

## AB 6888 Exhibit 2 – Modified Station Subarea Boundary Public Feedback

This details all comments provided on the Let’s Talk platform as part of the 2026 Public Feedback from February 17 to March 13, 2026, for the Modified Station Area Boundary as part of the Comprehensive Plan GMA Compliance project.

Let’s Talk site statistics at a glance: 985 total visits, 267 visitors, 11 comments. 9 comments received via email

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
1	Jstan	February 21, 2026	<p>If the city is examining housing on the island, it should consider the whole picture. Reducing the barriers to adding ADUs, allowing for larger ADUs, and allowing for duplexing existing homes would expand opportunities for downsizing and the return of young couples raised on the island without ruining the qualities of residential neighborhoods and should be allowed.</p> <p>There are mixed opinions about whether this issue directly affects GMA issues, but regardless it is a long standing one that the city needs to address.</p>
2	Camaron	February 20, 2026	<p>Sustainable Integration of New Affordable Housing (GMA Compliance) Recommendation: To ensure upcoming increase in affordable housing (per GMA compliance) maintains the safety, security, cleanliness, and continued enjoyment of our city by existing residents — without increasing the tax burden on existing residents—following requirements proposed to be incorporated into the development plan.</p> <p>1. Infrastructure &amp; Public Service Upgrades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Education: Proactively increase school bus routes, driver staffing, and teacher capacity to accommodate new student residents.</li> <li>* Transit: Ensure adequate parking for transit passengers to prevent new high-density residents from utilizing existing commuter parking.</li> <li>* Safety &amp; Cleanliness: Install additional, well-maintained street lighting and functional surveillance cameras to prevent vandalism, random acts of violence, and illegal activity.</li> <li>*Waste Management: Install, maintain, and frequently service trash cans and pet waste receptacles.</li> </ul> <p>2. Mandatory Development Agreements &amp; Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Active On-Site Management: Require all new, high-density, or subsidized developments to have 24/7 on-site management and dedicated maintenance services.</li> <li>*Resident Responsibility Program: Include in lease agreements mandatory participation in exterior upkeep/cleanliness programs for residents, ensuring the property remains clean without using city resources.</li> <li>*Durable Design Standards: Require site plans to use high-quality, anti-graffiti, and durable materials to minimize long-term</li> </ul>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
			<p>maintenance costs.</p> <p>*Nuisance Abatement: Empower the City Code Compliance team to work directly with property managers to enforce swift action on illegal dumping, noise, or pet waste violations.</p> <p>3. Resident Onboarding &amp; Community Standards</p> <p>* Mandatory Orientation &amp; Welcome Kit: All new residents, including children, must attend an orientation meeting and sign a "Community Standards Agreement."</p> <p>* Orientation Content: Cover pet lease laws, proper trash disposal/recycling, noise ordinances, max occupancy, and reporting procedures for maintenance or illegal activity.</p> <p>*Clear Infrastructure &amp; Signaling: Utilize multi-lingual/icon-based signage for trash, composting, and emergency contact information (24/7 hotline).</p> <p>4. Financial Sustainability</p> <p>*Self-Supporting Costs: Affordable housing rents should cover the full costs of on-site maintenance, water, sewer, and waste services, ensuring these costs are not passed on to existing residents or the city.</p>
3	First Hill Jim	February 19, 2026	Why is does the TOD boundary cut through the Mercerdale Hillside open space, Mercerdale Park and lower and upper Luther Burbank Parks?
4	John Nelson	February 19, 2026	It would have been nice if all those years ago when the Sound Transit Boondoggle was just a fantasy that Marxocrats would have openly touted their support for mandating massive amounts of low-income housing on Mercer Island. They could have also openly presented their support for monstrosities like the GMA instead of concealing it from Voters. Now Islanders are stuck dealing with GMA mandates in exchange for the dubious "benefit" of having a Sound Transit station on the Island.
6	Brad Miller	March 11, 2026	I know that it is a bit early, but when you rezone the city center to permit buildings over four storeys in height, I strongly recommend that you contact the King County Fire Marshall and the M.I. Fire Department to get estimates of the cost of new equipment that will be required to combat fires in high rise buildings. The costs may be substantial and agreements with neighboring communities for fire fighting services may need to created or modified.
5	Amy Lavin	March 13, 2026	As a resident of Mercer Island for over 40 years, I want to voice my opposition to the current the City of Mercer island's current Comprehensive Plan proposal. First, I think it's important that the City of MI devise and submit a viable proposal that serves the City of Mercer Island and realistically meets the requirements of the Growth Management Plan. The City of Mercer Island has to address numerous priorities to move the City forward in a timely manner. This issue needs a legitimate course forward so that the City can move on and address other things. Time has been wasted in prior untenable proposals at the expense of other city issues.

