

From: [Meg Lippert](#)
To: [Adam Ragheb](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [Parks & Rec Commission](#); [Council](#)
Subject: Re: Please protect our MI Parkland!
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:16:57 PM

Hi Adam,

I am **vehemently opposed** to ANY commercialization or "enterprising" of our parks--but I agree with you about allowing the existing practice of collecting user fees from sports teams for the sports fields.

Thank you for protecting our parkland.

Meg Lippert

On Wed, Jan 31, 2024 at 11:53 AM Adam Ragheb <adam.ragheb@mercerisland.gov> wrote:

Hello Meg,

Thank you for reaching out to me with your public comment regarding the proposed Park Zone. I am in agreement with all of your points and will continue to defend our parks at our upcoming meetings - I submitted my written comments on the zoning code to the City today in preparation for our Feb 8 meeting.

On the topic of not rezoning the parks, I actually posed the question near the end of the meeting about heightening the standard to rezone parks (along with advocating for removing the production of animals from the proposed code). Two ideas that have been bounced around were a unanimous City Council vote and a vote of the citizens - I will start with proposing a community vote with a higher bar than a simple majority, but could see the merits of a unanimous City Council vote too (definitely not just a CC majority). In my written comments submitted today, I proposed that a community vote of at least 66% be required in addition to other steps to rezone land from Park Zone to something else (Parks levy passed with 64.27% and our State Constitution required 60% to pass a levy [for now]).

<https://youtu.be/suiaqN2EEYY?t=12259>

Our next meeting will be a joint meeting with the Parks & Recreation Commission on February 8 at 6:00pm

<https://www.mercerisland.gov/bc-pc/page/planningparks-recreation-commission-special-joint-hybrid-meeting>

In our January 24 meeting, I did advocate against allowing parking structures in our parks, suggesting revising the language to read "at-grade / street level parking directly supporting park use" (and the removal of "parking structures" and "underground parking") which sparked two follow-on responses of note, one immediately after mine

<https://www.youtu.be/suiaqN2EEYY&t=8087>

and one a few minutes later

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=suiagN2EEYY&t=8198s>

One topic that I opposed was the commercialization or "enterprising" of our parks (I am not in opposition however to the existing practice of collecting user fees from sports teams for the sports fields). The point was brought up and I am curious - what are your thoughts about leasing park resources to privately-run companies? It was proposed by another Commission member and I am wanting to better understand the public sentiment on this topic.

<https://youtu.be/suiagN2EEYY?t=1990>

Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments and if you have further comments and/or questions, please do not hesitate to reach out again!

-Adam Ragheb

From: Meg Lippert <meg.lippert@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 1:49 PM

To: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@mercergov.org>; Council <council@mercergov.org>; Parks & Rec Commission <ParksAndRec.Commission@mercergov.org>

Subject: Please protect our MI Parkland!

MI Residents value our prime parkland! Please protect our MI Parkland by:

- **Leaving parkland for recreational uses and facilities only – not government offices**
- **Substantially reducing the proposed height limit of buildings within the park**
- **No Net Increase in Impervious Surfaces**
- **Limiting transit stops to the right of ways**
- **Not allowing parking structures in our parks**
- **Not allowing a future re-zone of a park without a community vote**

THANK YOU!

Meg Lippert