

August 10, 2025

Mr. Ryan Harriman
Planning Manager
City of Mercer Island, Community Planning and Development
9611 SE 36th Street
Mercer Island, WA 98040

RE: Mercer Island Beach Club Response to Comments regarding Shoreline Substantial Development Permit

Dear Ryan,

On behalf of the Mercer Island Beach Club please see our responses to each of the comments consolidated from the documents sent to MIBC dated May 22, 2025.

If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Gardner Morelli
MIBC Board of Trustee and Committee Lead on Marina and Shoreline Renewal

Planning:

1. Please review and prepare responses to the public comment received from the WA Department of Ecology dated May 20, 2025 (attached). [Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2162.3](#)
2. Please review and prepare responses to the public comment received from the Snoqualmie Indian Tribe dated May 14, 2025 (attached). [Please see attached document from Drayton Archeology \(Drayton Cultural Resources Review- MIBC 062525\)](#)
3. Please review and prepare a response to the third-party peer review completed by

Facet (attached). **The inconsistencies between JARPA, NNLR and Plan set have been addressed.**

4. Please review and prepare responses to the public comments received on May 10, 2025 from Patricia Bostrom (below).

Statement and Question 1 from Patricia Bostrom:

I have lived in my home for over 29 years and during that time I have witnessed logs and other debris stopped by the present log boom and floating over to become lodged in the pilings under my dock. These logs which become lodged under the dock damage my dock pilings. If the M.I. Beach Club's log boom is allowed to be relocated, doubled and lengthened even more logs and debris will become lodged under my dock and further damage to my pilings will be done. During these 29 years I have never witnessed the M.I. Beach Club removing logs or floating debris from the lake but I have witnessed them pushing the logs and debris toward my property instead.

Has any consideration been taken to revise the M.I. Beach Club plans to expand on the other side of the Beach Club and leaving the existing log boom as is?

MIBC Response to Statement and Question 1 from Patricia Bostrom

- **Loose log flow and debris from the Cedar River is a recurrent issue and varies year-to-year based on weather. This impacts all lakefront properties.**
- **Although we cannot attest to the past 29 years in its entirety, Mercer Island Beach Club's operation plan does include monitoring the waterfront and removal of logs and debris. When the logs are too big, Mercer Island Marine Patrol is called and scheduled to remove.**
- **Mercer Island Beach Club does not operate with the intent or directive to "push" debris into neighboring properties.**
- **The General Manager has no record of contact by this neighbor/member regarding any complaints about debris.**
- **For boater and swimmer safety, the club actively removes logs & debris on an ongoing basis from the lake**
- **We interpret your question concerning the log boom in being double in width. The proposed design only includes a single width log boom.**
- **We interpret your question concerning the length from shore in doubling to its proposed furthest point in the lake, it is not double.**

Question 2 from Patricia Bostrom:

Has any consideration been taken to revise the M.I. Beach Club plans to expand on the other side of the Beach Club and leaving the existing log boom as is?

MIBC Response to Question 2 from Patricia Bostrom

- The “Other Side” of the Club only includes “E” and “F” docks and a boat launch (remaining intact). There is no additional room to include a swimming area within the Club’s property lines.

Statement 3 from Patricia Bostrom:

Any work should be done from the water or from the main entrance to the club.

MIBC Response to Statement 3 from Patricia Bostrom

Mercer Island Beach Club intends to use the main entrance for vehicle access and lake for in-water deliveries.

Statement 4 from Patricia Bostrom:

It is not easy living so close to the Beach Club for there is often excessive noise, yelling from the swimming pool during work outs, light illumination even at night, and blocked driveways from illegal parking on Benotho Place. It would be extremely unfortunate if in addition to these problems we as neighbors would also experience destruction of our views and erosion of our rockery walls.

MIBC Response to Statement 4

- MIBC has been located at its current location generating great family memories for Island member residents and their quests in a safe and welcoming environment for over 70 years. The work that is being performed is updating the current marina to accommodate the same number of boats that are in use today while taking into account different code and ecological requirements of today. This will not increase any parking issues on Avalon Drive, 85th or Benotho Place. Regarding Benotho place, there is no authorized access to the Club but rather a side gate that is used by Members who live on Benotho or 85th which actually decreases traffic and congestion within the Club's parking lot. The marina work being performed is in the center of the Clubs property and within the inner harbor line. The SW side of our property line is impacted by an adjustment of a single log boom which floats on the water with the other adjustment being the placement of the swim dock which will, for swimmer safety, be placed a little further in the lake to ensure deep enough

water for the swimmers within the designated swim area. None of the proposed work encroach on other property owners.

