



January 18, 2023
Project No. 21-004

Ms. Elizabeth Huber
c/o Brandt Design Group
Attn.: Kate Miller,
18915 142nd Avenue NE, #140
Woodinville, WA 98072

**Subject: Geotechnical Plan Review
Proposed Single Family Residence
9611 SE 72nd Street, Mercer Island, Washington
Parcel: 257950-0040**

Dear Elizabeth,

As requested, PanGEO prepared this letter to respond to the January 9, 2023, review comments regarding the plans for the residential construction at the above address, provided by the Kolke Consulting Group, on behalf of the City of Mercer Island. The following are our responses to the geotechnical review comments.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND GEOTECHNICAL PLAN REVIEW

We reviewed the geotechnical engineering aspects of the current plans for the above-referenced project. Our review includes the following:

- Architectural plan Sheets A100 through A701 dated November 7, 2022, by Brandt Design Group;
- Civil Plan Sheets C-100 through C-310 dated November 17, 2022, by Latitude 46, PS.;
and
- Structural plan sheets S1.1 through S5.1 dated January 13, 2023, by Swenson Say, Faget;

- Shoring plan sheets SH1.1 through SH4.1 dated January 13, 2023, by Swenson Say, Faget.

In general, it is our opinion that the plans reviewed had incorporated all substantial geotechnical recommendations presented in our geotechnical report dated September 7, 2021, and geotechnical addendums dated January 6, March 8 and May 9, 2022.

STATEMENT OF MINIMUM RISK

We understand that the site is mapped as a geologic hazard area. Per Mercer Island City Code Section 19.07.160.B.3, development within geologic hazard areas and critical slopes may occur if the geotechnical engineer provides a statement of minimum risk with supporting documentation indicating that one of the following conditions can be met:

- a. The geologic hazard area will be modified, or the development has been designed so that the risk to the lot and adjacent property is eliminated or mitigated such that the site is determined to be safe;
- b. Construction practices are proposed for the alteration that would render the development as safe as if it were not located in a geologic hazard area;
- c. The alteration is so minor as not to pose a threat to the public health, safety, and welfare;
- d. An evaluation of site-specific subsurface conditions demonstrates that the proposed development is not located in a geologic hazard area.

Based on our additional analyses and our review of the current plans, it is our opinion that Criterion (a) and (b) can be met, provided that the project is properly constructed per the approved plans. We recommend that best management practices be implemented during construction, including the proper use of silt fence, minimize earthwork activities during periods heavy precipitations, minimized exposed areas in wet season, etc. Furthermore, the proposed permanent erosion control measures (landscape and hardscape) will effectively mitigate the risk of erosion in the long term.

CLOSURE

We trust that the information outlined in this letter meets your needs at this time. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Stephen H. Evans

Stephen H. Evans, L.E.G.
Senior Engineering Geologist



W. Paul Grant, P.E.
Senior Geotechnical Engineer