

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
Community Engagement Plan for E-Bike Regulations in Parks			
1	Struck	Engagement Opportunities Based on previous park focused surveys, a priori, what is the expectation as to the # of responses?	Based on the level of engagement anticipated and the ease of access to the survey through direct email, in-person engagement opportunities, and dedicated park postings- staff anticipate around 200-250 responses.
2	Cohen	Does the City have any sense of how widespread citizen use of Let’s Talk as a source of information about proposals is?	Let’s Talk is one of several tools that the City employs to facilitate two-way communication with residents of Mercer Island, and its use, in terms of traffic, is comparable to the City’s main website. The platform is useful to share in-depth information about complex projects and topics as well as administer surveys to measure and track constituent views.
3	Cohen	Is it feasible to consider emailing all residents, or does the City not even have that kind of data base?	The City does not maintain a contact list for all residents. Staff will however provide the survey via various mailing lists it currently has- which residents have opted in to- such as the MI Weekly Newsletter.
4	Cohen	Should the PRC see the survey questions before the survey goes live, similar to what was done with the PROS Plan?	Staff do not anticipate sharing the survey questions in advance of publishing. The survey will largely follow the 2022 statewide survey on E-Bike Use on DNR- and WDFW- Managed Lands (Appendix 2), with questions tailored to Mercer Island and specific areas of interest communicated by the PRC.
5	Cohen	Posting information on trails: a. Where are these signs contemplated to be placed? b. Will there be QR or similar codes to facilitate obtaining more information?	A. Signs will be posted at trail heads, on differing trail types, and at a variety of park gathering spaces including plazas, athletic fields, and kiosk areas. B. The signs will direct community members to the project page on Let’s Talk using QR codes and/or Tiny URLs.

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
6	Westberg	The staff report indicates that survey questions for MI will follow the 2022 statewide survey on E-bike Use on DNR and WDFW lands. I looked through that survey and although some of the questions seem applicable and provide useful information, some do not, or at least seemed geared toward the mountain biking community not urban park users. How will you modify the survey questions to address questions more pertinent to Mercer Island?	<p>The survey will be tailored to Mercer Island park and open space trails- questions will also be modified based on areas of interest received from the Commission at the PRC meeting.</p> <p>Staff also intends to gain information on how the individual survey taker uses the park spaces.</p>
7	Westberg	Will the survey address the broader issue of the use of park trails in Mercer Island Parks by all types of bicycles?	<p>Staff would like to hear from the PRC whether this is an area of interest. Early input from the Commission at previous meetings was to treat e-bikes separately.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of a more broad information gathering approach.</p>
8	Westberg	Will all park trail users (e.g. walkers, nature lovers, bird watchers, etc.) have the opportunity to complete the survey?	Yes- the survey will be open to all park users, as well as the broader community.
Clarke & Groveland Beach Parks Joint Infrastructure Plan			
1	Brettmann	For the Groveland plan, could a person in a wheelchair travel from the playground to the accessible paths at the beach?	No, the proposed paths from the play area to the waterfront are not accessible. The topography at Groveland Beach prohibits the possibility of creating a fully accessible path from the parking lot to the waterfront without considerable expense and impact to the existing forest. The preferred plan proposes maintaining the existing route from the parking lot to the waterfront, which is currently paved but does not feature accessible grades.

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
2	Brettmann	Have the plans for Clarke and Groveland been reviewed for environmental impact?	<p>The project team completed preliminary environmental studies, including critical areas reconnaissance and geotechnical data review, during the technical assessment phase of this planning effort conducted in 2023-2024. An overview of the results of these assessments was shared with the Parks and Recreation Commission on May 1, 2025. A Non-Project SEPA process for this planning effort will be initiated after the June 4, 2026, PRC meeting,</p> <p>Additional environmental studies and project-level SEPA reviews may be conducted as part of the future design efforts for each park.</p>
3	Brettmann	Can you provide a copy of the reviews or relevant documents related to environmental considerations?	Copies of the critical areas reconnaissance and geotechnical data review for each park will be e-mailed to the Commission with this Q&A Matrix.

