

Table 1. Land Use Element Public Comment Tracking.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	Overall - Do not remove mentions of "single family," "single-family" or permutations thereof. Except for Goal 16 on Page 23...achieving additional capacity in Town Center and multifamily zones should receive preference to single-family zones.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *is* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable and bikeable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that broaden phrasing related to single-family were generally related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered as that "character" is less pronounced and the amount of the city changed is smaller than that of our single-family neighborhoods and their special character.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMA requirements and/or statewide housing legislation	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.6	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 15.5 - This should be reverted enough to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.7	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 16.5 - I like the preference to areas near HCT as it makes sense	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.8	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 17.3 - Please revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." This policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone appears to have been added at the last minute.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.9	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 27.6.4 - Remove this goal, also added at the last minute. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element).	Policy Choice*  See also the response to comment PUB-8.14 below.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	15.1: This should be going back to the original language "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. The change "All residential zones" weakens the goal in this paragraph. Single-family zones will be the most affected by not preserving the character – they have the most neighborhood character and this is a good thing. It is over 67% of our city and it looks like the goal of this recent revision is to destroy it.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	15.5: As noted below, data in this plan says we have a single-family city..... Protect that, this unique to MI and develop the town center as needed since there is less character there" See again Table 2 of Housing Element	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.3	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	17.3: Undo the recent changes to this – what you had as a Commission a few months ago was just fine. This recent revision no longer protects residential areas from the likely-to-be expanded allowed uses in the Commercial Office zone.	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.4	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	Overall comment: it looks like your goal as a Commission/planning department is to remove the single-family character of our city. Is there a reason for that beyond ideology? That is the reason why people move here – Seattle is right across the bridge if you want density and less character.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please keep "single family," "single-family" or permutations thereof. Except for Goal 16 on Page 23...achieving additional capacity in Town Center and multifamily zones should receive preference to single-family zones.</li> </ul>	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.5	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	Heading 15: delete "moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *is* a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area). Like mentioned above, there is no reason to change that. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable and bikeable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-3.6	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	27.6.4: Delete this in its entirety. We already have one of the lowest GFARs in the region. If I recall correctly, to explain why they supported this, a Commissioner mentioned that they know of families around the world that live in 2,000 sqft apartments; Mercer Island is not Hong Kong, London, or Tokyo. It is a suburb of a midsize US city that consists of at least 67% single family homes. There are many options across both bridges for smaller apartment or middle housing units that arguably are more convenient due to their proximity to existing transit, retail, and jobs.	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.1	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Needs a Vision Statement consistent with the City's Vision Statement and Vision Statement in my May 20, 2024 email that Mercer Island is primarily a single family community and that all future affordable housing must go in the town center and CO zones per County policies.	Policy Choice*  The scope of work as approved the by the City Council with <a href="#">Resolution No. 1621</a> and per the addendum approved by City Council with <a href="#">Resolution No. 1645</a> did not include tasks associated with amending the vision statement or developing a new vision statement for the Land Use Element. Amending an existing vision or developing a new vision statement would be a significant increase in the scope of work, particularly for the public participation aspect of that project. In general, vision statements require broad public participation to ensure that the updated statement reflects the broad public opinion about how the City should address growth.
PUB-8.2	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Goal 15 - Strike the addition of "to moderate" in relation to housing density. Mercer Island *is* principally a low density, single family community (Table 2 of the Housing Element quantifies that as 67% of housing units and presumably a larger portion of the land area) and it should remain so. These two words can be used to change the character of and densify the entire island, removing trees, walkable neighborhoods, and the suburban and sometimes even rural feel of the Island.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-8.3	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.1 - Revert to read "Preserve the neighborhood character in single-family residential zones. All residential zones weakens this goal and if denser housing must be accommodated, then the "character" of Town Center or multifamily zones should be the first to be altered.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.
PUB-8.4	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.2 - Clarify that this be done in accordance with and not to exceed GMPC requirements and/or statewide housing legislation, or the city's GMA future housing allocation.	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.5	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.3 - Clarify that the encouraging is only to be done in accordance with (and most importantly not to exceed) GMA requirements.	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.6	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	15.5 - Should be amended to articulate the fact that Mercer Island is a primarily single-family residential community. "As a primarily single family residential community....." See again Table 2 of Housing Element	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires cities to plan for moderate density housing options within urban growth areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and (c)</a> ). The GMA also requires the City to allow moderate density housing in any zone where single-family homes are allowed ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ). Proposed amendments throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan that generalize phrases related to single-family were typically related to those GMA requirements.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.7	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Goal 16. Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible land use techniques and entitlement regulations.	Goal 16, as proposed, would state: "Achieve additional residential capacity in residential zones through flexible land use techniques and land use entitlement regulations."  This goal is not expected to oblige the City to adopt concurrent regulations. The City can implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as it has resources available, provided the implementation is consistent with the implementation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan and the processes and criteria established in the Mercer Island City Code.
PUB-8.8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.1 - Mercer Island has lost over a 1,000 residents since 2020. In 2020, we were at 25,752 and in 2023, we were at 24,742 according to the latest US Census Bureau: U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States and King County's population has been flat over the past four years.  This goal needs to identify what "shared housing opportunities" means, and how they would achieve affordable housing in the single family zone when County policy states all affordable housing must be in the Town Center or CO zone.	The GMA requires cities to plan using the Office of Financial Management (OFM) population forecast (RCW 36.70A.110(2)). The OFM population forecast is based on the April 1 Population Estimates, which estimate the City population slightly growing since from 25,748 in 2020 to 25,800 in 2023 (source: <a href="https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-estimates/april-1-official-population-estimates">https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-estimates/april-1-official-population-estimates</a> ).  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> ).
PUB-8.9	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.2 - This goal is irrelevant. County policy mandates that all 1239 future housing units must be affordable and in the Town Center or CO zone.	Policy Choice*  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ).
PUB-8.10	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.4 - Mercer Island already allows accessory dwelling units on single family lots. This policy needs to state that current ADU regulations will not change.	Policy Choice*  The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a> .
PUB-8.11	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.5 – "Encourage" should be changed to "to allow".	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.12	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	16.6 – Needs concurrent development regulations to identify the flexible residential development regulations and to further identify that the only other affordable housing recognized by County policy is in the Town Center and the CO zone.	Policy 16.6 as proposed would read: "Explore flexible residential development regulations and entitlement processes that support, create incentives for, and encourage public amenities such as wildlife habitat, accessible homes, affordable housing, and sustainable development." This policy as drafted is not expected to obligate the City to adopt concurrent development regulations. The City can implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as it has resources available, provided the implementation is consistent with the implementation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan and the processes and criteria established in the Mercer Island City Code.