- When it comes to erosion of the shoreline, the Club has experienced this just like our neighbors. Storms continue to get more intense and the number of slow-moving wake surf boats continues to increase.

5. Please review and prepare responses to the public comments received on May 11, 2025 from Mike and Tina Hartley (below).

There are two primary issues that impact our property and nearby neighbors to the south of this development:

1. The reflective waves from the log boom;
2. The log debris and miscellaneous flotsam that will collect from the log boom due to the relocation, lengthening and type of log boom being installed.

Reflective Waves

As I understand the current plan under review the existing single-log boom will be doubled up to assist the M.I. Beach Club will minimizing waves from wind-generated waves and boat wakes.

The lengthening of this boom and doubling the log will result in more wave reflection on to both our property and our neighbors during storm events that predominately occur from the southeast during winter months. This effectively increases the size of waves that will be transmitted to our rockery wall along the shoreline. This will result in more wave energy transmitted to our shoreline from two directions instead of one resulting in increased wave and wake heights. We have experienced some shoreline erosion behind our rockery wall however, I am concerned that the relocation of the log boom closer to our property, the additional reflective transmission of waves from a doubled-up log boom, and the substantial increase in boom length will result in potential for significant scour beneath our rockery wall and erosion behind it.

To my knowledge no studies have been conducted of this potential impact.

MIBC Response to Mike and Tina Hartly's first primary issue and statement

- Please see the attached engineering report to request your concerns. (Mercer Island Beach Club- Wave Reflection_FINAL)

- We interpret your question expresses concern regarding the log boom being double in width. The proposed design only includes a single width log boom.
- We interpret your questions expresses concern regarding the length from shore to its proposed furthest point in the lake, it is not double.

Mike and Tina Hartly's second primary issue:

Log Debris and Flotsam

We have been a resident at this address for 28 years. In that time we have witnessed much debris from the Cedar river to the southeast that typically transmits log debris, flotsam, floating televisions, kayaks, chairs and other items. The predominant wind directs these to the southeast side of Mercer Island where they collect on our property and along the shorter existing log boom the Mercer Island Beach Club currently has installed. We have witnessed staff pushing logs and debris off of the log boom on to our property and have witnessed staff dumping a floating tv on to our upland property as well.

That being said the debris is not allowed to continue down the shoreline as it collects on the existing log boom. Some debris has floated over the top of the single-log boom while a majority of the debris is held next to the boom and when the wind shifts is then relocated to our shoreland property. During northerly wind events this debris sometimes comes back to our dock and boat lift with potential for damage to both. The lengthening of this boom to the Inner Harbor Line will result in

...com/mail/none/id/AAQkADI3ZjhZjk3LWNjYWEtNDdjYS1hNTVmLTlzYWZlNjkWY2JlYgAQACKRS%2BIRGL5JoUoqUvFPHzg%3

Mail - Madelyn Nelson - Outlook

significantly more log debris and flotsam being held and transported to our property. The relocation of this boom to within 10 feet of our property line will only make matters worse.

It is our opinion the City should require the Mercer Island Beach Club manage the debris and flotsam that is collected by their log boom through periodic monthly maintenance to remove the logs, flotsam and debris. The log boom should also not be allowed to move even closer to our property as it will only exacerbate the problem we currently face from the existing log boom.

MIBC Response to Mike and Tina Hartly's second primary issue

- Loose log flow and debris from the Cedar River is a recurrent issue and varies year-to-year based on weather. This impacts all lakefront properties.
- Although we cannot attest to the past 29 years in its entirety, Mercer Island Beach Club's operation plan does include monitoring the waterfront and removal of logs and debris. When the logs are too big, Mercer Island Marine Patrol is called and scheduled to remove.

- Mercer Island Beach Club does not operate with the intent to “push” debris into neighboring properties.
- The General Manager has not been contacted in writing by this neighbor/member regarding any complaints about debris.
- Mercer Island Beach Club’s proposal contains development within the property line as recorded on the City records.

Additional Statements from Mike and Tina Hartly.

I also have two other concerns I would like to address:

1. The fence line for our northern property boundary is not shown on the design plans. This is a fence that we installed in 1997 and I do not want it damaged during the upland construction activities.