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
7	Kian Bradley	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="822 224 1263 256">Hello Council and City Manager,</p> <p data-bbox="822 305 2507 378">I appreciate the informational session around GMA compliance the city gave yesterday. I'm glad to see we are making concrete steps in the direction of compliance with state law.</p> <p data-bbox="822 418 2507 532">I'm a bit concerned, as you are, about our inability to comply with the 0-30% housing affordability range. City Manager Bon stated that we've been handed what she sees as an impossible task, because market-rate housing does not adequately facilitate the production of housing in this range.</p> <p data-bbox="822 573 1163 605">The presentation stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="822 613 2507 727">&gt; Implementing the TC and adjacent MF-2 upzones reduces the number of units requiring adequate provisions from 519 to 510 and provides \$30.7 m of fee in-lieu funds to support (with leveraging) direct delivery of 170 to 200 of these remaining units (&lt; 30% AMI).</li> <li data-bbox="822 735 2507 808">&gt; However, Mercer Island will still have to plan for the remaining gap of 300 to 340 units (&lt; 30% AMI) at an estimated cost of \$161.6 m to \$208.6 (again, does not include infrastructure costs).</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="822 849 2507 1036">I believe the key constraint holding us back from being able to produce the remaining 300-340 units at &lt;30% AMI is that we are upzoning the bare minimum of area around the light rail station (as part of the TOD Bill HB1491 compliance that's happening alongside). Limiting ourselves to this area is the key factor. Mercer Island has great areas that should be opened up for more people of all incomes to live in. Imagine a walkable mixed-use district around the high school and by the south-end commercial center, for example. Allowing for a larger area alongside the necessary fee in-lieu funds would get us in compliance.</p> <p data-bbox="822 1076 2507 1149">I want the city to succeed at the September 15th GMA compliance hearing. If we keep the island at 90% single-family zoning, we are not able to comply with the state mandate.</p> <p data-bbox="822 1190 935 1222">Thanks,</p> <p data-bbox="822 1271 999 1304">Kian Bradley</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
8	David Hogan	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="822 230 2507 337">To whom it may concern, First I want to say thank you for working on this issue as we know it was passed down from the state level and solving these issues is not an easy task.</p> <p data-bbox="822 383 2507 532">As a Mercer Island resident, I am writing to share my concerns about the current Comprehensive Plan proposal. I support thoughtful planning, but I believe the City's approach needs to be grounded in what is actually achievable given our infrastructure, community character, and available resources. We have already seen previous proposals stall because they were not practical — we should avoid that pattern.</p> <p data-bbox="822 578 2507 727">The most logical place to direct growth is south of I-90. That area has better access to services and transit, underutilized commercial property, and room for infrastructure improvements. By contrast, the north side of I-90 presents serious obstacles: elevated property values, shoreline constraints, limited road access, and insufficient parking and utilities. Trying to push significant new density into that part of the Island does not reflect reality.</p> <p data-bbox="822 773 2507 880">I would also encourage the City to take advantage of every available tool, including the fee-in-lieu option, to meet regional housing obligations in a manner that respects our actual capacity. Planning should respond to local conditions rather than impose targets on areas that cannot reasonably support them.</p> <p data-bbox="822 925 2507 1032">The TOD framework appears to offer meaningful flexibility for concentrating development where it is most appropriate. For Mercer Island, that clearly points to the corridor between I-90 and Mercerdale Park — a location where increased density could energize the town center, complement existing transit connections, and make genuine use of nearby services.</p> <p data-bbox="822 1078 1408 1117">Thank you for considering these comments</p> <p data-bbox="822 1162 999 1201">David Hogan</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