Log #	Date	Commenter	Public Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.13	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	17.3 - Revert to original PC recommendation to read: "Add multifamily residential uses to the Commercial Office zone. This should be accomplished through changes in zoning regulations that minimize adverse effects to surrounding areas, especially residential zones." Commissioner Akyuz introduced this policy change (change minimize to consider and strike "especially residential zones.") that removes specific protection of residential zones from the impacts from an expanded CO zone.	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.14	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Goal 27.6.4 – remove this goal. Smaller units have more surface area to achieve the same floor area and thus lose more energy to the environment. Additionally, the greenest house is one that has already been built. This is a bad addition and can be used to justify destroying the character of the majority of our neighborhoods (over 67% of the housing according to Table 2 of the housing element). This goal needs to be removed or the concurrent development regulations drafted to identify how smaller housing units will be encouraged and needs to reflect that triplexes needs to be removed as not mandated by state law for Mercer Island.	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>Many factors contribute to the production of greenhouse gases related to the construction and operation of residential housing, including type and source of materials, unit size and whether units are attached or detached. The City can research options for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting energy efficiency during the implementation of this policy.</p> <p>The City will be updating its development code to comply with <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> related to middle housing. RCW 36.70A.635(1)(a) requires Mercer Island to authorize the development of two units per lot on all lots zoned predominantly for residential use, as well as the development of four units per lot within one-quarter mile walking distance of a major transit stop and when at least one unit is affordable housing. Development consistent with RCW 36.70A.635(1)(a)(ii) and (iii) would include triplexes and quadplexes.</p> <p>Further, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> requires the City to adopt policies in the Housing Element specifically addressing triplexes, it states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that: [... ]</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) Includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences, and within an urban growth area boundary, moderate density housing options including, but not limited to, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes;</p>
PUB-8.15	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	29.1 Goal. This action plan needs to clarify how the “usability” of the Development Code will eliminate repetitious overlapping and conflicting provisions and to state nothing in this goal supports changing the Development Code for the single family zone.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.1	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Land use element – Goad 7: change “on street parking” to “parking.” I don’t think we should decide from here where the parking should be.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.2	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Land use element – Goal 9: change “ample to adequate” and rework Goal 9 and it’s policies as policies under Goad 8. Parking should not be an end in itself.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.3	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Land use policy 15.6.A: add “carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.”	Policy Choice*

\* Comments marked as “Policy choice” propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

