

SEPA Environmental Checklist
Mercer Island Center for the Arts

Attachment R
Citizen Question Index

March 2017

MICA SEPA PUBLIC QUESTION/COMMENT INDEX

sorted by SEPA section

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
A	122	Charney	Project proponent; lives nearby and notes that current parking lots are empty after 6pm.
A	126	Scalzo	Project proponent
A	132	Witmer	Project proponents
A.3	1	Lippert, Alan	Refers to CCMIP letter
A.3	16	Bond	Refers to CCMIP letter
A.3	17	Dunbar	Question about Party of Record
A.3	56	Gilman	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	84	Robinson	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	86	Majury	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	87	McWilliams	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	88	Medved	Forwards Granbois letter
A.3	100	Thompson	Objection to SEP16-015 language regarding 14-day comment period, administrative appeals, etc. Objection to zoning text amendment and long-term lease allowing MICA in Mercedale Park.
A.3	102	Thompson	Objection to 14 day period for written comments without having supporting materials available online.
A.3	105	Thompson	Objection to action by City Council absent a public vote since the zoning code amendment for MICA will create a precedent that will allow other private developers to request or demand the reduction or elimination of required on-site parking.
A.3	111	Thompson	The City Council's proposal to eliminate the turn lane on 77rh, as well as the bike lane, in order to provide street parking for MICA, is an unwise decision that will create traffic gridlock in the town center, both for citizens who live north of ICW attempting to drive through the town center to the top of Island Crest Way in order to access the I-90 HOV/HOT lane (if allowed by FHWA), and for citizens attempting to exit to ICW eastbound or SOV citizens driving through the town center to enter at 76th westbound.
A.3	117	Vu	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	118	Zwingle	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	123	Cero	Asks to be party of record
A.3	134	Dunbar	Request notice of threshold determination, along with right of appeal.
A.3	139	CCMIP	DNS Issuance Failed to Follow SEPA Procedures
A.3	140	CCMIP	Please list all required permits and approvals, along with appropriate mitigation measures
A.4	44	Fletcher	If MICA is given approval, why would you give them preferential treatment?

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
A.4	89	Lippert, Meg	The public and the city will not build nor own the facility and will not have control over the programs and/or activities that take place within and/or adjacent to the building in the area facing the Mercerdale Park Lawn.
A.4	90	Lippert, Meg	MICA is not a public institution and it is not constructing a public building and thus none of the proposed changes to the City code, which focus on public facilities, would apply to the proposed MICA structure in Mercerdale Park.
A.4	91	Lippert, Meg	None of the exceptions listed in the chart (in the proposed Zoning Text Amendment) apply to MICA, since MICA is not a public building.
A.4	92	Lippert, Meg	Objection to exempting a private facility from the city requirement to provide off-street parking.
A.4	104	Thompson	Objection to City Council granting a long-term lease to a private organization for construction in a public park.
A.5	58	Granbois	The planning and permitting processes for the proposed MICA Center for the Arts ("MICA Center") require MICA to comply with, among other things, Chapter 19.11 MICC, Town Center Development and Design Standards. See Mercer Island City Code ("MICC") 19.05.010(C).
A.5	60	Granbois	It appears that MICA failed to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70.B.050(1) and WAC 197-11-030(2)(d) by not addressing the Town Center Development and Design Standards.
A.5	66	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 6 subsection c states the project will meet "LEED Silver" standards. The current Mercer Island Development Code requires "LEED 5 Gold" standards. Mercer Island City Code (MICC) 19.11.050. MICA's proposal is not compliant with current Mercer Island Code.
A.5	124	Kuttner	Do the environmental studies take into adequate consideration the recent Town Center code?
A.7	20	Fletcher	How do you propose to cherish the environment, per the Comprehensive Plan?
A.7	21	Fletcher	Open space must be preserved per Comp Plan Land Use section
A.7	22	Fletcher	How does the Zoning Code change protect environmental values?
A.7	23	Fletcher	The protection of trees and open space should be given priority.
A.7	103	Thompson	I believe MICA should not be placed in a public park, especially considering Mercerdale is the only significant open or green space in the town center
A.7	114	Thompson	MICA is contrary to Mercer Island's commitment to historical and cultural preservation of green spaces and open spaces.
A.8	115	Thompson	Further studies of alternative sites should be performed.
A.8	120	Cassan	MICA should buy the Hines property and build there.
B.0	18	Fletcher	What is "green" about the facility?

