed limit of all cyclists, including e-bikers, to 10 MPH on park trails and requiring cyclist to dismount when pedestrians are present within 30 ft. There are many blind corners and areas of limited site distance on the trails, in such cases I think cyclist should be required to slow down to 5 MPH. The speed limit on the Mountain to Sound paved trail across the Northend of the Island should remain at 15 MPH.</p> <p>I acknowledge that it would be challenging to enforce whatever rules are adopted; therefore, I believe an education program should be developed and required to be attended by all students at all schools on an annual basis.</p>
21	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	<p>Our son has biked to school independently since early at West Mercer Elementary and then purchased his first e-bike in 6th grade so that he could continue biking to the South end for middle school. He has followed the rules set for cyclists, which were reinforced by our family. When he was ready to purchase a new e-bike this year, he researched the state laws and confirmed with us that he was buying an e-bike that was within the rules. Despite this he is frequently honked at, cursed at, flipped off, and tailed dangerously while biking on the roads. Drivers seem to think that teenagers, and especially those with e-bikes should not be allowed on the road. I personally witnessed in the Fall a car flip him off and zoom around him while he tried to make a left hand turn into our driveway on West Mercer Way. Due to this, he frequently uses trails and parks to commute around the island.</p> <p>Kids need to be able to have independence and feel safe getting around their community. Please allow bikes and e-bikes to continue accessing public spaces including parks in our community. The poor actions of a few e-bike riders should not be cause for all e-bike riders to be restricted. As police have educated youth and families, and enforced current laws such as confiscating illegal e-bikes, safe park use has already improved significantly and will continue to improve.</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
22	E-Bikes	PRC Inbox (After Packet Published)	<p>The City Staff has proposed the following policy regarding e-bikes on trails and within parks on Mercer Island.</p> <p>"Class 1 and class 2 electric assisted bicycles, and motorized foot scooters, are not allowed within open spaces or parks except on paved trails, or as otherwise posted. Class 3 electric assisted bicycles are not allowed in open spaces or parks."</p> <p>I support the policy in that it grants class 1 and 2 e-bike cyclists access to and use of the I-90/Mountain to Sound trail (the "Trail") across the Island. This aligns the City with the policies of Seattle, Bellevue and King County regarding the use of the Trail by e-bikes. The policy ensures that e-bike cyclists will continue to have access to the Trail for commuting and recreational cycling.</p> <p>I question the pavement requirement for trail use by class 1 and 2 e-bikes. The requirement seems arbitrary in that there is no real distinction between a paved trail or gravel trail when used by bikes or e-bikes. Many trails (e.g. Easttrail) are gravel surfaced and are used by bikes and e-bikes alike without issue. In addition, the use of "pavement" as a distinguishing characteristic leads to inconsistent outcomes. For example, Pioneer Park presently allows regular bikes to use its trails. The perimeter trails around Pioneer Park contain both paved and unpaved sections. The perimeter trail on the NE quadrant near Island Crest is paved while the perimeter trail on the NW quadrant is unpaved. These trails are regularly used by cyclists today. Given the "paved" requirement of the new policy, e-bikes would be denied access to most of the trail—and for what reason? We should want bikes (and e-bikes) on these perimeter trails so that cyclists can commute to work and children can bike to school. A second example is Mercerdale Park which is paved, meaning e-bikes would be allowed under the new policy. But Mercerdale is a small downtown park where cyclists would not likely ride, but even if they did so their presence would be inconsistent with the users of that park. Nevertheless, the policy automatically grants e-bikes access.</p> <p>The policy allows for exceptions to be "posted". Prior to implementing this policy, Staff and the two committees involved should do an evaluation of parks and open spaces to determine exceptions. To the extent the policy leads to differences between the treatment of e-bikes and regular bikes, it will be confusing to cyclists and the community at large.</p> <p>Finally, as I understand it, this policy proposal was driven by concerns about safety on the Trail and yet the proposal does not include safety-oriented provisions. In addition to the commonsense safety proposals set</p>

Log #	Category	Location	Comment/Question
			forth in Kirk Griffin's statement, the City should require that users of the Trail wear helmets and that a Trail wide speed limit of 15 mph be implemented across the Trail system.

Updated 1/8/26- 12:00pm.

This matrix will be updated with any additional comments received before the meeting and re-published with the packet following the meeting.