



## Eastside Environmental Pros

9 March 2026

EE-720

Clay Showalter  
8602 N Mercer Way,  
Mercer Island, WA 98040

**REFERENCE:**        **King County Parcel 545260-0020**  
**SUBJECT:**            Criteria Compliance & Project Narrative

### **Project Narrative:**

The applicant proposes a in-kind repair and reconstruction of an existing legally established deck with a minor expansion of the deck. Per §19.07.130 - *Modifications*, additions to or reconstruction of an existing legally established structure or building within a critical area and/or buffer constructed on or before January 1, 2005, provided the specific criteria are met.

The replaced portions of the structure are located entirely within the footprint of an existing legally established deck, however a small 14 square foot expansion of the uncovered deck is proposed. This development is located entirely outside stream areas and its setback but is located within an erosion hazard area.

This construction will result in no impacts to stream buffers and has been situated entirely outside of the stream and their associated buffers, resulting in no direct or indirect impacts.

This narrative describes how the application meets the review criteria for Critical Area Review 2 in MICC 19.07.090, MICC 19.07.160, MICC 19.07.170, MICC 19.07.180 and/or MICC 19.07.190.

### **MICC 19.07.090 – Critical Area Review Process**

The application meets the requirements for Critical Area Review 2, as it involves proposed development within a mapped geologically hazardous area.

- **Studies Include:** *Critical Areas Study* prepared by Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc. and a *Geotechnical Study and Critical Area Study* prepared by Geotech Consultants and a *Statement of Risk*, Inc. in accordance with MICC 19.07.110. No additional information has been requested by the City to date.
- **Application Completeness:** A complete development application was submitted, including a Site Plan accurately delineating the location and boundaries of Critical Areas onsite or within the Study Area, buffers or setbacks from the off-Site piped stream do not come onsite and no buffers or setbacks are required from the geologically hazardous areas.

### **MICC 19.07.160 – Geologically Hazardous Areas**

#### **1. Identification of Geologically Hazardous Areas (GHA) on Site**

*Pages references in this section are in regard to the Geotechnical and Critical Area Report prepared by Geotech Consultants, Inc.*

A Site visit was conducted by Geotech Consultants, Inc. and a Geotechnical and Critical Area Report was prepared by Geotech Consultants, Inc. and more detailed information can be found in their report. According to the City of Mercer Island GIS, the entire parcel is mapped as a *Potential Landslide Hazard Area, Erosion Hazard Area and seismic hazard* (Page 1). However, no steep slopes are present on or adjacent to the property, and no steep slope hazard buffers apply (Page 1).

#### **2. Description of Site Conditions**

Per Geotech Consultants, Inc. and their prepared Geotechnical and Critical Area Report (Page 2), *“The ground surface on the property generally slopes downward toward the north at a gentle to moderate inclination. There are no steep slopes on, or near, the site. On the north portion of the property, approximately 15 feet north of the house, the ground surface becomes relatively flat. This low, generally-flat grade extends onto the neighboring northwestern (#8452) and northeastern (#8478) lots and continues north to the shore of Lake Washington. Based on our observations, this low, relatively-flat area was originally below the surface of Lake Washington before the lake’s level was dropped in 1916 by the completion of the Montlake Cut. During our visit to the site, we conducted explorations in the areas of the proposed new foundations outside the area of the previously-existing deck. These hand-excavated test holes encountered a varying thickness of fill and loose, highly-weathered silty sand overlying silty sand that becomes denser and less weathered with depth. In our previous exploration for a project two lots to the west (#8456) we found similar native soil conditions. By reviewing Mercer Island’s GIS, we were able to find logs of explorations completed for the houses constructed on all of the adjoining lots. These explorations found similar medium-dense to dense, glacially-compressed soils on the properties located west and east of the site, above the historic level of Lake Washington. The lots to the northwest and northeast, within the previous limits of Lake Washington, are underlain by varying amounts of old lake deposits, beneath*

*which are dense, glacially-compressed soils. Seepage or wet soil conditions were not encountered to the maximum 5-foot depth of the onsite test holes."*

### **3. Impact of Proposed Development on Geological Hazards**

Per Geotech Consultants, Inc. and their prepared Geotechnical and Critical Area Report (Page 2-3), *"The existing residence and planned new deck construction are not close to any steep or tall slopes. The dense to very dense, glacially-compressed soils that underlie the site, and which will support the deck, are not susceptible to instability, even during a strong earthquake. The stability of the gently- to moderately-inclined ground on, and around, the site will not be adversely affected by the shallow excavations needed for the new development. No buffer or other mitigation measures are required to address the Potential Landslide Hazard mapping of the site. The deck expansion will not increase the potential for instability on the site or the neighboring properties."*

### **1. Mitigation Measures and Construction Recommendations**

Per Geotech Consultants, Inc. and their prepared Geotechnical and Critical Area Report (Page 2-3), The report states the following conclusions and recommendations:

- a. **Seismic Hazard:** *The glacially-compressed soils beneath the development area are not susceptible to seismic liquefaction. The foundations for new construction will also bear on these non-liquefiable soils. No additional mitigation is required to address the mapped Seismic Hazard.*
- b. **Potential Landslide Hazard:** *The existing residence and planned new deck construction are not close to any steep or tall slopes. The dense to very dense, glacially-compressed soils that underlie the site, and which will support the deck, are not susceptible to instability, even during a strong earthquake. The stability of the gently- to moderately-inclined ground on, and around, the site will not be adversely affected by the shallow excavations needed for the new development. No buffer or other mitigation measures are required to address the Potential Landslide Hazard mapping of the site. The deck expansion will not increase the potential for instability on the site or the neighboring properties.*
- c. **Erosion Hazard:** *The site disturbance for the proposed development will be limited, and will occur primarily on gently-sloped ground. The mapped Erosion Hazard can be mitigated by implementing proper temporary erosion control measures that will depend heavily on the weather conditions that are encountered. Existing ground cover and landscaping should be left in place wherever possible to minimize the amount of exposed soil. Small soil stockpiles should be covered with plastic during wet weather. Soil and mud should not be tracked onto the adjoining streets, and silty water must be prevented from traveling off the site. It should be possible to complete the planned remodel/expansion during the wet season without adverse impacts to the site and neighboring lots. As with any construction project, it can be necessary to periodically maintain or modify temporary erosion control measures to address specific site and weather conditions.*

## **5. Statement of Risk Required by MICC 19.07.160(B)(2)**

The following declaration is provided by Geotech Consultants Inc. in their Statement of Risk Letter provided on 9 March 2026 to satisfy MICC requirements:

*“Construction practices are proposed for the alteration that would render the development as safe as if it were not located in a geologically hazardous area and do not adversely impact adjacent properties.”*

(Page 1)

## **6. Seismic Considerations (MICC 19.07.160(D))**

Per Geotech Consultants, Inc. and their prepared Geotechnical and Critical Area Report (Page 3) *“In accordance with the International Building Code (IBC), the site class within 100 feet of the ground surface is best represented by Site Class Type D (Stiff Soil). The IBC and ASCE 7 require that the potential for liquefaction (soil strength loss) during an earthquake be evaluated for the peak ground acceleration of the Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE), which has a probability of occurring once in 2,475 years (2 percent probability of occurring in a 50-year period). The dense soils beneath the site are not susceptible to seismic liquefaction under the ground motions of the MCE.”*

### **Development standards – Erosion hazard areas.**

Compliance with chapter 15.09, storm water management program

- Compliance is documented in architects plan set
- No drainage design necessary, net increase in impervious surface is less than 500 square feet (See Plan Set A1.01)
- Total new and replaced hard surface area equals 14 square feet, no drainage design is necessary due to total being less than 2000 square feet (See Plan Set A1.01)
- No net increase in geological instability on or off site as described in Geotechnical Report
- Non-impact described in critical area study Geotechnical Report
- Recommendations from Geotechnical Report should be followed (Page 3)

### **Development standards - Additional criteria for specific activities**

- Less than 2,000 square feet of site disturbances are proposed, and project should be eligible for a waiver for seasonal disturbances if work should need to occur between October 1 and April 1.
- Geotechnical Study and Critical Area Study was prepared by Geotech Consultants addresses Geotechnical slope stability concerns, erosion and sedimentation impacts can be effectively controlled on site consistent with adopted storm water standards;
- The proposed construction work will not subject people or property, including areas off site, to an increased risk of associated impacts

This narrative satisfies the critical area reporting requirements for geologically hazardous areas under **MICC 19.07.160**, based on the professional findings and recommendations of the January 19, 2026, Geotechnical Report prepared by Geotech Consultants, Inc.

### **MICC 19.07.170 – Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas**

*Pages references in this section are in reference to the Critical Area Report prepared by Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc.*

One non-fish-bearing (Type Np, piped) watercourse was identified off-site. No other fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas were identified on-site or within the Study Area. The stream is discussed within the *Critical Areas Study* prepared by Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc (page 2-3). No WDFW priority habitats were identified within the Study Area.

### **MICC 19.07.180 – Watercourses**

One non-fish-bearing (Type Np. Piped) watercourse, **Stream 1**, was identified onsite.

- **Water Course identification:** Stream 1 is a constructed, piped segments to the west and continues to the northwest. It meets the definition of a Type Np, piped stream and requires a no standard buffer and a 10-foot building setback per MICC 19.07.180.
- Piped portions of the stream meet the criteria under MICC 19.07.180.C.6.d for a 10-foot setback, due to the infeasibility of daylighting under an existing roads or residential areas (page 2-3).
- **Buffer and Setback Compliance:** The proposed expansion is situated entirely outside of the buffer or setbacks and more than 50-feet away from property boundary
- The proposed developments are located entirely outside of all stream associated buffers.

### **MICC 19.07.190 – Wetlands**

No wetlands were identified on-site or within the Study Area based on field investigation using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers methodology (Page 2). Therefore, this section does not apply.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed developments fully comply with the applicable requirements of Critical Area Review 2. Impacts have been avoided and minimized, and the proposed development is consistent with MICC standards. No impacts to critical areas are expected, and **no net loss of ecological function shall occur**. This project meets the review criteria for Critical Area Review 2 in MICC 19.07.090, MICC 19.07.160, MICC 19.07.170, MICC 19.07.180 and/or MICC 19.07.190.