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.0	25	Fletcher	How does a large building in the park "protect the natural environment"?
B.1.1	3	Antilla	Is the Mercerdale location safe from landslide?
B.1.1	27	Fletcher	Multiple concerns regarding parking quantity, location and access
B.1.1	35	Fletcher	Who is responsible for doing the study (including the hillside)? Developer, City or MICA?
B.1.1	36	Fletcher	Was the Environmental Study done before vegetation removal? is the hill at risk of landslide?
B.1.1	59	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 1 subsection a is non responsive. The "steep slopes" box is not checked even though "excavation into the hillside" will be required. See SEPA Attachment D.
B.1.1	93	Lippert, Meg	Is MICA on a steel slope? What would happen in the event of a landslide - would lives be in danger?
B.1.1	94	Lippert, Meg	"Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction or use?" The response includes clearing and construction but not use. Yet erosion from the adjacent hillside could certainly occur during use of the facility, perhaps causing hazardous conditions for occupants
B.1.1	106	Thompson	The geotechnical report should address the risk to patrons of MICA should a slide occur.
B.1.1	142	CCMIP	Add existing information about landslide hazard areas
B.1.1	144	CCMIP	Develop a landscape design that restores and keep the hillside from sliding on structure
B.1.2	61	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 1 subsection f is non responsive. The question whether erosion could occur "as a result of clearing, construction or use" has not been answered.
B.1.2	143	CCMIP	Add existing information about erosion hazard areas
B.1.3	37	Fletcher	Will the building be able to withstand a 9.0 earthquake?
B.1.3	141	CCMIP	Add existing information about Seismic Hazard Areas
B.10.1	107	Thompson	MICA will have negative aesthetic impacts to recreational users, adjacent land owners, and citizens in general.
B.10.2	38	Fletcher	How will MICA impact views at the park and for neighbors?
B.10.2	67	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 10 subsection b states "building itself will not alter or obstruct any views". In fact, the MICA building will obstruct views of the wetlands and natural hillside.
B.10.2	155	CCMIP	Request a more realistic visualization of views, showing how the building will actually appear amidst the open space.
B.10.3	39	Fletcher	How high is the proposed building?
B.11	68	Granbois	No specific details regarding lighting were provided.

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.11	157	CCMIP	An analysis should be undertaken to verify that the glare of the glaze materials will not degrade the park environment and neighborhood. Use the National Institute of Building science design guide for visual glare.
B.12.1	34	Fletcher	Will the restroom in MICA be open for public use?
B.12.1	113	Thompson	MICA will harm recreation opportunities.
B.12.1	130	Stapanov-Sommerfield	Where will visitors to Mercedale Park and the many activities there go to use a public restroom facility?
B.12.1	158	CCMIP	How much of Bicentennial Park will be unavailable & for how long?
B.12.1	159	CCMIP	Reducing open space inventory warrants mitigation.
B.12.2	29	Fletcher	Will the proposed building encroach onto the path?
B.12.2	30	Fletcher	Are they planning on building a new path, and where will it go?
B.12.2	31	Fletcher	What will happen to the trail?
B.12.3	32	Fletcher	What will happen to the Bicentennial Monument?
B.12.3	33	Fletcher	Per the City's Park Rules, it would be illegal to disturb any monument...plant or flower
B.12.3	69	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 13 subsection b fails to recognize the historical and cultural importance of the Bicentennial Park to many historians and veterans, who have served and currently serve our country. See http://mercerislandhistory.org/historic.html .
B.12.3	128	Stapanov-Sommerfield	I hate to see beautiful Centennial Park torn down, as it is a favorite shady spot.
B.12.3	160	CCMIP	To mitigate for removing Bicentennial Park, please relocate and reinstall the Bicentennial Park prior to construction
B.12.3	161	CCMIP	Flagpole is of "cultural importance" to the site.
B.14.1	2	Antilla	MICA should create its own parking
B.14.1	119	Brondstetter	Allowing MICA to be built without off street parking will increase the number of cars on the street of Mercedale that are moving and the number of cars that are parked, which will risk the safety of pedestrians.
B.14.1	121	Cassan	Parking will be a disaster.
B.14.1	127	Stapanov-Sommerfield	Allowing MICA to be built without enough parking Mercedale will put traffic congestion into Mercedale.
B.14.2	6	Jeff Bender	The Transportation Impact Analysis omits key intersections that will be affected by MICA
B.14.2	7	Jeff Bender	The Transportation Impact Analysis should include ST East Link project 2019
B.14.2	8	Jeff Bender	A level of service analysis should be done for North Mercer Way & 77th; SE 27th & 80th
B.14.2	9	Jeff Bender	A level of service analysis should be done for SE 28th & 80th
B.14.2	48	Fletcher	How will cars and buses from North Mercer Way get to Island Crest Way when the R8A configuration is implemented?