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
4	Brettmann	Do Clarke or Groveland have critical slopes? If so, how does this plan address critical slopes?	<p>Field delineation of critical slopes has not been conducted as part of this planning effort. However, Critical Area Reconnaissance and Geotechnical Data Review prepared by Shannon & Wilson includes an evaluation of existing slope conditions based on the available survey information, GIS data, and nearby geotechnical data.</p> <p>Based on these findings, both sites are located within potential erosion hazard areas, a steep slope hazard area, and a seismic hazard area. Slopes at Clarke Beach Park generally range from 20% - 30%, and slopes at Groveland Beach Park range from 10% to 80%. As park improvements advance through design, additional geotechnical investigation and critical area studies, including field verification, will be conducted as required by Mercer Island City Code. These efforts will inform the engineering approach and ensure that site-specific conditions are appropriately addressed through detailed design.</p>
5	Brettmann	What square footage of surfacing be changed?	<p>Staff are coordinating with the consultant team to provide preliminary estimates of square footage changes, which will be shared during the presentation. These changes include areas of proposed paving replacement, removal of hardscape in favor of planting or other pervious conditions, bulkhead removal and replacement, and conversion of planted areas to new hardscape or structures. These quantities will continue to be refined during subsequent design phases.</p>
6	Brettmann	How much impervious surfacing will these plans add or remove from each park, if any?	<p>At this conceptual stage, the Infrastructure Plans are expected to increase impervious surfaces due to proposed improvements. Staff are coordinating with the consultant team to quantify these changes and will share preliminary estimates during the presentation.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
7	Brettmann	What is the surfacing of the new trails at Clarke?	The preferred plans do not propose specific surfacing for trails at Clarke or Groveland. However, the accessible trails at Clarke would likely be a mix of accessible surfacing materials such as compacted gravel, asphalt, or concrete.
8	Brettmann	How many trees will be impacted in each plan?	Tree surveys have not been conducted at this stage of the planning process, but the intent is to minimize impacts to existing trees during future design and construction. Further evaluation, including a detailed tree inventory and assessment by a certified arborist, will be conducted during subsequent design phases for each park.
9	Brettmann	I've never observed water from the lake go so low that it does not hit the bulkheads at Clarke or Groveland, so I'm confused — what does the blue dotted line marked "lake line" mean? How high is the lake expected to go?	The blue dotted line marked "lake line" on each plan represents the sewer lake line installed in Lake Washington that circumvents most of Mercer Island. It is not related to lake levels.
10	Brettmann	How will these projects impact wildlife and wildlife habitat, especially protected species like the bald eagle that lives at Clarke beach?	Wildlife surveys have not been conducted as part of this planning effort. Wildlife surveys would be conducted as part of future design efforts, as required by Mercer Island City Code and applicable permitting agencies.

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
11	Brettmann	How will these projects impact fish and fish habitat, especially the removal of bulkheads?	<p>Additional study will be conducted as the proposed plans move into future design efforts to determine the specific details of the proposed improvements.</p> <p>The shores of Lake Washington are a vital nursery for young salmon, and much of the shoreline has been altered with overwater structures, bank armoring, and reduced native vegetation, which interrupt important processes that keep the shorelines healthy and cut off resources that support fish habitat and other ecological processes.</p> <p>Removing the bulkheads and replacing these conditions with more gradual sloped edge transitions and introducing other natural features such as logs, boulders, and planting improves the nearshore habitat for rearing and migratory juvenile Chinook salmon as well as other fish species. In particular, the proposed removal of the jetties or “groins” that project out from the nearshore area at both parks will improve the ability of fish to move along the edge and stay within the critical nearshore habitat zone.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
12	Brettmann	How will the removal of bulkheads impact the waterfront, beach, and swimming areas?	<p>Additional study will be conducted as the proposed plans move into future design efforts to evaluate the hydraulic impacts of the proposed bulkhead removals and develop appropriate design measures to ensure the long-term stability of the waterfronts.</p> <p>The existing bulkheads at these sites are nearing fifty years old and are reaching the end of their viable lifespan, with spalling, cracking, undermining, voids, and other emerging deficiencies. These issues are at a point where they can become safety hazards for users of the site. In particular the existing sheet pile enclosure at Clarke Beach Park has sufficiently degraded with a missing pile cap exposing the steel pile edge such that the area has been closed to swimmers. Removal of these aging bulkheads and replacing them with new edge conditions, primarily consisting of softened slope transitions, along with some new rockery bulkheads designed to current engineering and environmental standards will improve the safety of these facilities, while maintaining opportunities for waterfront recreation and providing improved amenities including piers, restrooms, water access, and waterfront gathering spaces.</p>