9	Adam Ragheb	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="827 232 1139 258">Hello Councilmembers,</p> <p data-bbox="827 305 2448 375">First off, I want to say that I am very happy with the outreach that the City is trying to provide regarding these significant changes. I especially appreciate the slides being posted - great job on that by our City Manager and her staff!</p> <p data-bbox="827 422 2494 837">As regards the change from the baseline station area to the preliminary modified station area, I agree with removing parks, open spaces, and the I-90 corridor, and no one can fault our city for that. I do not agree, however, with extending the zone arbitrarily to line up with roads or other straight features. If a parcel is accessible by less than 0.5 miles on foot, then it should be in; if it is not, then it should be excluded. That is the law and there is no need to exceed it. Better yet, let the subarea lines follow the 1/2 mile walking distance, independent of parcel boundaries - we already have parcels that are split-zoned on Mercer Island and code specifying how to handle those situations. Peoples' quality of life will eventually change within the zone away from a low density primarily single-family neighborhood to a denser, busier, environment. Many moved away from larger cities for the former. Additionally, there may be unnecessary financial damages imposed on those within a possible zone but beyond 0.5 miles walking. The land will become more valuable to developers, and because land must be assessed at its highest and best use (true and fair market value unless it is open space), it can reasonably be expected that property assessments and consequently property taxes will increase for those members of the community.</p> <p data-bbox="827 885 2462 911">I also would question the methodology of determining the baseline station area, specifically in the SE portion of the area.</p> <p data-bbox="827 958 2494 1068">Case in point: SE 31st St. 8255 is in the boundary and 8356 is out. It appears the analysis again assumed one could approach 8255 from the west, which is not possible - there is a steep wooded hill with no paths that I am aware of. Any access on foot must be from the east. Google maps walking put it at 0.7 miles from the east edge of the Light Rail Station per the link below:</p> <p data-bbox="827 1115 2475 1185"> <a data-bbox="827 1115 2475 1185" href="https://www.google.com/maps/dir/47.5878212,-122.2320465/47.5822589,-122.2289752/@47.5850075,-122.2346089,1526m/data=!3m2!1e3!4b1!4m2!4m1!3e2?entry=tту&amp;_ep=EgoyMDI2MDMxMS4wIwKXMDSoASAFQAw%3D%3D">https://www.google.com/maps/dir/47.5878212,-122.2320465/47.5822589,-122.2289752/@47.5850075,-122.2346089,1526m/data=!3m2!1e3!4b1!4m2!4m1!3e2?entry=tту&amp;_ep=EgoyMDI2MDMxMS4wIwKXMDSoASAFQAw%3D%3D</a> </p> <p data-bbox="827 1232 1825 1258">Even to reach 3057 31st St, google maps quotes it as being a 0.6 mile walk.</p> <p data-bbox="827 1305 2462 1416"> <a data-bbox="827 1305 2462 1416" href="https://www.google.com/maps/dir/47.5878212,-122.2320465/3057+SE+31st+St,+Mercer+Island,+WA+98040/@47.585069,-122.232034,763m/data=!3m2!1e3!4b1!4m9!4m8!1m0!1m5!1m1!1s0x54906bb8bed10cb9:0x3c95479437e2ac46!2m2!1d-122.2271318!2d47.582472!3e2?entry=tту&amp;_ep=EgoyMDI2MDMxMS4wIwKXMDSoASAFQAw%3D%3D">https://www.google.com/maps/dir/47.5878212,-122.2320465/3057+SE+31st+St,+Mercer+Island,+WA+98040/@47.585069,-122.232034,763m/data=!3m2!1e3!4b1!4m9!4m8!1m0!1m5!1m1!1s0x54906bb8bed10cb9:0x3c95479437e2ac46!2m2!1d-122.2271318!2d47.582472!3e2?entry=tту&amp;_ep=EgoyMDI2MDMxMS4wIwKXMDSoASAFQAw%3D%3D</a> </p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
			<p>Other corner cases unnecessarily added to the modified station area include 2204 70th Ave SE and 1600 72nd Ave SE, both of which are 0.7 miles walking from the west light rail entrance. This represents a 40% increase in distance above what is required by the law.</p> <p>As others have noted, when TOD compliance time comes, do not forget to exclude critical areas, critical area buffers, and shoreline jurisdiction from the subarea.</p> <p>In summary, I ask that the City include what is required and nothing more, and revise the methodology to account for areas that are impassible on foot, an example of which is the green space behind the apartments on 81st PI SE (runs parallel to ICW on its east side). Let's make sure we're taking the most thoughtful approach, not just the most convenient one as current residents' homes, quality of life, finances, and safety are at stake here.</p> <p>-Adam Ragheb</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
10	Michelle Goldberg	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="819 225 1392 256">Dear Mercer Island City Council Members,</p> <p data-bbox="819 305 2419 376">As a resident of Mercer Island for almost 20 years, I'd like to voice my opposition to the City of Mercer Island's current Comprehensive Plan proposal and proposed sub area plans.</p> <p data-bbox="819 425 2494 646">My main concern is that the city's infrastructure will not be able to accommodate such a forced increase in density. I'm especially concerned about the state of our utilities, especially our sewer system. For example, for the past few years, the county has undertaken a project to update the Enatai water treatment facility and its connected pipeline. This project has experienced significant delays because of the many, many mistakes that were made that then had to be discovered and corrected. Watching this project has certainly eroded my confidence in the county, and the county's ability to accommodate growth.</p> <p data-bbox="819 695 2494 799">Rather than forcing an increase in density and its corresponding stress on infrastructure, Mercer Island should be able to use the fee in-lieu option instead. Using this tool, MI can contribute to regional growth in a manner that is consistent with MI development and community capacity, public infrastructure and community priorities.</p> <p data-bbox="819 847 2427 919">A viable plan must plan for growth and the impacts on utilities and transportation. The current plan does not do this. I respectfully request that the City re-visit using the fee in-lieu option instead.</p> <p data-bbox="819 967 1077 1036">Thank you, Michelle Goldberg</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