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.14.2	49	Fletcher	Has a Traffic Study been performed? By whom and when was it done?
B.14.2	54	Fletcher	The City's street mobility rating under the GMA is already at the lowest level, and therefore any variance would have to address further degradation of mobility on the City's streets from both MICA traffic and off-site parking?
B.14.2	85	Magaram	MICA will further strain the hillside; create more traffic and pollution in an already very congested area; bring noise and light pollution to an increasingly busy area: further strain overly strained parking resources; and cause a bike lane passing through Town Center to be eliminated.
B.14.2	110	Thompson	MICA's traffic and parking studies were completed prior to the determination by FHWA on August 5,2016, that eliminated Mercer Island SOV access to the HOV lanes. As a result, the regular exit from I-90 onto 77rh eastbound will become critical for citizens exiting an overburdened I-90 in order to get to Island Crest'Way
B.14.2	129	Stapanov-Sommerfield	The traffic study was done before Pagliacci's pizza was built.
B.14.2	135	Chong	Increased traffic and congestion due to limited access points.
B.14.2	137	Morrison	Requests a plan for how patrons from off-island will get to MICA.
B.14.2	164	CCMIP	Please provide a Transportation Management Plan to get MICA users to facility in modes other than SOV and include on and off street parking parking impacts.
B.14.2	165	CCMIP	Include in LOS analysis intersection of N Mercer Way & 77th Ave SE, SE 27th St & 80th Ave SE & SE 28th & 80th Ave SE
B.14.2	166	CCMIP	MICA transportation impact analysis uses a 2019 horizon for analyzing its future impact without mention of the i-90 East link.
B.14.3	10	Jeff Bender	What days was on-street parking study done for the Parking Management Plan?
B.14.3	11	Jeff Bender	When were the two days the on-street parking done? If it were done the week of April 11-15, it should take into account that Mercer Island High School was on spring break.
B.14.3	12	Jeff Bender	New Seasons will affect on-street parking supply
B.14.3	13	Jeff Bender	MICA needs a Transportation Management Plan to get MICA users to its facility in modes other than single occupancy vehicles.
B.14.3	14	Jeff Bender	On street parking should not be counted
B.14.3	24	Fletcher	How can adding more parking and adding cars help attain our quality of life?
B.14.3	45	Fletcher	The Code talks about "off-street parking," but in the Application, you are talking about "off-site parking," is there a difference between off-site and off-street?
B.14.3	75	Granbois	Attachment G (#2) to the SEPA Environmental Checklist proposes parking that fails to acknowledge let alone comply with MICC 19.05.010(D) and MICC 19.05.020(B)(4).

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.14.3	108	Thompson	I object to MICA's parking management plan that proposed to eliminate any requirement for off-street (on-site) parking.
B.14.3	138	Morrison	Parking.
B.14.3	163	CCMIP	On street parking should not be counted
B.14.4	15	Jeff Bender	Off street parking should have 30 year agreement
B.14.4	19	Fletcher	Did anyone check with Thrift Shop, Rite Aid, Farmer's, City and Metro for patrons to park in their lots?
B.14.4	52	Fletcher	Have anyone submitted any parking agreements with private land owners to evidence its "off-site" parking, which should be a requirement for any SEPA review.
B.14.4	55	Fletcher	Is there a parking agreement with other property owners?
B.14.4	70	Granbois	The correct answer to "how many parking spaces would the completed project have" is ZERO.
B.14.4	109	Thompson	MICA has not presented any informal or formal agreements with private property owners for parking for MICA, including the Farmer's property or the Rite-Aid property.
B.14.4	136	Chong	Concern that MICA patrons will be parking in Lower Mercerdale neighborhood.
B.14.4	162	CCMIP	MICA provides no evidence that it has engaged with nearby private owners for parking.
B.14.5	46	Fletcher	Where are they going to be dropping the children off?
B.14.5	51	Fletcher	if the parking is across the road in the Rite Aid parking lot or on the street across the road from the proposed MICA, how does one propose patrons are supposed to get to the parking in a safe manner?
B.14.5	73	Granbois	Where specifically will the "queued vehicles" be other than in the street? There is no drop off area – how will the "staff outside" assist with cars lined up in the street?
B.14.6	47	Fletcher	How are the refuse trucks supposed to get to the back of the building to pick the trash up from?
B.15	74	Granbois	There is no answer to whether "the project resulted in an increased number of public services". In fact, neither the Chief of Police nor the Fire Chief have been consulted about whether this project will increase the demand for public services.
B.15	167	CCMIP	Police and fire departments have not been consulted about the MICA project increase in activity at night.