13	Brettmann	What feedback did the Principal Advisory Group at IMS provide?	<p>Groveland Beach Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students use the park for swimming, playing on the playground, jumping off the dock, and playing at the sand volleyball court.• Beach materials – Sandy beach is good for building sandcastles, but beach is kind of dirty. Gravel beach hurts kids’ feet.• Waterfront amenities – The concrete wall for the swimming area is uncomfortable to climb/sit on; make it more comfortable or remove it. Add a swing from the beach that swings into the water. More maintenance/cleaning of the sand volleyball court.• Docks – Condition isn’t great. See older kids jumping off the railings into the water.• Hangout opportunities at the beach – Liked options shown for nature play and like the addition of an overwater hammock near the dock. <p>Clarke Beach Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students don’t use the park as much for accessing the water as they do Groveland Beach or Luther Burbank.• Improve the restrooms – Keep them blue as a landmark but they aren’t the cleanest/best restrooms.• Play opportunities – Add a new playground, play opportunities on the water, multi-age play.• Piers/docks – Repair the piers to improve safety and usability; students feel “nervous” using the piers right now.• Off-leash dogs at the park already so create an off-leash dog park.
----	-----------	--	---

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park is hidden – Add more signage so more people know it’s there.
14	Brettmann	I love the "vote with your dollars" exercise staff did at community presentations. At the Chinese Association event, most participants "funded" restroom upgrades and new play opportunities. Do people consider the beach/swimming a play opportunity or were they hoping for more?	Some participants responded positively to the beach play area identified in Concept 3 for Clarke Beach Park, and others preferred improving the playground area at Groveland Beach Park. Overall, the feedback reflected via the voting exercise was general, though.
15	Brettmann	Will Clarke beach retain the sand-pit play area?	No, the existing sandpit play area on the north waterfront is not maintained in the preferred plan for Clarke Beach Park. The preferred plan replaces it with a sculptural seat wall and natural beach area.
16	Brettmann	It looks like the staff have made strong efforts to get input on the plans. What are the plans for feedback now that the Overall Plans have been created for each site and after more detailed plans have been created?	<p>The preferred plans have been shared with the community via Let’s Talk and are being promoted through the following awareness activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MI Weekly article • Social media posts • A-frame posters placed at each park • Mailer to park neighbors (mailed by March 27, 2026) <p>Community members are invited to provide final input on one or both preferred plans by commenting on Let’s Talk, providing public comment to the Parks and Recreation Commission, or e-mailing Sarah Bluvus, CIP Project Manager, directly. These opportunities have been shared via the awareness activities outlined above.</p>
17	Brettmann	What are projected costs for these projects?	The cost ranges for each preferred plan will be shared with the Commission during the presentation on March 26.

