

## Comments on MICA SEPA Documents March 13, 2017

To: Mercer Island City Government Senior Planner Robin Proebsting.

Please accept my comments on the MICA SEPA documents dated March 13, 2017.

### I. Attachment E:

1. The cover page J-857-01 says this study was done for the proposed office building and parking structure for Farmers New World Life Insurance Company. Is MICA relying on site tests made for another project? Log of Test Pit TP-1 is dated 7-19-8. Is the city accepting 30 year old data that has been researched for another site for the current MICA project? Are any of these findings specific to the site of the proposed art center?

### II. Attachment B:

Proposed leased Boundary. How much parkland will be needed for the MICA project that will be outside the lease boundary? How will it be maintained and who is responsible? Has there been a completed document by the city showing the percentage of the park that will actually be used for the private development?

### III. Attachment C: Exhibit A

SE 32<sup>nd</sup> St is a public street and is not part of Mercerdale Park. Why would the city give up public street access when it may be needed to redirect traffic after the MI freeway exits and entrances are modified?

### IV. Attachment D: Public Institution 19.05.010

How can a privately owned fee based development be considered a public institution?

Design requirements: Why does MICA have an exemption to setbacks and height requirements? What other projects have been given the same exemption?

Parking : Why is MICA exempt for all parking requirements? How are the school buses which were mentioned in the August MICA documents being coordinated with all the other MICA traffic? As a frequent user of downtown MI, the written plans do not match the parking reality as it exists today much less adding 300+ 100+ 100+ seats of venue space. How many other projects will be given the same parking exemption?

### V: Attachment H page 4

According to the city's storm utility max (Mercer Island GIS Portal) surface water from Wetland A flows both north & south into the city's storm water system. How much water is expected into the city's storm water system after the bio retention ponds are in place? What if the retention ponds are not sufficient? How will the water issue be resolved?

Wetland Buffers page 5

Decreasing the wetland buffers from 50 ft to 25 feet is mentioned. Which government agency will regulate the decision for decreasing the buffer? How will this decision be determined?

Attachment I

Trees. Assessments will need to be made after the structure is build. Who is responsible for the assessment and any changes that may be needed?

Attachment J:

Critical Area Study 3. 3.1

What is the criteria to show the 25 foot buffer is adequate? How is this assessment made and will there be future assessments to ensure it is adequate?

4. Project description:

The address is given as 3205 77<sup>th</sup> AVE SE. Is this the correct site address for the 21,680 Square foot building? There is also a document with the address 3249 78<sup>th</sup> Ave SE. Source City of MI DSG-Archive Local id #8978. How is this document attached to the 3205 77<sup>th</sup> Ave SE address?

4.2 Site Selection:

YTN has been identified in this report as the primary user. Has the City seen a cost analysis to show that YTN can support funding necessary for this project? Has the City seen a revenue report for the last 5 years of YTN's activities to show proof of ability to pay? This is a normal process when a partnership is being formed as it is between the City of MI and the private developers.

6.6 Maintenance

The site will be maintained for five years following the completion of the plant installation. Who is responsible for the upkeep and cost after 5 years in the 30+ year lease?

Respectfully,

Jackie Dunbar

7116 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave SE

Mercer Island WA 98040