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.2	63	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 2 subsection a is non responsive. There are no details regarding specific emissions to the air typical to the construction process or "when the project is completed".
B.2	146	CCMIP	"Typical emissions" during construction is an inadequate generalization. Include more precise detail.
B.2	147	CCMIP	Response in B2a of "none needed" to reduce emissions is inadequate.
B.3.1	4	Antilla	The project should not be granted special rights with regard to wetlands issues
B.3.1	26	Fletcher	How do you plan to protect environmentally sensitive lands, such as where MICA is located?
B.3.1	78	Granbois	Any alteration of a critical area or buffer requires a critical area determination. MICC19.07.020. To date, there has been no critical area determination and MICA has not listed this required element in its SEPA application.

MICA SEPA PUBLIC QUESTION/COMMENT INDEX

sorted by commenter

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
A.3	1	Lippert, Alan	Refers to CCMIP letter
B.14.1	2	Antilla	MICA should create its own parking
B.1.1	3	Antilla	Is the Mercerdale location safe from landslide?
B.3.1	4	Antilla	The project should not be granted special rights with regard to wetlands issues
B.8.2	5	Antilla	This project should not be granted special rights with regard to a change in city code
B.14.2	6	Jeff Bender	The Transportation Impact Analysis omits key intersections that will be affected by MICA
B.14.2	7	Jeff Bender	The Transportation Impact Analysis should include ST East Link project 2019
B.14.2	8	Jeff Bender	A level of service analysis should be done for North Mercer Way & 77th; SE 27th & 80th
B.14.2	9	Jeff Bender	A level of service analysis should be done for SE 28th & 80th
B.14.3	10	Jeff Bender	What days was on-street parking study done for the Parking Management Plan?
B.14.3	11	Jeff Bender	When were the two days the on-street parking done? If it were done the week of April 11-15, it should take into account that Mercer Island High School was on spring break.
B.14.3	12	Jeff Bender	New Seasons will affect on-street parking supply
B.14.3	13	Jeff Bender	MICA needs a Transportation Management Plan to get MICA users to its facility in modes other than single occupancy vehicles.
B.14.3	14	Jeff Bender	On street parking should not be counted
B.14.4	15	Jeff Bender	Off street parking should have 30 year agreement
A.3	16	Bond	Refers to CCMIP letter
A.3	17	Dunbar	Question about Party of Record
B.0	18	Fletcher	What is "green" about the facility?
B.14.4	19	Fletcher	Did anyone check with Thrift Shop, Rite Aid, Farmer's, City and Metro for patrons to park in their lots?
A.7	20	Fletcher	How do you propose to cherish the environment, per the Comprehensive Plan?
A.7	21	Fletcher	Open space must be preserved per Comp Plan Land Use section
A.7	22	Fletcher	How does the Zoning Code change protect environmental values?
A.7	23	Fletcher	The protection of trees and open space should be given priority.
B.14.3	24	Fletcher	How can adding more parking and adding cars help attain our quality of life?
B.0	25	Fletcher	How does a large building in the park "protect the natural environment"?
B.3.1	26	Fletcher	How do you plan to protect environmentally sensitive lands, such as where MICA is located?
B.1.1	27	Fletcher	Multiple concerns regarding parking quantity, location and access
B.4	28	Fletcher	If MICA installs a retaining wall will that mean the destruction of more trees?
B.12.2	29	Fletcher	Will the proposed building encroach onto the path?
B.12.2	30	Fletcher	Are they planning on building a new path, and where will it go?
B.12.2	31	Fletcher	What will happen to the trail?
B.12.3	32	Fletcher	What will happen to the Bicentennial Monument?
B.12.3	33	Fletcher	Per the City's Park Rules, it would be illegal to disturb any monument...plant or flower
B.12.1	34	Fletcher	Will the restroom in MICA be open for public use?
B.1.1	35	Fletcher	Who is responsible for doing the study (including the hillside)? Developer, City or MICA?
B.1.1	36	Fletcher	Was the Environmental Study done before vegetation removal? is the hill at risk of landslide?
B.1.3	37	Fletcher	Will the building be able to withstand a 9.0 earthquake?
B.10.2	38	Fletcher	How will MICA impact views at the park and for neighbors?
B.10.3	39	Fletcher	How high is the proposed building?