2. The M.I. Beach Club should not be allowed to bring construction materials and earthfill along Benotho Place. As pointed out by Public Works Staff this paved road does not meet city standards to allow the City to adopt it as a public street. It remains a private street. Recent house construction activities over the last several years damaged portions of the asphalt pavement on Benotho Place requiring it to be repaved. Some of these new sections of pavement are already showing signs of alligator cracks since no underlying structural base was added during the reconstruction. The structural section of this paved road is not capable of handling heavy construction traffic. We recommend the City require all access for construction either be water-borne or through the main entrance to the beach club.

MIBC Response to Mike and Tina Hartly’s additional statements

- Mercer Island Beach Club’s proposal contains development within the property line as recorded on the City records. There are no plans to impact the fence.
- Mercer Island Beach Club intends to use the main entrance for vehicle access and lake for in-water deliveries.

6. Please review and prepare responses to the public comments received on May 6, 2025 from Mark and Marian Sinkey (below).

Statement 1

First of all, the existing aging dock has a loud squeaking sound with movement of the dock decking whenever the water is rough, or there is a lot of boat traffic. This squeak can be heard for several blocks along the waterfront and persists all day long with boat traffic and rough water during the summer. We have asked the Beach Club to try and fix this, but have had an inadequate response. It makes it unpleasant for us to enjoy our dock and outdoor spaces. We would hope the new docks will have a new design which will eliminate this obnoxious irritating sound.

MIBC Response to Mark and Marian Sinkey's statement 1

- There is no complaint on record from M. Sinkey with a request to fix
- MIBC contacted the design-installer (OEM) of E& F dock to help identify opportunities to help reduce noise that comes from these structures. Noise comes from the connection between the gangway and land and the rollers that surround the piles. MIBC replaced at the end of July the metal shackles with plastic bushed swing links as well as replaced the gangway guides and rollers at the base of the ramp to further reduce noise. Noise has been reduced to almost nothing since this change out and even during Seafair weekend, the noise was almost non-existent.
- Per the recommendation of the designer of the new marina- "the new gangways for the new marina will have plastic bushed swing links that will not make steel on steel noises. All piles will have roller guides to minimize rubbing, squeak noises as well."

Mark and Marian Sinkey's statement 2

The second issue is the heavy traffic and unsafe parking on Avalon by summer members and guests. There is often parking in front of mailboxes and blocking fire hydrants. The cars often park on both sides of the street narrowing the street so emergency vehicles may have trouble getting through. The Beach Club puts a few

://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AQMkAGFkNTIINTZiLWY1NDgtNDY3Yy04NjQ2LW4MzI3ZDBjOGNIMQBGAADQ7Bapw3%2BkiyLcd1PMZ... 1

5, 1:56 PM

Mail - Ryan Harriman - Outlook

small (very hard to read) unofficial no parking signs that often fall down or are ignored. Our concern is that if the dock is enlarged or improved that this will attract even more guests and more car traffic. We would like to see greater effort from the Beach Club to mitigate and control the parking in a more orderly and safe fashion. We would suggest designating a Parking Attendant on known busy days who would monitor where cars are parked to ensure that mailboxes and fire hydrants are not blocked. Periodic Police patrols on Avalon Drive would also be useful during those busy summer days/weekends.

MIBC Response to Mark and Marian Sinkey's statement 2

- Avalon Drive is a public road.
- The Mercer Island Beach Club takes the following actions every summer to assist in managing parking.
 - Installing “SLOW” and “No Parking” signs on Avalon Drive.
 - Contracting valet parking for all Home Swim Meets (5 in total) to accommodate as many cars possible in the parking lot.
 - Providing residents on Avalon Drive a schedule of summer events including 5 Home Swim Meets, July 4th Celebration & Adult Summer Party.
- In recent years, the number of large swim meets has declined due to changes in Midlakes end of season event schedule (no Senior Prelims events).
- The plan for the marina replaces existing boat slips on a 1:1 basis. No added traffic volume is anticipated and no change in membership numbers as a result of this project.

7. Provide a diagram showing the calculations of both existing and proposed lot coverage and hardscape within the two shoreline areas (0-25’ and 25-50’ landward from the OHWM).

MIBC Response: Please see sheet 26 or 27 of the Plan Set.

8. The applicant shall provide a navigation study to ensure the proposed marina does not interfere with the public use and enjoyment of the water or create a hazard to navigation.