**Table 2. Housing Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 1.7 - Remove this in its entirety. It is incompatible with Goal 1.9 and Goal 16.5 of the Land Use Element. It makes no sense to disperse affordable housing across the Island - access to existing high capacity transit is essential (i.e., locate it in the Town Center) and access to retail is a very good-to-have	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>Proposed Housing Policy 1.7 states: "Strive to increase class, race, and age integration by equitably dispersing affordable housing opportunities."</p> <p>Policy 1.7 was drafted, in part, to respond to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policy (MPP) H-5, which states: "Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color."</p> <p>Policy 1.7 is also part of the City's response to Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) H-20 and H-21, which state:</p> <p><b>H-20</b> Adopt and implement policies that address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p> <p><b>H-21</b> Adopt policies and strategies that promote equitable development and mitigate displacement risk, with consideration given to the preservation of historical and cultural communities as well as investments in low-, very low-, extremely low-, and moderate-income housing production and preservation; dedicated funds for land acquisition; manufactured housing community preservation, inclusionary zoning; community planning requirements; tenant protections; public land disposition policies; and land that may be used for affordable housing. Mitigate displacement that may result from planning efforts, large-scale private investments, and market pressure. Implement anti-displacement measures prior to or concurrent with development capacity increases and public capital investments.</p>
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 1.9 – Housing choices for those earning lower wages should also be located in close proximity to retail.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 1.10 - Change "encourage" to "continue to allow." ADUs are already allowed. Encouraging them implies financial incentives or regulation / permitting relief - we should let the market determine if ADUs need to be built and not create the justification for using City dollars to provide landlord incentives relating to ADUs.	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a>.</p>
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 2.1 - We shouldn't support construction near planned things, only ones that already exist; if a plan were to fall through or experience a multi-year delay, there is no benefit (except to developers) to encourage allegedly compatible construction next to it.	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 2.2.C - Revise "build and preserve affordable housing" to "renovate and preserve preexisting affordable housing." This is an important anti-displacement measure that should not be overlooked.	Policy Choice*  The GMA requires the City to plan for housing needs across all income segments ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)</a> ). According to the County's allocation of housing needs (CPP H-1), the City of Mercer Island must plan for 1,207 additional units affordable to households that earn 80 percent of the area median income or below.. This will likely necessitate both construction of new housing and preservation of existing housing along with requirements for covenants that require income-restricted rents long-term.
PUB-2.6	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 2.5.H - This is a *bad* one if you think about it; a cursory reading of this sounds good. It can be used to waive *any* building regulations not related to health and safety if marketed as income restricted housing - Gross Floor Area Ratio, permeable surface, height/floor limits, facade height, parking requirements, and property line offset requirements, to name a few.	Policy Choice*  See also the response to comment PUB-8.14 below.
PUB-2.7	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 3.2 - This is purely performative - please remove it; if anything, talking about something fosters inaction on the topic as people can say they've done something (by only adding a sentence or two)	Policy Choice*  Proposed Policy 3.2 would read: "Acknowledge historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color."  The policy was drafted based on the PSRC MPP H-5, which states: "Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color."
PUB-2.8	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 4.2.B - Who pays for this Relocation assistance? The city? The landlord? If the latter, that cost will indirectly be passed on to renters. Please remove this as implementation can be messy and will inevitably add bureaucracy and costs to all.	Policy Choice*  Relocation assistance costs are typically covered by the developer as part of the redevelopment process. It might be that those costs would be passed on to renters. Policy 4.2 states: "Evaluate the potential increased risk of displacement that could accompany any increase in development capacity concurrent with proposed zoning changes affecting a zone where multifamily or mixed-use development is allowed." This evaluation would take place at the time a zoning change is proposed. The applicant proposing the rezone would need to complete the evaluation.
PUB-2.9	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 5.1.D - Please revert this to the original as proposed by the Housing Working Group. Unnecessarily is a qualitative definition and is subject to broad interpretation.	Policy Choice*  Policy 5.1.D directs that when the City reviews the multifamily development standards (Policy 5.1) it should: "Ensure parking requirements do not unnecessarily restrict multifamily housing but rather carefully balance the need for parking and the cost of providing it." The City would determine how to apply this policy during its implementation.
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	2.1: Only support construction near existing infrastructure. Plans change and large projects are inevitably delayed and sometimes cancelled.	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	2.2.C: From an environmental point of view, it is preferable to preserve and update affordable housing than to build new – you lose trees, discard building materials, need to cut down new wood for lumber, and concrete is very energy-intensive to produce. New “affordable” housing will be more expensive and contributes to displacement...update this goal accordingly.	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.3	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	2.5.H: Delete this. Building a six story box with no yard, no trees, and no permeable surfaces could be done with this goal as a justification. Having grass, having trees, having a short building, and having permeable surfaces can be considered to be non-safety related.	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.4	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	1.7: Get rid of this – it is inconsistent with the goal two steps down from it. Also dispersing makes it harder to benefit from existing transit options or makes it necessary to significantly grow the size and cost (and reduce the efficiency of) transit offerings.	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>Proposed Housing Policy 1.7 states: “Strive to increase class, race, and age integration by equitably dispersing affordable housing opportunities.”</p> <p>Policy 1.7 was drafted, in part, to respond to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policy (MPP) H-5, which states: “Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color.”</p> <p>Policy 1.7 is also part of the City’s response to Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) H-20 and H-21, which state:</p> <p><b>H-20</b> Adopt and implement policies that address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p> <p><b>H-21</b> Adopt policies and strategies that promote equitable development and mitigate displacement risk, with consideration given to the preservation of historical and cultural communities as well as investments in low-, very low-, extremely low-, and moderate-income housing production and preservation; dedicated funds for land acquisition; manufactured housing community preservation, inclusionary zoning; community planning requirements; tenant protections; public land disposition policies; and land that may be used for affordable housing. Mitigate displacement that may result from planning efforts, large-scale private investments, and market pressure. Implement anti-displacement measures prior to or concurrent with development capacity increases and public capital investments.</p>
PUB-3.5	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	1.9: Close to retail offerings is also an important thing to add	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.6	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	1.10: Encourage to me implies incentives which are usually financial or reduced permit review. We already have ADUs permitted by code, so let’s just keep allowing them	<p>Policy Choice*</p> <p>“Encourage” can also mean reducing regulatory barriers. The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a>.</p>



Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-3.7	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	5.1.D: The Housing Working Group-suggested language is preferable to what the Planning Commission came up with – trust the experience of the City Council members and go back to their words.	Policy Choice*  Policy 5.1.D directs that when the City reviews the multifamily development standards (Policy 5.1) it should: “Ensure parking requirements do not unnecessarily restrict multifamily housing but rather carefully balance the need for parking and the cost of providing it.” The City would determine how to apply this policy during its implementation.
PUB-8.1	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.4.D - (See CPD comment)	Staff is unsure which comment this refers to
PUB-8.2	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.7 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)	Policy Choice*  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance for complying with affordable housing requirements in House Bill 1220 indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ).
PUB-8.3	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.8 – (What does this mean?)	Policy Choice*  Housing Element Policy 1.8 states: “Discourage neighborhood segregation and the isolation of special needs populations.”  <a href="#">Oxford Languages</a> defines segregation as: “the action or state of setting someone or something apart from others.” The CPPs define special needs populations within the definition of special needs housing, as follows: “Housing arrangements for populations with special physical or other needs. These populations include the elderly, disabled persons, people with medical conditions, homeless individuals and families, and displaced people.”
PUB-8.4	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.9 – (This vague amendment needs clarification and that County policy recognizes affordable housing must be in the town center and CO zone)	Policy Choice*  WA State Department of Commerce Guidance for complying with affordable housing requirements in House Bill 1220 indicates that jurisdictions should plan for affordable units to be provided as moderate- to high-density housing. That does not preclude affordable housing in other forms/locations. The GMA also requires the City to plan for moderate-density housing in residential areas ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.635</a> ).
PUB-8.5	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	1.10 – (Does “encourage” mean GFAR bonuses? Mercer Island allows ADUs, but they are not affordable)	Policy Choice*  The City must update existing ADU regulations by June 30, 2025, to comply with new requirements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.680</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.681</a> .
PUB-8.6	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.1 – (Clarify within Town Center and CO Zone)	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.7	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.3 – (How? Needs clarification)	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.4 – (See CPD comment. Clarify not in single family zone)	Staff is unsure which comment this refers to The City must adopt regulations permitting moderate density housing in the residential zones by June 30, 2025.
PUB-8.9	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.5 – (Must be limited to Town Center and CO Zone)	Policy 2.5 lays out the approaches to be used to encourage construction of new permanent income-restricted housing. Policy 1.11 and 1.12 provide the direction for increases in multifamily or mixed-use housing to take place in the Town Center and Commercial Office zones.
PUB-8.10	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	2.5.H – (See CPD comment)	Staff is unsure which comment this refers to
PUB-8.11	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	3.1.C – (Needs clarification and zone)	There are many policies throughout the Housing Element that provide more specific direction for how the City will incentivize affordable housing construction, including which zones it will focus on initially.
PUB-8.12	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	3.2 – (Vague – specify)	Policy Choice*  Proposed Housing Element Policy 3.2 states: “Acknowledge historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color.”  Policy 3.2 was drafted, in part, to respond to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policy (MPP) H-5, which states: “Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color.”
PUB-8.13	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	5.1.D – (See CPD comment. 5.1.D must identify what is being balanced)	Policy Choice*  Policy 5.1.D directs that when the City reviews the multifamily development standards (Policy 5.1) it should: “Ensure parking requirements do not unnecessarily restrict multifamily housing but rather carefully balance the need for parking and the cost of providing it.” The City would determine how to apply this policy and balance need for parking and the cost of providing it during its implementation.
PUB-8.14	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	5.1.E – (Needs clarification of zone and whether incentives include regulatory limits)	5.1 clarifies that policies 5.1.A-5.1.E would apply to the development regulations in multifamily zones, this would be the MF-2, MF-2L, and MF-3 zones.
PUB-8.15	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	5.2 to 5.5 – (Need concurrent development regulations)	Policies 5.2 to 5.5 as drafted are not expected to obligate the City to adopt concurrent development regulations. These three policies provide some direction for when the City prepares code amendments to address statewide middle housing and accessory dwelling unit legislation.  The City can implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as it has resources available, provided the implementation is consistent with the implementation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan and the processes and criteria established in the Mercer Island City Code.

\* Comments marked as “Policy choice” propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

**Table 3. Transportation Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-1.1	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	"The Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust is a coalition-based organization that leads and inspires action to conserve and enhance this special landscape, ensuring a long-term balance between people and nature." It is meaningless. Please remove it from page 2: I do not believe owns any property on Mercer Island and they don't provide any trails whatsoever on Mercer Island. And please remove this: <del>the vision and development of the Town Center. The regional Mountains-to-Sound Trail runs along the I-90 corridor providing a convenient connection to Seattle and Bellevue for pedestrians and bicyclists.</del>	Planning Commission addressed on 6/5/24
PUB-1.2	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And please remove this: The Temple Herzl, for example, want to build a building and not provide one parking, not one, but have shared parking with the synagogue and the French American School, is that what we want? No, we do not want shared parking, so remove this goal: <del>1.2 Encourage businesses and residential areas to explore opportunities for shared parking and other parking management strategies.</del>	Policy Choice* Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element
PUB-1.3	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And I want you to add the wording "and retain trees" to read: "Encourage programs that retain trees and encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of rights-of-way." <del>3.3 Construct transportation improvements with sensitivity to existing trees and vegetation. Encourage programs that plant trees in unused portions of public rights-of-way.</del>	Planning Commission addressed on 6/5/24
PUB-1.4	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And would someone like to explain how anyone thinks that you could build a parking lot which would be for Mercer Islanders only. I don't know if you are aware, but pre-covid, Sound Transit were offering permits for people to park in the Park and Ride for \$120 a month on a first come, first serve basis. It was not exclusive to Mercer Islanders. Business is business and if someone from Bellevue, for example, wanted to purchase a permit for the MI Park and Ride, how do you think you are going to tell them that it is "for Mercer Islanders only?" It is not, so take this language out. <del>4.4 Investigate opportunities for operating, constructing and/or financing park and ride lots for Mercer Island residents only.</del>	Policy Choice* Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element
PUB-1.5	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And why are you wasting our money on this? Light rail is Sound Transit's project, not Mercer Island's project, if they want to make it safe to get to their light rail (that is even if it should work), let them study opportunities and besides, it is up to WSDOT to approve, so take this out: <del>4.9 Implement transportation programs and projects that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups.</del>	Policy Choice* Can we add a reference to the CPPs to illustrate why this policy is needed?
PUB-1.6	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	I have never heard of the Eastside Partnership, King County Metro are the ones who schedule the bus routes, so shouldn't you be coordinating planning with them? <del>5.5 Work with the participants of the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) to coordinate transportation planning for the Eastside subarea.</del>	Policy Choice* Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element  The <a href="#">Eastside Transportation Partnership</a> was established by interlocal agreement in 1987 to provide a forum for cooperation between eastside jurisdictions to implement coordinated, prioritized transportation plans and programs through leadership, education and advocacy.