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.8.1	40	Fletcher	Why is the lease site halfway down the street that is next to Mercerdale Park when the proposed building does not come that far down?
B.4	41	Fletcher	I would like to know if the Code will be followed with regard to "Site Design Tree Ordinance" requirements?
B.4	42	Fletcher	Could you please inform me as to what measures the arborist is going to use to preserve the trees? And Is there an Arborist's Report and is he adhering to the code?
B.8.2	43	Fletcher	If you allow a variance for MICA, does it not set a precedent?
A.4	44	Fletcher	If MICA is given approval, why would you give them preferential treatment?
B.14.3	45	Fletcher	The Code talks about "off-street parking," but in the Application, you are talking about "off-site parking," is there a difference between off-site and off-street?
B.14.5	46	Fletcher	Where are they going to be dropping the children off?
B.14.6	47	Fletcher	How are the refuse trucks supposed to get to the back of the building to pick the trash up from?
B.14.2	48	Fletcher	How will cars and buses from North Mercer Way get to Island Crest Way when the R8A configuration is implemented?
B.14.2	49	Fletcher	Has a Traffic Study been performed? By whom and when was it done?
B.8.1	50	Fletcher	if there is supposed to be parking along the whole of 32nd Street, wouldn't the Lease need to be extended to the whole street, rather than just a part?
B.14.5	51	Fletcher	if the parking is across the road in the Rite Aid parking lot or on the street across the road from the proposed MICA, how does one propose patrons are supposed to get to the parking in a safe manner?
B.14.4	52	Fletcher	Have anyone submitted any parking agreements with private land owners to evidence its "off-site" parking, which should be a requirement for any SEPA review.
Other	53	Fletcher	Does MICA comply with the ADA requirement for access for the disabled?
B.14.2	54	Fletcher	The City's street mobility rating under the GMA is already at the lowest level, and therefore any variance would have to address further degradation of mobility on the City's streets from both MICA traffic and off-site parking?
B.14.4	55	Fletcher	Is there a parking agreement with other property owners?
A.3	56	Gilman	Refers to CCMIP
B.8.4	57	Granbois	Scott Greenberg requested that MICA include a short subdivision as part of the project. The SEPA Checklist only states that "a possible Short Plat if required by the City"
A.5	58	Granbois	The planning and permitting processes for the proposed MICA Center for the Arts ("MICA Center") require MICA to comply with, among other things, Chapter 19.11 MICC, Town Center Development and Design Standards. See Mercer Island City Code ("MICC") 19.05.010(C).
B.1.1	59	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 1 subsection a is non responsive. The "steep slopes" box is not checked even though "excavation into the hillside" will be required. See SEPA Attachment D.
A.5	60	Granbois	It appears that MICA failed to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70.B.050(1) and WAC 197-11-030(2)(d) by not addressing the Town Center Development and Design Standards.
B.1.2	61	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 1 subsection f is non responsive. The question whether erosion could occur "as a result of clearing, construction or use" has not been answered.
B.3.3	62	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 1 subsection g is non responsive. The specific percentage of impervious surface coverage was not noted.