11	JP Wollersheim	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="827 220 2497 293">I respectfully urge the City to keep Phase II growth focused south of I-90 and to not advance plans that would shift significant new density north of I-90.</p> <p data-bbox="827 342 2497 529">Based on recent City Council materials and discussions about GMHB compliance, the City has been clear about taking a phased approach—starting with upzones in the Town Center and nearby multifamily areas. That’s where added density is most feasible and where it fits the planning framework already in place. Council has also started public feedback on a preliminary station-area boundary, which reinforces a practical point: transit-oriented growth should be anchored where services, infrastructure, and mobility options already exist—primarily south of I-90.</p> <p data-bbox="827 570 2497 724">South of I-90 is the most realistic place to meet the City’s housing and compliance obligations while strengthening the Town Center. It’s closer to light rail, better served by existing commercial and civic uses, and consistent with long-standing Comprehensive Plan policies that concentrate higher density in these areas instead of dispersing it into constrained residential neighborhoods.</p> <p data-bbox="827 764 2497 951">By contrast, areas north of I-90 have well-documented constraints that have come up repeatedly throughout this process. Shoreline regulations are intended to limit development intensity along Lake Washington, not expand it. Transportation access and surface circulation are limited, and placing Phase II growth there would add pressure to neighborhood streets rather than leveraging existing transit, services, and infrastructure. Council’s decision to begin phasing with the Town Center effectively acknowledges these constraints.</p> <p data-bbox="827 992 2497 1146">With a firm compliance deadline ahead, the City should prioritize an approach that is implementable, defensible, and aligned with adopted policy. I urge Council to affirm Phase II growth south of I-90, keep north-of-I-90 areas focused on environmental protection and neighborhood stability, and continue following the phased strategy already described in public meetings and materials.</p> <p data-bbox="827 1187 1217 1227">Kind regards, JP Wollersheim</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
12	Steve Hearon	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="827 228 1257 256">Dear Mercer Island City Council,</p> <p data-bbox="827 305 2494 375">As a Mercer Island resident for almost 45 years, I respectfully urge the City to keep Phase II growth focused south of I-90 rather than expanding significant new density north of I-90.</p> <p data-bbox="827 423 2494 529">Mercer Island needs to submit a Comprehensive Plan update that is both viable and compliant with state Growth Management requirements. A practical approach will allow the City to move forward confidently and focus on other important priorities. Concentrating growth where it is most feasible will help ensure that the plan can realistically be implemented.</p> <p data-bbox="827 578 2494 724">The area south of I-90—particularly around the Town Center—offers the most appropriate location for additional housing. This area is closest to light rail, already served by commercial and civic uses, and includes underutilized properties that can accommodate increased density. Focusing growth here aligns with the goals of transit-oriented development and with long-standing Comprehensive Plan policies that concentrate density where infrastructure and services already exist.</p> <p data-bbox="827 773 2494 878">By contrast, areas north of I-90 face significant constraints, including shoreline regulations along Lake Washington, limited surface access, and very high land costs. These factors make it unlikely that meaningful housing capacity could be realized there and risk placing additional pressure on established neighborhoods.</p> <p data-bbox="827 927 2494 1032">Maintaining a strategy that prioritizes growth south of I-90—including the area between I-90 and Mercerdale Park—would support a more vibrant Town Center while ensuring Mercer Island meets its planning obligations in a realistic and defensible way.</p> <p data-bbox="827 1081 1284 1109">Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p data-bbox="827 1157 1002 1185">Respectfully,</p> <p data-bbox="827 1234 1010 1261">Steve Hearon</p> <p data-bbox="827 1310 1139 1338">Mercer Island Resident</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