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment															
PUB-1.7	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And what on earth do you mean by this?: 6.2 Develop strategies to manage property access along arterial streets in order to preserve their function.	Policy Choice*  Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element															
PUB-1.8	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And again, this is up to Sound Transit, not the City of MI, let ST study opportunities: 12.412.4 Study opportunities to expand electric bicycle facilities that serve the Town Center, light rail station, and park and ride.	Policy Choice*															
PUB-1.9	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	I have never heard of a Level of Service for pedestrians. What on earth do you mean by this?: 12.55 Prioritize areas near schools and commercial areas for a higher level of service for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.	Policy Choice*  Note: this policy was carried over from the existing Transportation Element  <a href="#">This resource</a> from the National Association of City Transportation Officials provides more information on Level of Service for pedestrians.															
PUB-1.10	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	AND FINALLY, IT HAS TAKEN ME 5 YEARS TO GET YOU TO CORRECT THE INFORMATION WITH REGARDS TO THIS: You had 80th Ave SE and North Mercer Way and 77th Ave SE and North Mercer Way as being "Town Center Intersections" which they never were, but you refused to correct it, and finally, you have to make the heading Town Center and Adjacent Town Center with an LOS of C which is all I wanted you to do.  <table border="1"> <caption>Table 1. 2018 Existing Intersection Operations</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Intersection</th> <th>AM Peak Hour</th> <th>PM Peak Hour</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"><b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SE 24th St/76th Ave SE</td> <td>B</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Mercer Way/Park &amp; Ride/80th Ave SE</td> <td>C</td> <td>C</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	<b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b>			SE 24th St/76th Ave SE	B	B	N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE	A	A	N Mercer Way/Park & Ride/80th Ave SE	C	C	As communicated at the time this correction was initially requested, it was not possible to amend the comprehensive plan outside of the periodic update process. As promised, the requested change has been incorporated.
Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour																	
<b>Town Center Intersections Within and Adjacent to the Town Center (LOS C Standard)</b>																			
SE 24th St/76th Ave SE	B	B																	
N Mercer Way/77th Ave SE	A	A																	
N Mercer Way/Park & Ride/80th Ave SE	C	C																	
PUB-1.11	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	And there is an assumption that light rail will work, but it is not a given. The first engineering company who were asked to look at light rail on the I-90 bridge said it wouldn't work which was not what Sound Transit wanted to hear so fired that engineering company, so do not make out that light rail "runs through", we don't know yet if it will be operational, plus I have never heard of the buses deemed "fixed route service"  <u>Link light rail runs through Mercer Island along the median of I-90 with a station located north of the Town Center, between 77th Avenue SE and 80th Avenue SE. The light rail provides frequent connections to Seattle, Bellevue, and other regional destinations.</u>  Local fixed route service operates on the arterial roadway system, and provides public transit service connecting residential and activity areas.	Word Smithing**															



Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment																				
PUB-1.12	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And I am sorry, but this is COMPLETELY FALSE:</p> <p><small>According to the Fourth Quarter 2017 Park and Ride Utilization Report prepared by King County, the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays. A number of the users of this lot do not reside on the Island.</small></p> <p>The Mercer Island Park and Ride is not full at all, not at all and certainly not "typically fully occupied. Since covid, you can always get parking, so please remove that statement. I live right opposite and keep monitoring the Park and Ride. If you want photos of any given day after 9am, i can provide them to you to show you the empty parking lot.</p> <p>I don't know for the rest of the parking lots, but please amend this from 100% to 50% occupied:</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Table 2: Mercer Island Park and Ride Locations and Capacities</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Lot</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Capacity</th> <th>Cars Parked</th> <th>% Spaces Occupied</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mercer Island Park and Ride</td> <td>8000 N Mercer Way</td> <td>447</td> <td>447</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>And keep the wording "analysis assumes the opening of the East Link", we don't know if it is going to actually work:</p> <p><small>The analysis assumes the opening of the East Link light rail line in 2023, which will result in provides an additional travel option between the Town Center and regional destinations.</small></p>	Lot	Location	Capacity	Cars Parked	% Spaces Occupied	Mercer Island Park and Ride	8000 N Mercer Way	447	447	100%	Word Smithing**										
Lot	Location	Capacity	Cars Parked	% Spaces Occupied																				
Mercer Island Park and Ride	8000 N Mercer Way	447	447	100%																				
PUB-1.13	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And none of these two projects should be done if there is going to be a lot of construction in the Town Center because all those construction trucks are going to damage the roadway:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Justification</th> <th>Cost (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="5"><b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NM-1</td> <td>80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)</td> <td>Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.</td> <td>2023-2028 TIP (SP136)</td> <td>1,376,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NM-2</td> <td>78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)</td> <td>Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.</td> <td>2023-2028 TIP (SP137)</td> <td>779,488</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)	<b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b>					NM-1	80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP136)	1,376,000	NM-2	78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP137)	779,488	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)																				
<b>Non-Motorized Projects (NM)</b>																								
NM-1	80th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 27th St - SE 32nd St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP136)	1,376,000																				
NM-2	78th Ave SE Sidewalk (SE 32nd St - SE 34th St)	Replace existing curb, sidewalk, ADA ramps, trees, and lighting.	2023-2028 TIP (SP137)	779,488																				
PUB-1.14	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And I am getting annoyed. I have told you dozens of times that it is not up to the City of Mercer Island to remove the bus bay and to widen the trail, it is not your project, nor are you transport experts, not to mention it is a lot of money. And like I keep telling you, having bicyclists on the sidewalk no matter how wide is a disaster and it is just a matter of time before there is an accident. Who can make it that the signs tell bicyclists to use the bike trail leading to 24th St to 84th Ave SE and to not have bicyclists riding on the sidewalk which by definition is for pedestrians, not bicyclists?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Justification</th> <th>Cost (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NM-8</td> <td>North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements</td> <td>Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.</td> <td>2023-2028 TIP (SP144)</td> <td>1,203,081</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)	NM-8	North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements	Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.	2023-2028 TIP (SP144)	1,203,081	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>										
ID	Location	Description	Justification	Cost (\$)																				
NM-8	North Mercer Way - MI Park and Ride Frontage Improvements	Remove bus bay on north side of NMW, widen trail, and construct safety improvements.	2023-2028 TIP (SP144)	1,203,081																				

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment					
PUB-1.15	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And as a pedestrian, putting a traffic light at the intersection of 28th Ave SE and 80th Ave SE is going to be the worst possible thing, not to mention that it is not going to work and it is going to cause more backups so please remove this, not to mention the high costs. And what about the plan to make a one-way street where Tully's is? Some new person in the city came up with the terrible idea to get rid of a section of Greta Hackett park in order to add parking, what is happening with that plan? So in addition to your wanting to add a traffic signal there, you want to add a one-way street next to the traffic light, how is that going to look and how will it work?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 493 1423 560"> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 493 699 520">I-2</td> <td data-bbox="699 493 864 560">SE 28th St/80th Ave SE</td> <td data-bbox="864 493 1112 520">Install traffic signal.</td> <td data-bbox="1112 493 1258 560">2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)</td> <td data-bbox="1258 493 1423 520">1,464,000</td> </tr> </table>	I-2	SE 28th St/80th Ave SE	Install traffic signal.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)	1,464,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
I-2	SE 28th St/80th Ave SE	Install traffic signal.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#1)	1,464,000					
PUB-1.16	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And I don't understand, there is already a turn lane which has a left-turn light, so why are you spending all this money when there is already a left turning lane? Please explain:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 667 1423 733"> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 667 699 693">I-3</td> <td data-bbox="699 667 864 733">80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way</td> <td data-bbox="864 667 1112 733">Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.</td> <td data-bbox="1112 667 1258 733">2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)</td> <td data-bbox="1258 667 1423 693">754,000</td> </tr> </table>	I-3	80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way	Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)	754,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
I-3	80th Ave SE/North Mercer Way	Add turn lane to improve traffic operations at the intersection.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#14)	754,000					
PUB-1.17	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And this is a WSDOT issue, not a MI issue and I don't understand how you could make it an "exclusive westbound left turn lane"</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 808 1423 923"> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 808 699 834">I-4</td> <td data-bbox="699 808 864 923">North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way</td> <td data-bbox="864 808 1112 854">Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.</td> <td data-bbox="1112 808 1258 874">2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)</td> <td data-bbox="1258 808 1423 834">650,000</td> </tr> </table>	I-4	North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way	Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)	650,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
I-4	North Mercer Way/I-90 Westbound Off-Ramp/Island Crest Way	Add exclusive westbound left turn lane at I-90 off-ramp.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#15)	650,000					
PUB-1.18	5/28/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>And you need to figure out the coordination and synchronization with WSDOT and with the City of MI. This is what I have observed. When the intersection leading from 27th St onto the I-90 going westbound is clogged, drivers are instead using the 28th St and Island Crest Way intersection to get onto the I-90 clogging up 28th St. Who is responsible for the synchronization and what happens if you come up with the traffic light at 27th St and 80th Ave SE and it makes the traffic conditions worse and more dangerous for pedestrians? What is the backup plan? Would you revert it back to a stop street?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1197 1423 1366"> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 1197 699 1223">R-2</td> <td data-bbox="699 1197 864 1366">Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way – SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.</td> <td data-bbox="864 1197 1112 1272">Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.</td> <td data-bbox="1112 1197 1258 1272">2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)</td> <td data-bbox="1258 1197 1423 1223">690,000</td> </tr> </table>	R-2	Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way – SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.	Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)	690,000	<p>No Additional Comment</p> <p>Note: the project list portion of the Transportation Element was prepared with input from Public Works staff to ensure that it includes planned projects.</p>
R-2	Signal Coordination Along Island Crest Way (North Mercer Way – SE 28th St) and at the North Mercer Way/80th Ave SE intersection.	Coordinate four existing traffic signals along Island Crest Way and North Mercer Way.	2022 Transportation Impact Fee (#11)	690,000					
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	<p>Goal 4.9 - Was this specifically required by the new housing bills passed as law by the State? If I recall correctly, this came out of the King County Planning Policies document, which is *guidance,* not law. Please strike "Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color" from this goal. Differentiating programs and how we treat others based solely on skin color is racism and suggests that people are less well-off based solely on the color of their skin. Differentiating programs and resources based on needs relating to income or disability status is a good thing and is proper. Racism is not. Additionally, as a member of the Jewish community in this post-10/7 world, I am disappointed with the goal as-proposed, as it explicitly excludes the Jewish Community, among many others.</p>	<p>Proposed Transportation Policy 4.9 states: "Implement transportation programs that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups."</p> <p>This policy was drafted to align with the King County Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) T-9, which states: "Implement transportation programs and projects that prevent and mitigate the displacement of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low and no- incomes, and people with special transportation needs."</p>					

