

Table 1. First Draft Transportation Element Planning Commission Question / Comment Matrix.

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
PC-1	Adam Ragheb	Page 2, comment 1: Suggest editing to "The new light rail station located north of the Town Center, on the I-90 corridor between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE, is planned to eventually provide access to destinations in Seattle, Bellevue and other cities that are part of the Sound Transit system." It is not providing access yet and I believe was recently delayed	It is expected that the light rail station will be open by the time the City adopts the Comprehensive Plan update in 2024. Amending the text as proposed is not recommended.
		Page 2, comment 2: I think it is important to note the dates of the data. It carries a lot more weight that the local traffic counts were done very recently per my notes from the presentation. Would also be good to note the PSRC forecast date. Could a link to these data be made available to readers so that it is easier for the general public to access and understand the data upon which these forecasts were based?	<p>The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) forecasts were done for 2044, as listed in the paragraph.</p> <p>New traffic counts were only done at select locations in 2022, to determine if a full recount was needed or if the counts from 2018 were still accurate for planning purposes. The 2018 counts were determined to still be accurate and the traffic operations data in the transportation element is based on those 2018 counts. The data collected in 2022 was not used in the traffic analysis for the Transportation Element.</p> <p>This is the future land use section and it is focused on forecasts and growth assumptions. It is not the appropriate place to describe the details of the traffic counts. The details of the existing traffic counts are described in Section 3: Existing Conditions.</p>
		Page 2, comment 3: I only find on Page 14 that these data are from 2018 and 2022 (which is good...should make that clear early-on!)	<p>The Introduction section is intended to be an overview and summary of the overall transportation element. We believe the details of the existing traffic counts belong in the Existing Conditions section.</p> <p>The local traffic counts do not influence any of the numbers that follow this sentence (growth target, housing growth, jobs growth), and might distract readers from the larger picture that the Introduction is intended to provide.</p>
		Page 3, comment 1: From where does this revision originate? KC's CPPs only mentions nonprofits for responding to changes in mobility patterns. I read that this language is encouraging partnerships with nonprofits for maintenance of transportation infrastructure....that does not sound like a good idea. Is this not a government function?	The language originates in King County Countywide Planning Policy (KC CPP) T-22. The focus of this policy is to "encourage partnerships" with nonprofits and private sector, not to imply that they will be responsible for the transportation system. The CPP includes the phrase "where applicable" at the end. To clarify your comment, we added "where applicable" to the end of this policy in the second draft.
		Page 4, Policy 2.7: In the world of engineering, optimize is a word that carries a lot of weight and detail, especially for people involved in MDO. I would suggest changing it to "maximize"	Policy 2.7 and the word "optimize" are drawn from KC CPP T-33. The word "optimize" is referring to efficient use of existing infrastructure. Switching to "maximize" would imply increasing the use of existing infrastructure, which is not the intent of the policy. Amending the text as proposed is not recommended.
		Page 4, Policy 3.1: Edit: strike "for all communities" That phrase does not add any specificity to the statement - what communities? It actually makes it more vague and subject to interpretation.	The phrase "all communities" is drawn from KC CPP T-30 and is specified in the CPP to be all communities, especially those "that have been disproportionately affected by transportation decisions". Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this goal as proposed, see second draft.
		Page 4, Policy 4.1, first bullet: suggest revising to "maintain public transit service on the Island in accordance with on-Island demand"	The first sentence of Policy 4.1 already states "ensure adequate transit services to meet the needs of the island". We recommend removing the first bullet point of Policy 4.1 because it is repetitive.
		Page 4, Policy 4.1, third bullet: Suggest stopping after "Mercer Island." as the existing Light Rail station and bus transfer area growth are already providing connection to regional transit - is there still a need to further "enhance" those connections, especially after COVID changes?	The results of the 2022 MI community survey indicate "access to public transportation" tied as the second most dissatisfied transportation category. Several comments cited a lack of bus services and connections between the Town Center/light rail area and the rest of the island, which compounds parking issues. Policy 4.1 is aligned with KC CPP T-1 and T-6, which emphasize that regional transit systems should be connected to "multimodal" linkages and networks. Amending the text as proposed is not recommended.