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
18	Cohen	<p>Clarke: What surfacing materials are contemplated for the paths?</p> <p>a. Should those be indicated on the design plans to facilitate public understanding?</p>	<p>The preferred plans do not propose specific surfacing for trails/paths at Clarke or Groveland. However, the accessible trails at Clarke would likely be a mix of accessible surfacing such as compacted gravel, asphalt, or concrete. Surfacing treatments will be further identified during future design efforts for the proposed plans.</p>
19	Cohen	<p>Clarke: What is being considered for the south pier “restoration”?</p> <p>a. Is a reduction in size still being considered? As I’ve mentioned to staff, that would adversely impact fishing, which can be “tight” even now.</p> <p>b. What amenities are being considered? Some materials showed fancy designated fishing stations that to me seemed out of character for this park.</p>	<p>The preferred plan for Clarke Beach Park proposes restoring the existing piers in their current location, configuration, and size. Further development of methods of repair/restoration and opportunities for added amenities would be studied during future design efforts for the proposed plan improvements.</p>
20	Cohen	<p>Groveland: What surfacing materials are contemplated for the paths?</p> <p>a. Should those be indicated on the design plans to facilitate public understanding?</p>	<p>The preferred plans do not propose specific surfacing for trails/paths at Clarke or Groveland. However, the paths would likely be developed with a mix of accessible surfacing (asphalt, concrete, packed gravel, fiber-reinforced plastic grating, etc.) and other surfacing (packed dirt trails, timber curb stairs, etc.).</p>
21	Cohen	<p>Groveland: Is there any consideration being given to eliminating the cabled-down wave attenuators, which make fishing off the dock next to impossible? Some earlier materials stated that floating piers are expected to provide some wave attenuation at Luther Burbank, so I wondered how essential it is to retain the wave attenuators at Groveland.</p>	<p>The preferred plan for Groveland Beach Park proposes replacing the existing dock with a new pier structure that could include a combination of fixed pier and floating dock. Further development of the pier/dock design, including whether to retain or remove the existing wave attenuators, would be studied during future design efforts for the proposed plan improvements.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
22	Cohen	Groveland: Will “natural character” be considered for any new equipment in the teen (currently beach volleyball) area? In the survey materials, some examples looked out of character to me for a Mercer Island park area.	No specific equipment or other design ideas have been selected for the beach area at Groveland Beach Park at this planning stage. The ideas shared in the teens-only survey were intended as examples only. Further development of a youth/teen-centric space would be studied during future design efforts for the proposed improvements at Groveland.
23	Westberg	The beach volleyball court has disappeared from the plan. Survey results concerning this amenity seem mixed. Was the decision to remove it based on the results of the youth outreach?	Since feedback on the volleyball court during the community engagement process was mixed, staff proposed adding a designated teen hangout space to Groveland Beach in place of a specific amenity. Staff will share more about the youth/teen outreach completed this month, which may inform the Commission’s recommendations for the designated teen space included in the preferred plan.
Athletic Facilities Allocation and Use Policy Update			
1	Hay	<p>I recall that we received some email comments around mid-January regarding this topic (Lisa Sherland, Aaron Koopman, et al). You mentioned that you would compile the comments received, for us to review prior to the meeting. Would be helpful to see the comments received on this topic.</p> <p>Also - it is not clear to me what is changing (or remaining the same) - is there a tracked change version we can review so that we know what changes we are approving? Sorry if I missed this somewhere in the materials.</p>	<p>Staff will provide the PRC with copies of the comments received ahead of the meeting and forward additional comments received since publishing the packet.</p> <p>This policy revision does not include significant policy changes- however the formatting and language changes were not conducive to providing a red-line version.</p> <p>Staff will highlight key changes which are identified in the Agenda Bill through the agenda item presentation.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
2	Hay	<p>...The policy we are reviewing is related to the Athletic FIELDS, correct? And we are calling the fields "facilities" in this policy ... is that right?</p> <p>We also have a Sports Court Allocation and Use policy (pickleball, tennis, etc.) and do we also have an Allocation and Use policy for indoor facilities (community center gym)?</p>	<p>This policy is specific to Athletic Facilities, which as defined in the policy document, includes athletic fields, batting cages, concession stands, and related storage.</p> <p>Sport Courts and the Community Center (including the gym) each have their own dedicated policies. The reason for maintaining three separate policies is that these facilities serve different priorities, and each policy reflects a distinct focus. For example, the Athletic Facilities Policy is centered on maximizing organized use of fields, the Sport Courts Policy prioritizes drop-in use and limits reservations/events, and the MICEC use policy represents a balance of both approaches.</p>
3	Struck	<p>Purpose: - To clarify, by omission of the MIHS campus facilities, implies that the City is not responsible for the allocation and use of those facilities. Correct?</p>	<p>Correct.</p>
4	Struck	<p>Definitions: Revised "Resident Organization" definition - by reducing the team residency requirement from 100% to 75% may have the unintended consequence of favoring "select" teams that are more likely to have off-Island players than "recreational" teams. Does City staff view this as a potential issue, and if so, how do they plan to deal with it?</p>	<p>Both the current and draft policies use a 75% residency threshold to determine whether an organization/individual qualifies as a resident group.</p> <p>The revised policy further incorporates additional criteria for staff to review requests in an effort to equitably provide access to all resident users.</p> <p>The revised policy more closely replicates the way in which the allocations are currently made, and provides a more transparent set of criteria.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
5	Struck	<p>Definitions: Regarding the exemption for MISD and City recreational activities, what is a rough estimate of the amount of field use allocated to these two entities? Would the proposed change materially affect their field use allocation in any way?</p>	<p>In 2025 MISD and the City respectively booked- 1,523 and 1,125 hours of time. (not including scheduled maintenance)</p> <p>The revised policy does not change how either MISD or the City utilizes or accesses athletic facilities.</p> <p>MISD and the City operate with a collaborative relationship, and utilize separate agreements to inform on use, scheduling and responsibilities (Interlocal Agreements). In general- staff inputs City and MISD requests first- to establish availability for other users.</p>
6	Struck	<p>Policy Principles: Suggest changing the word, <i>maximize</i>, to manage as in "Manage field capacity to achieve Cost Recovery goals". Maximize implies, in my mind, full usage, and there are times when fields need to "rest". The term, "manage" provides a bit more flexibility in order to achieve Cost Recovery goals. Indeed, policy directive (e), de facto, says there are reasons not to maximize field capacity.</p>	<p>The term “maximize field capacity” is intended to reflect the City’s practice of scheduling athletic field use to optimize utilization and access on a given day.</p> <p>This aspect of maximization also promotes rational for maintaining a high-quality facility and performing appropriate maintenance to ensure ongoing and sustained playability.</p>
7	Struck	<p>Policy: (c) Is there a need to more specifically call out multi-day tournament reservations that may be subject to add'l conditions, etc. Creates more transparency about this issue.</p>	<p>While it does not explicitly call out multi-day tournament reservations, the Facility Allocation Criteria, such as community benefit, duration of use, compatibility, and equitable access, are designed to guide staff in evaluating these requests.</p> <p>Dependent on the request for a tournament/impacts- a Special Event permit may be required. This is part of staff’s initial review of a request.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
8	Struck	Facility Allocation Criteria: Seasonality of Sport - May wish to note that this "priority" is reviewed periodically to reflect the changing nature of sport seasons. For example, simply insert "currently" following the first sentence ending, "the determined season of play for each sport, <i>currently</i> :"	Staff intends to periodically update this policy section as emerging sports seek access.
9	Cohen	I understand that you want to include both individuals and entities in “Residential Organizations”, but someone reading the policy might not focus on the definitions first and be confused and think that “organizations” are included, but individuals are not. Are there any other possible terms that could mitigate this possible confusion?	Staff feel the language as written is appropriate. Staff have not experienced confusion from requestors regarding this during the allocation process.
10	Cohen	How does Policy 2(d) that prior use and priority doesn’t guarantee any aspect of allocation square with Item 3, 4 th bullet that consideration “shall be given” to historical use?	Policy 2 (d) transparently informs users that they are not guaranteed any aspect of access. The fourth bullet under Item 3 serves as a criterion for staff to evaluate when multiple organizations are requesting similar use.
11	Cohen	Section 4(h)/Disqualifying Criteria—Consider adding a citation to the Fair Play in Community Sports Act.	Staff will review with legal, adding more broad discrimination language.