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffery Weisman	Goal 4.10 - Please articulate that off-street parking is a significant issue (read essentially necessary) for handicapped persons and families.	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 5.4 - Change equity to equality	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 7.3 - Nice idea, likely impossible unfortunately	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 12.4 - Post-COVID, e-bikes have really gravitated from rentals or city-owned to personally-owned. We should deploy city money in a more impactful way than this	Policy Choice*
PUB-2.6	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 14.6 - This was already studied. Surely there are better uses of city money post-COVID	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	4.9: This is really a socioeconomic issue and not a race issue as one Commissioner mentioned in a recent meeting. Injecting race into this goal muddies the water and diverges from the intent (helping those who need help through extra programs and resource allocation). As a person who would qualify as BIPOC, I also find that aspect of this goal to be quite patronizing.	Proposed Transportation Policy 4.9 states: "Implement transportation programs that address the needs of and promote access to opportunity for underserved communities, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low or no incomes, and people with special transportation needs, while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups."  This policy was drafted to align with the King County Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) T-9, which states: "Implement transportation programs and projects that prevent and mitigate the displacement of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color, people with low and no- incomes, and people with special transportation needs."
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	4.10: Three Commissioners have noted in some form that guaranteed parking off of a street is necessary for families and those who are handicapped – these are solid points and important to note here	Policy Choice*
PUB-8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	4.10 - Needs to articulate that off street parking is an issue (i.e., necessary) - especially for handicapped and families.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.1	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Transportation element policy 6.9: change to "Seek to provide parking and other automobile facilities to meet anticipated demand generated by new development, carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it."	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.2	6/2/2024	Chris Goelz	Transportation element – Goal 11: I'd omit this goal and incorporate policy 11.1 elsewhere. If it remains, it should be clear that we need to carefully balancing the need for parking and the cost of providing it.	Policy Choice*

\* Comments marked as "Policy Choice" propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

\*\* Comments marked as "Word Smithing" are comments proposing an alternate wording for non-policy and non-goal parts of the draft element. The Planning Commission can amend the text as proposed without changing the policy direction, but further consistency analysis would be required to ensure that the amendment does not conflict with policies elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Table 4. Capital Facilities Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment

**Table 5. Utilities Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-7	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher	<p>I am sorry, but what PSE wants is so against any of our values when they want to add transmission lines to the Eastside. Look up "Energize Eastside," which is they want to shove massive transmission lines <a href="#">Overview - Energize Eastside EIS</a> Please see the video. It is a massive detriment to the environment:</p> <p>I hope that you will make sure that Mercer Island will not receive their electricity through this Energize Eastside power lines. This is what they are asking for, please make sure that Mercer Island will not be behind this grid infrastructure, we don't want a part of it and you certainly won't be expediting any local permitting, that would be nuts to do so:</p> <p><b>Policy 8 - Grid Infrastructure</b> Expedite the local permitting and approval process in order to maintain grid capacity and reliability. [Land Use Element]</p> <p><b>PSE Programs</b> New regional transmission lines are needed to serve new utility scale clean energy resources, such as wind and solar.</p> <p>New local transmission lines are needed to meet increasing local demand due to growth, EV's, and electrification of the heating sector (e.g., Sammamish to Juanita line in Kirkland).</p> <p>Transmission upgrades are needed to meet increasing local demand (e.g., Energize Eastside line in Redmond, Bellevue, Newcastle, and Renton upgraded from 115kv to 230kv) due to growth, EVs, and electrification of the heating sector.</p> <p>In order to assure continued capacity and reliability, new and larger substations will be needed to meet growing energy needs due to growth, EVs and electrification of the heating sector.</p>	No Additional Comment