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
		Page 4, Policy 4.1, fourth bullet: What are the current innovative transit services? Did these end / are they decreasing as a result of COVID?	Both King County Metro (KCM) services (204, 630) are DART (Dial-A-Ride Transit), which provide fixed-route, flexible-route, and reservation-based service depending on location. These services have both been cut significantly since COVID. There are also 2 custom bus services (981, 989) serving private schools from MI Park and Ride (P&R).
		Page 5, Policy 4.4: Is this still being done, or have these efforts been completed?	The City is still considering options to provide Park & Ride lots for Mercer Island residents only and evaluation of this topic is ongoing.
		Page 5, Policy 4.8, Comment 1: edit - remove "Black, Indigenous, and other People of color." I do not think we should be differentiating how the City provides services to persons based on race. We should, however, based on socioeconomic needs (which remains with the proposed edit). Revise: "people with low and no incomes" to "people with low or no income." A person cannot have both low and no income, so it must be an "or" statement	Policy 4.8 is copied directly from KC CPPs T-8 and T-9. The City's preference is that the comprehensive plan update aligns city policies with the current countywide policies. Amending the text as proposed is not recommended.
		Page 5, Policy 4.8, comment 2: Is there any evidence of displacement here on Mercer Island? Perhaps we can remove the word mitigating, as that implies that it is happening - are there data that support this assertion?	See response for 4.8 above. Regarding the word "mitigate", excluding it would leave only "prevent displacement". This could be interpreted as obligating the City's projects and programs to cause zero displacement. Amending the text as proposed is not recommended.
		Page 6, Policy 5.4: Suggested revision: Advocate for state policies, actions, and capital improvement programs that promote safety and that are consistent with relevant portions of the Regional Growth Strategy, VISION 2050, and the Countywide Planning Policies. Equity and sustainability are very subjective terms and edits to the document should be clear and concise.	Policy 5.4 is copied directly from KC CPP T-11, except for the word "safety". The City's preference is that the comprehensive plan update aligns city policies with the current countywide policies. Amending the text as proposed is not recommended.
		Page 14, comment 1: suggest editing to "This is primarily due to changes brought on by the COVID pandemic and advances in technology and a cultural shift that have increased the number of people working from home, working more-flexible hours, and working a hybrid schedule." I think it is important to note that even when pandemic is "over" these changes will stay, and WFH doesn't catch everyone - the more flexible hours and hybrid in-office/WFH schedules will also permanently affect traffic.	Added language from this comment to clarify "working a hybrid schedule" in the second draft.
		Page 14, Tale 1: Shouldn't this now articulate that it is 2022 Intersection Operations?	Table 1 LOS results are based on 2018 traffic analysis. The results were determined to be still accurate for planning purposes after comparing select 2022 counts with their 2018 counterparts. The word "existing" is preferred to "2018" for a Transportation Element adopted in 2024.
		Page 16, comment 1: Do these overflow conditions still occur? If not, it would be worth noting.	Yes, the park & ride is full and overflow parking would be expected to occur without the permit program. The text has been amended to remove reference to 2001.
		Page 20, comment 1: Do we have post onset of COVID data? If not, it still is worth mentioning as I think those data would be very valuable to have given the significant cultural shifts that occurred after March 2020.	No, the P&R Utilization report has not been published since 2017. The text has been amended to remove reference to the 2017 P&R Utilization Report.
		Page 21, comment 1, Table 2: same comment - do we have post 3/2020 data for usage? If not, I think we should mention it as an item for study even if King County does not want to do it.	No, the P&R Utilization report has not been published since 2017. We have contacted Metro to see if they can provide more recent P&R utilization data.
		Page 21, comment 2: Worth mentioning the future light rail? Didn't see any mention of it in the last few pages under public transport.	Yes, a section has been added to the second draft in the Existing Transportation Conditions for Light Rail since it is expected to be complete by 2024 when the Comprehensive Plan is adopted.
		Page 22, comment 1: Keep as future tense....it's not here yet!	It is expected that the light rail station will be open by the time the City adopts the Comprehensive Plan update in 2024.
		Page 22, comment 2: Finding the KCUGC data, dates, and assumptions wasn't very easy. We should clearly articulate any future projections' assumptions and dates - if data were modeled in 11/2019, those assumptions for population growth, travel demand, etc. would be invalid.	The future traffic volumes are primarily developed based on the City's 2044 land use projections, which are described in more detail in the Land Use Element. The text identifies the 2021 version the King County Urban Growth Capacity (KCUGC) report used. Regional growth plans such as PSRC's Vision 2050 are currently evaluating the impacts of COVID-19 and will potentially adjust growth models in the future.

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
		Page 22, comment 3: These projections' assumptions are clearer I think. These are based on the 2018 data that were double-checked to still be valid in 2022, right?	Yes, the traffic forecasts are based on the 2018 counts and were reconfirmed to be valid in 2022.
		Page 29: While I am sure there exists research on the merits of roundabouts and an illustration I saw alleviated my concerns about a roundabout taking out more trees than a signal (am I correct in that interpretation?), are there any data/research results that look at the potential for an increase in accidents when the first roundabout is installed in a locality? Could there perhaps be a spike in accidents for the first few years after the first roundabout is built as people get used to the new feature?	The signal and roundabout options have preliminary cost estimates, but not enough design work has been done to make determinations on the impacts for trees at this location. In general, roundabouts have been shown to decrease injury crashes, even in their initial operation year. The first roundabout on the island will be constructed at the N Mercer Way and 77th Avenue SE intersection.
		Page 33: What specific services are being reinstated or is this old verbiage?	Removed the word "reinstate" to make transit planning more forward-looking. This is old verbiage referring to previous transit service cuts.