

Scott Greenberg

From: Meg Lippert <meg.lippert@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 4:47 PM
To: Scott Greenberg; Kari Sand; Ali Spietz
Subject: SEPA16-015 and ZTR16-002
Attachments: Sepa Letter.pdf

Dear Mr. Greenberg:

Please accept this email along with the attached comment letter from the Concerned Citizens for Mercer Island Parks (CCMIP) as my comments to MICA's SEPA checklist and proposed zoning code amendment. I agree, incorporate, and support the comments that are detailed in the attached CCMIP comment letter.

Please include me as a party of record for the purposes of receiving notice once the City makes a threshold determination for this project, along with the right to appeal.

Unfortunately, I received notice about these important documents too late to review them thoroughly for detailed analysis and comments. However, in addition to the comments in the attached letter, I would like to express my specific concern about the following items:

1) An overall concern is that there is too little detail about many of the MICA responses to the SEPA questions. For example, on page 3 B 1 a, "steep slopes" is not checked. Yet steep slopes will be affected, so much so that a tall retaining wall is planned for the west side of the building, against the hillside to hold back the earth there. Yet according to my interpretation of the site plans, that area is also an emergency access right of way. If there is a landslide there, children who are attending classes and programs in that area could be at risk.

B.1.f. asks "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.g. states that a "majority of the site" would be covered, but the question asks for a percentage, which is not given.

B. 3.a.2. refers to a 25 foot buffer. 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.c.1. water runoff-where is the bio-retention area and how will runoff water be treated?

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. (I have photographs of these plants blooming in the area which is proposed to be covered, and I would be happy to share these photographs with the City.)

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.

Due to the impending deadline I will have to curtail my comments; though I have many more concerns about destroying not only this precious and irreplaceable level woodland so easily accessible to the Town Center, but also the treasured historic Bicentennial Park, which was conceived, planned, funded and constructed by the Mercer Island Community and which is currently maintained by the City. It is not simply a flagpole and a plaza, but is a peaceful community gathering place enjoyed by nearby residents and business employees for their lunchtimes and break times, as well as by visitors to the summer Farmers Market.

Please respond and confirmed that you received this email. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Meg Lippert