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.2	63	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 2 subsection a is non responsive. There are no details regarding specific emissions to the air typical to the construction process or “when the project is completed”.
B.8.1	64	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 3 subsection c(1) contemplates a bioretention area, an underground stormwater detention vault and related drains outside of the lease boundaries. See SEPA Checklist Attachment M. There is no authority for MICA to build necessary building elements on city land without a lease for that specific area.
B.8.1	65	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 3 subsection d contemplates a “proposed swale that will be strategically graded into the hillside” outside of the lease boundaries. See SEPA Checklist Attachment B. There is no authority for MICA to build necessary building elements on city land without a lease for that specific area.
A.5	66	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 6 subsection c states the project will meet “LEED Silver” standards. The current Mercer Island Development Code requires “LEED 5 Gold” standards. Mercer Island City Code (MICC) 19.11.050. MICA’s proposal is not compliant with current Mercer Island Code.
B.10.2	67	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 10 subsection b states “building itself will not alter or obstruct any views”. In fact, the MICA building will obstruct views of the wetlands and natural hillside.
B.11	68	Granbois	No specific details regarding lighting were provided.
B.12.3	69	Granbois	The SEPA Checklist § B, Q. 13 subsection b fails to recognize the historical and cultural importance of the Bicentennial Park to many historians and veterans, who have served and currently serve our country. See http://mercerislandhistory.org/historic.html .
B.14.4	70	Granbois	The correct answer to “how many parking spaces would the completed project have” is ZERO.
Contents	71	Granbois	There are three Attachment Gs – which document and sections within the document specifically address roads?
Contents	72	Granbois	There are three Attachment Gs – which document and sections within the document specifically address trip generation?
B.14.5	73	Granbois	Where specifically will the “queued vehicles” be other than in the street? There is no drop off area – how will the “staff outside” assist with cars lined up in the street?
B.15	74	Granbois	There is no answer to whether “the project resulted in an increased number of public services”. In fact, neither the Chief of Police nor the Fire Chief have been consulted about whether this project will increase the demand for public services.
B.14.3	75	Granbois	Attachment G (#2) to the SEPA Environmental Checklist proposes parking that fails to acknowledge let alone comply with MICC 19.05.010(D) and MICC 19.05.020(B)(4).
B.8.2	76	Granbois	The July 18, 2016 letter from Mercer Island Development Services Group Director, Scott Greenberg, to Lesley Bain, appears to ask the applicant to request that the city engage in spot zoning.

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.8.2	77	Granbois	In addition, MICA is requesting that a private building owned by a private organization be placed in a zone for Public Institutions. All of the other uses delineated in MICC 19.05.010 are publically owned. This code text amendment would set a precedent for allowing private uses in a public zone.
B.3.1	78	Granbois	Any alteration of a critical area or buffer requires a critical area determination. MICC19.07.020. To date, there has been no critical area determination and MICA has not listed this required element in its SEPA application.
B.3.1	79	Granbois	Nor was there any mention of waiver or modification as may be allowed in MICC 19.07.050(E). MICA is surrounded by critical areas. See Exhibit 1, February 2016 Critical Area Overview.
B.3.1	80	Granbois	Per MICC 19.07.080(c)(2), a critical area study is necessary to reduce the size of a buffer zone. In addition, the code official must determine that: 1. A smaller area is adequate to protect the wetland functions; 2. The impacts will be mitigated consistent with MICC 19.07.070(B)(2); AND 3. The proposal will result in no net loss of wetland and buffer functions. MICC 19.07.080(c)(2).
B.8.2	81	Granbois	The answer "The proposal is not likely to cause impacts beyond the project covered in the SEPA checklist because the language of the Text Amendment is very narrow and highly unlikely to result in other project actions." is not responsive to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
B.8.3	82	Granbois	MICA fails to address the Growth Management Act ("GMA") requirement that the proposed text amendment is consistent with and implements Mercer Island's comprehensive plan.
B.8.3	83	Granbois	MICA fails to address GMA concurrency requirements. See, e.g., 36.70A.020 and RCW 36.70A.070.
A.3	84	Robinson	Refers to CCMIP
B.14.2	85	Magaram	MICA will further strain the hillside; create more traffic and pollution in an already very congested area; bring noise and light pollution to an increasingly busy area: further strain overly strained parking resources; and cause a bike lane passing through Town Center to be eliminated.
A.3	86	Majury	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	87	McWilliams	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	88	Medved	Forwards Granbois letter
A.4	89	Lippert, Meg	The public and the city will not build nor own the facility and will not have control over the programs and/or activities that take place within and/or adjacent to the building in the area facing the Mercerdale Park Lawn.
A.4	90	Lippert, Meg	MICA is not a public institution and it is not constructing a public building and thus none of the proposed changes to the City code, which focus on public facilities, would apply to the proposed MICA structure in Mercerdale Park.
A.4	91	Lippert, Meg	None of the exceptions listed in the chart (in the proposed Zoning Text Amendment) apply to MICA, since MICA is not a public building.
A.4	92	Lippert, Meg	Objection to exempting a private facility from the city requirement to provide off-street parking.
B.1.1	93	Lippert, Meg	Is MICA on a steel slope? What would happen in the event of a landslide - would lives be in danger?
B.1.1	94	Lippert, Meg	"Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction or use?" The response includes clearing and construction but not use. Yet erosion from the adjacent hillside could certainly occur during use of the facility, perhaps causing hazardous conditions for occupants
B.3.3	95	Lippert, Meg	What is the percent of impervious surface?