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

9. Are there alternative designs that could avoid or reduce the marina’s expansion farther into the lake?

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

10. Ecology is of the opinion that the additional overwater coverage from proposed development would be a substantial adverse impact. Are there designs that could avoid or further reduce this impact?

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

11. Ecology is of the opinion that the existing wave attenuator is a legal nonconforming

use, and the proposed design would “expand the existing wave attenuator/breakwater and make it double as moorage”, which may require a shoreline variance. Please provide an analysis of the design, size and configuration of the overwater structure related to the demand analysis, navigation, wave attenuation properties and other relevant factors.

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

12. Are there alternative designs that could eliminate floating platforms?

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

13. The applicant shall provide an analysis of the wake reflection as it relates to the proposed log boom and possible impacts to adjacent properties. Has the project designer considered possible negative impacts to adjacent properties caused by wave reflection?

MIBC Response- Please see attached document titled “Mercer Island Beach Club- Wave Reflection_FINAL” which addresses wake reflection, and it impact to adjacent properties.

14. The applicant shall provide a plan to monitor and remove debris that may collect and rest adjacent to the proposed log boom. The plan must ensure the debris is removed and not simply relocated or pushed to a different location.

MIBC Response

- Loose log flow and debris from the Cedar River is a recurrent issue and varies year-to-year based on weather. This impacts all lakefront properties.
- The Facilities Director makes daily walks of the Mercer Island Beach Club’s property to assess and identify issues. When logs and debris are identified, the material is removed.
- If logs are too big to remove independently, Mercer Island Marine Patrol will be called and scheduled to remove.
- The Club has invested in a small john boat to assist in maintaining the beach club property clear of debris.

- Any concerns should be directed to generalmanager@mibeachclub.com and facilities@mibeachclub.com.

15. The applicant shall demonstrate the necessity of the concrete retaining wall . Could the shoreline be softened using natural materials?

MIBC Response- The Club proposes to remove treated timbers that form the separation between the grass area where people lounge, picnic and traverse along the shoreline and the children's protected sand play area along the lakefront. Removal of these treated timbers that break down over time, create splinters in children's feet and hands, and become unsafe as they rot and cause issues with the grass area over time is part of our shoreline renewal plan. MIBC considered various solutions, and a small, compact concrete wall provided the most effective solution to allow for safe passage of people along the shoreline, allows for the families to continue to picnic and lounge and minimizes any risk of harm to children, and provides a long term solution for the club.

16. The applicant shall demonstrate the necessity of extending the swim dock over 100-feet waterward from the OHWM.

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

17. Ecology is of the opinion that the proposed development does not appear to achieve no net loss of ecological functions, with the primary adverse impact being expansion of overwater coverage. The applicant shall provide additional mitigation measures to offset the impacts of the proposed development.

MIBC Response- Please see Ecology responses 4903-8910-2163.3

18. The proposed development shall be designed to eliminate excessive squeaking generated from the movement of docks. The applicant shall include design measures in the proposed development that will mitigate noise generated by the movement of docks.

MIBC Response

The Club has included language in the proposed design to ensure that the hardware provided will mitigate noise generated by the movement of the docks.

19. The applicant shall provide a parking plan that addresses parking demand during peak use. The applicant shall monitor off-site parking and require members or guests to park vehicles within the established parking areas on the subject property.

MIBC Response

The proposed marina design does not increase the number of boat slips from today's design. We do acknowledge that the number of PWC (jet skis) increases by 5. The summertime is and has always been the high demand season for MIBC.. Many of the neighbors of MIBC are members too and we are sensitive in helping mitigate any traffic on Avalon, 85th, and EWM.

Parking Plan:

- The MIBC Parking Lot is maximized with 85 parking spaces + 6 handicapped parking spaces + 3 trailer parking spaces.
- Valet parking is contracted for all Home Swim Meets (5 in total) to accommodate up to **40 additional vehicles** in the parking lot. During these events, the trailer spots are designated for vehicles (double parked) bringing the **total to 137 parking spaces**.

Monitoring of off-site parking:

The Mercer Island Beach Club takes the following actions every summer to assist in managing parking.

- Installing "SLOW" signs on Avalon Drive.
- Installing "No Parking" signs on lake side of Avalon Drive to ensure access for emergency vehicles while also providing improved safety and reduced inconvenience for residents.
- Managing parking within the club property with a parking lot attendant.
- Encouraging visitors and members to carpool to events.
- Limits the number of events that may create adverse parking conditions.