13	Anne Hearon	March 13, 2026	<p data-bbox="822 224 1257 256">Dear Mercer Island City Council,</p> <p data-bbox="822 305 2489 375">As a Mercer Island resident for more than 15 years, I respectfully urge the City to keep Phase II growth focused south of I-90 rather than expanding significant new density north of I-90.</p> <p data-bbox="822 423 2489 570">Mercer Island’s Comprehensive Plan update must realistically meet the requirements of the "Washington Growth Management Act," and "Washington State land-use planning law," while also aligning with the intent of Washington House Bill 2160, which encourages housing density near major transit investments. On Mercer Island, the area that best fulfills these goals is south of I-90, where access to the Mercer Island Light Rail Station, existing services, and infrastructure already exists.</p> <p data-bbox="822 618 2489 724">The Town Center and surrounding areas south of I-90 are the most practical location for additional housing capacity. These areas include underutilized properties, are supported by recent transportation improvements, and are well positioned to benefit from transit-oriented development that strengthens the Island’s civic and commercial core.</p> <p data-bbox="822 773 2489 878">By contrast, areas north of I-90 face significant and well-documented constraints. Shoreline regulations along Lake Washington appropriately limit development intensity, and surface access and circulation are more constrained. Combined with very high land costs, these factors make it unlikely that substantial housing capacity could realistically be achieved in those areas.</p> <p data-bbox="822 927 2489 997">Focusing growth south of I-90—including the area between I-90 and Mercerdale Park—would better align Mercer Island with state TOD policy while creating the opportunity to revitalize the Town Center and support a more vibrant community core.</p> <p data-bbox="822 1045 2166 1078">Thank you for your consideration and for your continued work on behalf of Mercer Island residents.</p> <p data-bbox="822 1127 1145 1232">Respectfully, Anne Hearon Mercer Island Resident</p>

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
14	Nicole Hogan	March 13, 2026	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Thank you for opening up this issue to comments from the community!</p> <p>As a Mercer Island homeowner in the Phase 2 neighborhood, I would like to share a few thoughts on the current Comprehensive Plan proposal. I support thoughtful planning, but the City's approach should reflect what is realistically achievable given our infrastructure, neighborhood character, and available resources. Previous proposals have stalled when they were not practical, and we should avoid repeating that pattern.</p> <p>The most logical place to direct growth is south of I-90. That area has stronger access to services and transit, underused commercial properties, and greater potential for infrastructure improvements. The north side of I-90, by contrast, faces significant constraints including high property values, shoreline limitations, limited road access, and insufficient parking and utilities, not to mention as of late - constant construction! Concentrating significant new density there does not reflect these realities.</p> <p>The City should also make full use of available tools, including the fee-in-lieu option, to meet regional housing requirements in a way that reflects Mercer Island's actual capacity.</p> <p>The Transit-Oriented Development framework provides flexibility to focus growth where it makes the most sense. For Mercer Island, that clearly points to the corridor between I-90 and Mercerdale Park, where additional density could strengthen the town center, positively impact businesses, and take advantage of walkability, existing transit and services.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>
15	Rosemary M	March 13, 2026	Compliance is challenging. However, the underlying aim - to increase affordable housing in the area - is important.
16	Rosemary M	March 13, 2026	Luther Burbank Park is an important amenity, benefitting all Islanders and beyond. I hope that the Station Area Subarea does not infringe on this or on any local parks.
17	Sunny	March 13, 2026	I think the City of Mercer Island is finally headed in a good direction that will lead to redevelopment of the aging portions of the city Center. I believe that the 1/2 mile subarea boundary shown in the slides during the public meeting on March 10th was determined appropriately and meets the intent of the GMHB Order.

Log #	Username	Date Received	Question
18	TL	March 13, 2026	The GMHB decision seems to be in compliance with the GMA and affordable housing requirements. The subarea plan will keep the higher density housing and affordable housing within a 1/2 mile radius of the transit station. This will contain the growth and improve the vitality and interest in the downtown area.
19	Tenley Tobin	March 14, 2026	I am in support of the GMHB and the GMA mandate which requires increased housing, including Affordable Housing, in the Mercer Island Town Center. . It is also very important for the MI community to be in compliance with the GMA in order to receive funding from the government. It also allows for a realistic revitalization of the Town Center and contains the growth and density in the TC rather than expanding into the single family residential neighborhoods.
20	Joe	March 15, 2026	I believe Sound Transit owns the parking garage at the Mercer Island Park and Ride. If you haven't already considered this, it would seem like a good idea to strike a deal with Sound Transit to allow and encourage a developer to build an apartment complex above that parking structure to help meet the density/affordable housing requirements that the state is imposing.