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.3.1	96	Lippert, Meg	When and by what authority was the buffer changed from 50 feet to 25 feet? "Wetland mitigation" is mentioned, but no mitigation is described. What is the mitigation, and who will be responsible for approving and supervising it?
B.3.2	97	Lippert, Meg	Where is the bio-retention area and how will runoff water be treated?
B.4	98	Lippert, Meg	B.4.a Plants--"grass" and "other types of plants" should have been checked. Some grass will be covered by pavement according to the site plans, and "other types of vegetation" include pink and white cyclamen and other woodland plants.
B.4	99	Lippert, Meg	4.b.The comment "The vegetation...is not generally healthy" is a judgement call. Most of the trees and vegetation that would be removed are thriving. It is a lovely woodland environment treasured by the community and providing habitat for native birds and animals. The area is in use and contains trails built and maintained by the City, as well as two benches where citizens can relax and enjoy the surrounding woods.
A.3	100	Thompson	Objection to SEP16-015 language regarding 14-day comment period, administrative appeals, etc. Objection to zoning text amendment and long-term lease allowing MICA in Mercedale Park.
B.4	101	Thompson	I object to and disagree with MICA's mitigation plan for the loss of wetlands and the effect it will have on flora and fauna.
A.3	102	Thompson	Objection to 14 day period for written comments without having supporting materials available online.
A.7	103	Thompson	I believe MICA should not be placed in a public park, especially considering Mercedale is the only significant open or green space in the town center
A.4	104	Thompson	Objection to City Council granting a long-term lease to a private organization for construction in a public park.
A.3	105	Thompson	Objection to action by City Council absent a public vote since the zoning code amendment for MICA will create a precedent that will allow other private developers to request or demand the reduction or elimination of required on-site parking.
B.1.1	106	Thompson	The geotechnical report should address the risk to patrons of MICA should a slide occur.
B.10.1	107	Thompson	MICA will have negative aesthetic impacts to recreational users, adjacent land owners, and citizens in general.
B.14.3	108	Thompson	I object to MICA's parking management plan that proposed to eliminate any requirement for off-street (on-site) parking.
B.14.4	109	Thompson	MICA has not presented any informal or formal agreements with private property owners for parking for MICA, including the Farmer's property or the Rite-Aid property.
B.14.2	110	Thompson	MICA's traffic and parking studies were completed prior to the determination by FHWA on August 5,2016, that eliminated Mercer Island SOV access to the HOV lanes. As a result, the regular exit from I-90 onto 77rh eastbound will become critical for citizens exiting an overburdened I-90 in order to get to Island Crest'Way
A.3	111	Thompson	The City Council's proposal to eliminate the turn lane on 77rh, as well as the bike lane, in order to provide street parking for MICA, is an unwise decision that will create traffic gridlock in the town center, both for citizens who live north of ICW attempting to drive through the town center to the top of Island Crest'Way in order to access the I-90 HOV/HOT lane (if allowed by FHWA), and for citizens attempting to exit to ICW eastbound or SOV citizens driving through the town center to enter at76th westbound.
B.3.2	112	Thompson	MICA will significantly affect the surface water and runoff from the hill behind it, and will negatively affect the animals and plants in the wetland
B.12.1	113	Thompson	MICA will harm recreation opportunities.