Outside of the Club property, on a public street (Avalon Drive), it is an unreasonable directive to require Club staff to monitor public parking. Club staff are not in a position to identify if a vehicle is occupied by a guest of the Club or residents of Avalon Drive and, re-

direct parking and furthermore have no authority to instruct members of the public on public property.

20. An archeological review shall be completed for the proposed development, as this is an area the Snoqualmie Tribe considered culturally significant and has a high probability of having unknown archeological deposits. If any archaeological work is performed, the Snoqualmie Tribe request notification. An Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP) should not be used in lieu of archeological investigation. Cultural and archaeological resources are non-renewable and are best discovered prior to ground disturbance.

MIBC response to 20

Please see attached document from Drayton Archelogy (Drayton Cultural Resources Review- MIBC 062525)

Building:

1. Comments related to construction codes are provided as courtesy for coordination between the owner and any land entitlement agencies. Review of the project for construction codes, including Washington State Building Code and Washington State Existing Building Code, will be performed under a required Building Permit Application. Applicable construction codes can be found in MICC 17.14.010 Section

MIBC Response: MIBC will be applying for a building permit.

101. The vesting of construction codes is address in MICC 17.14.101 Section 105.3.4.

2. This project will require a code analysis to be included in the building permit construction documents that documents conformance with applicable non-structural code. If this design relies or interacts with existing construction, there are three available compliance paths available in the Washington State Existing

Building Code:

- o Chapter 5: Prescriptive Compliance
- o Chapter 6: Classification of Work
- o Chapter 13: Performance compliance

MIBC Response: Four of the existing docks/piers are being fully replaced. The new docks/piers shall conform to the WSBV, this will be indicated on the building permit drawings.

3. In conventional building construction, Classification of Work is most commonly applied.

MIBC Response: See Item No. 2 response.

4. This project creates or modifies an occupancy which is required to be categorized in WSBC Section 302. Means of egress required by WSBC 107.2.3 needs to be included in the construction documents for the appropriate occupancy. Where features are required to be accessible, accessible means of egress must be provided per 1009.2

MIBC Response: The occupancy/use “U” swimming and boat piers shall be included on the building permit drawings.

5. Washington State Building Code 106.1 requires that construction documents be prepared by a registered design professional where required in the jurisdiction. RCW 18.08.410 provides exceptions to the requirement for a registered architect, which do not clearly apply to this scope of work:

MIBC Response: An Architect licensed in the State of Washington shall prepare the necessary documents for building permit submittal.

6. Unless otherwise demonstrated, a registered architect appears to be required for this project.

MIBC Response: An Architect licensed in the State of Washington shall prepare the necessary documents for building permit submittal.

7. Calculations and drawings herein are developed to demonstrate conformance with

structural aspects of Washington State Building Code, and calculations incorporate and appropriate and more specific NAVFAC standard.

Nonstructural conformance with construction codes, including the Washington State Building Code or possibly the Washington State Existing Building Code, will also be required. In particular, accessibility of recreational boating facilities is regulated by WSBC 1111.4.9. In general, recreational facilities including swimming and bathing are covered under WSBC 1111.3. Although the accessibility requirements of swimming and wading pools may not apply to this waterfront facility, they may be helpful in demonstrating compliance with the general requirement.

MIBC Response: An Architect licensed in the State of Washington shall prepare the necessary documents for building permit submittal.

Engineering:

1. On Sheet 5 of 23, please clearly indicate the boundaries of the existing public sewer easement for the lake sewer line, and confirm that no new piling structures are proposed within this easement. **MIBC Response: Confirmed**
2. On Sheet 5 of 23, please show the existing side sewer connection from the main sewer line, and confirm that there will be no conflicts between the existing side sewer serving the existing building and the proposed new marinas. **MIBC Response: Confirmed.**

Fire:

1. On Sheet FP-01, please provide a note: "A Class I manual, dry standpipe shall be provided in accordance with NFPA 303, NFPA 14, and COMI Standards."

MIBC Response: Confirmed

2. On Sheet FP-01, please provide a note: "One 4A 40BC portable fire extinguisher shall be provided at each standpipe hose connection. Each portable extinguisher shall be located in a listed weatherproof enclosure."

MIBC Response: Confirmed