

Ryan Harriman

From: Michele Lorilla
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 2:28 PM
To: Ryan Harriman
Subject: RE: CAO23-021

My opinion is that the site does not meet the definition of a geologically hazardous area based on the soil conditions encountered at the site.

[Michele Lorilla, P.E.](#)

Geotechnical Peer Reviewer
City of Mercer Island – Community Planning & Development
www.mercerisland.gov

Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW).

The City of Mercer Island utilizes a hybrid working environment. Please see the City's [Facility and Program Information](#) page for City Hall and City service hours of operation.

From: Ryan Harriman <ryan.harriman@mercerisland.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 1:56 PM
To: Michele Lorilla <michele.lorilla@mercergov.org>
Subject: RE: CAO23-021

Thanks, Michele.

Are you of the opinion that the proposed development is minor in nature and will not increase the risk of landslide, erosion, or harm from seismic activity, or that the development site does not meet the definition of a geologically hazardous area?

Thanks!

[Ryan Harriman, EMPA, AICP](#)

Planning Manager
City of Mercer Island – Community Planning & Development
206-275-7717 | www.mercerisland.gov

Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW).

The City of Mercer Island utilizes a hybrid working environment. Please see the City's [Facility and Program Information](#) page for City service hours of operation.

From: Michele Lorilla <michele.lorilla@mercergov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 9:06 AM
To: Ryan Harriman <ryan.harriman@mercerisland.gov>
Subject: RE: CAO23-021

Good morning,

I generally agree with them that the site does not contain geologically hazardous areas based on the soil conditions encountered. As for outdated maps, the development to the south installed a series of soil nail walls that would serve to

stabilize the slope, but I do not think that we are updating all the maps based on site developments, so I would not say that they are outdated. The geology and slope steepness can indicate a landslide prone area – and I believe that was what triggered the hazard classification in the first place. It just so happened that the landslide prone designation encroached on a small portion of the site in question. The site has a seismic hazard designation and I am not sure how that designation was established for this site, but I also think that a seismic hazard is not present due to the soil conditions encountered.

Let me know if that answers your question.

Michele Lorilla, P.E.

Geotechnical Peer Reviewer

City of Mercer Island – Community Planning & Development

www.mercerisland.gov

Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW).

The City of Mercer Island utilizes a hybrid working environment. Please see the City's [Facility and Program Information](#) page for City Hall and City service hours of operation.

From: Ryan Harriman <ryan.harriman@mercerisland.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 3:36 PM

To: Michele Lorilla <michele.lorilla@mercergov.org>

Subject: CAO23-021

Hi Michelle,

I wanted to get your thoughts on CAO23-021, specifically in regard to the Critical Area Consultation, dated September 13, 2023 and revised on November 17, 2023. ESNW consistently argues that the subject property doesn't contain geologically hazardous areas and our maps are outdated.

In your professional opinion, are they correct?

Thanks!

Ryan Harriman, EMPA, AICP

Planning Manager

City of Mercer Island – Community Planning & Development

206-275-7717 | www.mercerisland.gov

Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW).

The City of Mercer Island utilizes a hybrid working environment. Please see the City's [Facility and Program Information](#) page for City service hours of operation.