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
12	Brettmann	I'm not seeing anything about the order in which fields are booked so I'm a little confused about how this policy would be implemented. For example, would a local team who sought a booking one week before an event override a non-local team that booked the field two months prior? Or is there some deadline by which field requests are made and not changed after that point? Are deadlines for decision-making something staff recommend including in this policy?	<p>Athletic facility access will be scheduled in accordance with Section 3 of the policy, <i>Facility Allocation Criteria</i>. As part of our procedures, we utilize priority request windows, currently January 1–14 for spring/summer use and July 1–14 for fall/winter use. During these windows, organizations may submit requests for field use. Staff then review all submissions and apply the policy criteria to determine allocations.</p> <p>Following this review period, staff finalize rental agreements with applicants over approximately two weeks. Once this process is complete, any remaining field availability transitions to a first-come, first-served basis, both online and through staff.</p>
13	Brettmann	Have frequent users reviewed the athletic fields policy and provided feedback on this policy?	<p>At the annual Field User Group meeting this past December, staff shared their intent to revise the existing policy to improve clarity and better align with current booking practices and community needs.</p> <p>Field users were invited to provide feedback in January.</p> <p>Following the development of the meeting packet materials, staff notified users of the upcoming meeting and provided an additional opportunity for public comment on the draft revised policy.</p>
14	Brettmann	What feedback has been provided after frequent users reviewed this policy?	<p>General feedback from users is included in the Agenda Bill. Staff will forward the Commission with written feedback that received between the December Meeting and the PRC March 26 meeting.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
15	Westberg	<p>Policy item 2.i indicates that an applicant organization may not discriminate against any person based on sex. Is this intended to be a broad statement concerning non-discrimination or is it narrowly focused on gender identification?</p> <p>What is the Fair Play in Community Sports Act (disqualifying criteria 4.h)? Does it address forms of discrimination as well?</p>	<p>Staff will review with legal appropriate non-discrimination language.</p> <p>The Washington Fair Play in Community Sports Act (RCW 49.60.500), enacted in 2009, prohibits sex-based discrimination in community athletics programs managed by local governments, park districts, and school districts. It ensures equal athletic opportunities, applying Title IX-style protections to public, local, and regional sports programs.</p>