**Table 6. Economic Development Element Public Comment Tracking.**

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-2.1	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 5, Lines 14-18 - See comment below. Remove "are more likely to choose not to own a car and" from Line 15...this is a postulation backed up by zero facts and a counterexample is presented in the following comment.	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.2	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 12, Lines 16-20 - Residents of less expensive, multifamily housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend," "sports," or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the U-District are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership. Also, change "will be more likely to shop locally" to "may be more likely to shop locally" - this makes the statement consistent with Line 16 on Page 5 (i.e., it is a "may," not a "will.")	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.3	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 12, Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing - even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.4	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Page 12, Line 17. Reword to read "Recent state legislation mandates encouraging" from "Recent legislation will encourage" We have no clue if the laws will work to encourage development, especially in such a high-cost part of the area as our city; it, however, is fact that state legislation has mandated encouraging, so lets state the facts, not the stated intent of the laws.	Word Smithing**
PUB-2.5	5/29/2024	Jeffrey Weisman	Goal 7.6 - Remove this entire goal. Small scale retail development "outside the existing commercial districts" is an under-the-radar method of saying "inside the residential zones" and is a bad idea. Living next to a 7-11, gas station, or pot shop would be a nightmare and is incompatible with our existing community. It is well-accepted that in US suburbs, retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale"	Policy Choice*
PUB-3.1	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	Starting at line 16 on pp. 12: It is incorrect that car ownership is less likely in less expensive and/or multi-family housing. This assertion is false and should be removed. (same location): there is nothing about housing on Mercer Island that is "priced in the middle range". Stick to the words used by Olympia – Middle Housing. It is about the size/capacity of the housing, not the cost. Housing priced in the middle range could be Renton Highlands, Preston, or South Everett	Word Smithing**
PUB-3.2	5/29/2024	Alceu Spencer Peres Junior	7.6: Get rid of the goal. This is precisely why we have zoning. There are residential areas, there are commercial districts, there are mixed use areas, etc. "Studying" retail outside of districts that are zoned for commercial (and mixed use) breaks the residential zoning that makes Mercer Island so livable and unique for those who wish to live away from retail. This amounts to studying removal of residential-only zoning and should be avoided (beyond the small-scale home offices/business already allowed by code)	Policy Choice*

Log #	Date	Commenter	Comment	Staff Comment
PUB-8.1	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	7.6 - Delete this. Small scale retail development in the residential zones is a bad idea. Retail needs density to be viable and that is why residential, commercial, and mixed use zoning exists. Do not allow retail in residential, even at an unquantified "small scale".	Policy Choice*
PUB-8.2	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Lines 16-20 - residents of middle-priced housing are not by default less likely to own a car. Perhaps less likely to own a "weekend" or "fun" car, yes. Oftentimes taking public transport may require significantly more time than driving and that may preclude residents from working a second job or coordinating childcare / pickups / etc. Please remove "will be 19 less likely to own a car," from line 18-19. Beacon Hill, the Central District, the UDistrict are all dense and have transportation options, but still have a ton of car ownership.	Word Smithing**
PUB-8.3	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson	Lines 16 and 17 refer to "more housing priced in the middle range" - please change this to remove the reference to its price. Mercer Island has expensive dirt, so even an HB1110-mandated middle housing – even HB1110 as passed refers to middle housing, not affordable housing, and not middle range-priced housing. Suggest "More Middle Housing" - that is what the law requires and defines...the market will determine whether it is priced in the middle range, a term that is undefined - middle range of MI? Middle range of the Eastside? Middle range of King County? Middle range of Washington State?	Word Smithing**
PUB-13.1	6/4/2024	Chris Goelz	Economic element policy 12.2 – omit “without compromising existing available parking in commercial areas.” 12.4 covers this.	Policy Choice*
PUB-13.2	6/4/2024	Chris Goelz	Economic element policy 12.4 – omit “Interpretation of the policies in this element should not lead to a reduction in parking.” If in the next 20 years we can figure out a way to provide sufficient parking downtown while reducing spaces, why not do it? This is a place where parking seems to be an end in itself.	Policy Choice*

\* Comments marked as “Policy choice” propose an alternative approach to that taken in the current draft. the Planning Commission may recommend an amendment to address these comments. Making such an amendment would likely represent a substantial change in policy direction and would require additional review to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains internally consistent.

\*\* Comments marked as “Word Smithing” are comments proposing an alternate wording for non-policy and non-goal parts of the draft element. The Planning Commission can amend the text as proposed without changing the policy direction, but further consistency analysis would be required to ensure that the amendment does not conflict with policies elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Table 7. General and Process-Related Comments.**

Log #	Date	Commenter
PUB-4	5/29/2024	John Hall
PUB-5	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-6	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-8	5/29/2024	Daniel Thompson
PUB-9	5/29/2024	Matthew Goldbach
PUB-10	5/29/2024	Traci Grandbois
PUB-11	5/29/2024	Gary Robinson (note – this comment included the same policy comments as provided in PUB-8)
PUB-12	5/29/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-13	6/4/2024	Chris Goelz
PUB-14	6/4/2024	Meg Lippert
PUB-15	6/5/2024	Sarah Fletcher
PUB-16	6/6/2024	Sarah Fletcher

**Note:** The full text of each general and process-related public comments is provided in PCB 24-16 Exhibit 2.