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
A.7	114	Thompson	MICA is contrary to Mercer Island's commitment to historical and cultural preservation of green spaces and open spaces.
A.8	115	Thompson	Further studies of alternative sites should be performed.
B.5	116	Thompson	MICA will negatively affect the animals and plants in the wetland
A.3	117	Vu	Refers to CCMIP
A.3	118	Zwingle	Refers to CCMIP
B.14.1			Allowing MICA to be built without off street parking will increase the number of cars on the street of Mercerdale that are moving and the number of cars that are parked, which will risk the safety of pedestrians.
	119	Brondstetter	
A.8	120	Cassan	MICA should buy the Hines property and build there.
B.14.1	121	Cassan	Parking will be a disaster.
			Project proponent; lives nearby and notes that current parking lots are empty after 6pm.
A	122	Charney	
A.3	123	Cero	Asks to be party of record
			Do the environmental studies take into adequate consideration the recent Town Center code?
A.5	124	Kuttner	
B.3.1			The wetlands in the vicinity of the Town Center should be rehabilitated, not paved over.
	125	Kuttner	
A	126	Scalzo	Project proponent
B.14.1			Allowing MICA to be built without enough parking Mercerdale will put traffic congestion into Mercerdale.
	127	Stapanov-Sommerfielc	
B.12.3	128	Stapanov-Sommerfielc	I hate to see beautiful Centennial Park torn down, as it is a favorite shady spot.
B.14.2	129	Stapanov-Sommerfielc	The traffic study was done before Pagliacci's pizza was built.
			Where will visitors to Mercerdale Park and the many activities there go to use a public restroom facility?
B.12.1	130	Stapanov-Sommerfielc	
			The wetlands house animals, and it is not right to take up the little remaining space they have.
B.5	131	Stapanov-Sommerfielc	
A	132	Witmer	Project proponents
B.8.2	133	Gehrig	Park Property cannot be rezoned as commercial without a vote
A.3	134	Dunbar	Request notice of threshold determination, along with right of appeal.
B.14.2	135	Chong	Increased traffic and congestion due to limited access points.
B.14.4	136	Chong	Concern that MICA patrons will be parking in Lower Mercerdale neighborhood.
B.14.2	137	Morrison	Requests a plan for how patrons from off-island will get to MICA.
B.14.3	138	Morrison	Parking.
A.3	139	CCMIP	DNS Issuance Failed to Follow SEPA Procedures
A.3	140	CCMIP	Please list all required permits and approvals, along with appropriate mitigation measures
B.1.3	141	CCMIP	Add existing information about Seismic Hazard Areas
B.1.1	142	CCMIP	Add existing information about landslide hazard areas
B.1.2	143	CCMIP	Add existing information about erosion hazard areas
B.1.1	144	CCMIP	Develop a landscape design that restores and keep the hillside from sliding on structure.
Answered on new checklist, B.1.e.	145	CCMIP	Checklist missed to disclose environmental impacts of soil removal
			"Typical emissions" during construction is an inadequate generalization. Include more precise detail.
B.2	146	CCMIP	
B.2	147	CCMIP	Response in B2a of "none needed" to reduce emissions is inadequate.
			No evidence is provided regarding what on-site mitigation would be provided for the encroachment of this wetland.
B.3.1	148	CCMIP	
			Wetland buffer restoration appears to increase the footprint for MICA by 25%, reducing the amount of parkland vs MICA land.
B.8.1	149	CCMIP	
			What bioretention area is being referred to in item C.1 and what is the proposed detention vault, and what will be its size and location?
B.3.2	150	CCMIP	

Section	Comment #	Commenter	Comment (paraphrase)
B.5	151	CCMIP	Deer should be considered as one of the animals in this section of the park.
B.5	152	CCMIP	Additional study is needed to verify claim of "none known" for endangered species, especially bald eagles.
B.8.1	153	CCMIP	Proposed lease boundary fails to acknowledge that actual land disturbed is larger than proposed.
B.8.4	154	CCMIP	As directed by the City, a short plat is required
B.10.2	155	CCMIP	Request a more realistic visualization of views, showing how the building will actually appear midst the open space.
B.4	156	CCMIP	The number of trees to be removed is unclear and needs to be clarified.
B.11	157	CCMIP	An analysis should be undertaken to verify that the glare of the glaze materials will not degrade the park environment and neighborhood. Use the National Institute of Building science design guide for visual glare.
B.12.1	158	CCMIP	How much of Bicentennial Park will be unavailable & for how long?
B.12.1	159	CCMIP	Reducing open space inventory warrants mitigation.
B.12.3	160	CCMIP	To mitigate for removing Bicentennial Park, please relocate and reinstall the Bicentennial Park prior to construction
B.12.3	161	CCMIP	Flagpole is of "cultural importance" to the site.
B.14.4	162	CCMIP	MICA provides no evidence that it has engaged with nearby private owners for parking.
B.14.3	163	CCMIP	On street parking should not be counted
B.14.2	164	CCMIP	Please provide a Transportation Management Plan to get MICA users to facility in modes other than SOV and include on and off street parking impacts.
B.14.2	165	CCMIP	Include in LOS analysis intersection of N Mercer Way & 77th Ave SE, SE 27th St & 80th Ave SE & SE 28th & 80th Ave SE
B.14.2	166	CCMIP	MICA transportation impact analysis uses a 2019 horizon for analyzing its future impact without mention of the i-90 East link.
B.15	167	CCMIP	Police and fire departments have not been consulted about the MICA project increase in activity at night.
B.3.2	168	CCMIP	How will MCA ensure that the edesign for water runoff is adequate?