Doug McIntyre

From:	Paul Stickney <stick@seanet.com></stick@seanet.com>	
Sent:	Tuesday, July 28, 2020 4:38 PM	
То:	EIS	
Subject:	EIS Scoping Comment	
Attachments:	5.7.19 + 3.7.19 Correct Public Comment.pdf; 5.19.19 Concurrency and Land Uses.pdf; 5.23.19 Desired	
	Land Uses.pdf; 9.16.18 Solution Just Tell Me.pdf	

[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL]

EIS Scoping Team,

During all the meetings on transportation and concurrency from Fall of 2017 to spring of 2019 I never say analysis of how V/C LOS standards effected:

•Adopted single-family zoning in the Comprehensive Plan

•Adopted multi-family zoning in the Town Center Sub Area Plan.

In my opinion, this was either not done, or it was done and not shared publicly.

I do recall an occasional mention of six year and 20 year land uses, but I do not recall any analysis of how the adopted V/C LOS concurrency standards effected all adopted land uses in the Comprehensive Plan.

Another informed opinion ... by default this V/C Standard did not support growth contemplated by 2035 in the Comprehensive Plan and Town Center Sub area plan as this V/C had failures now. Mix in the fact that the City has not adopted a TIP to address these failures, then the V/C that was adopted in Spring of 2019 did NOT support adopted Comp Plan land-uses.

Attached are four emails of comments I made on the relationship of Concurrency and land-use during this period.

Summing up, a key cut and paste from my 5.19.19 email:

Concurrency does not drive desired land-uses. Desired land-uses drive concurrency.

Sincerely

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556

Four PDF's attached with pertinent written public comments

- 9.16.18 Solution Just Tell Me

- 5.7.19 + 3.7.19 Correct Public Comment

- 5.19.19 Concurrency and Land Uses

Please be aware that email communications with members of the City Council, City Commissioners, or City staff are public records and are subject to disclosure upon request.

Subject: Correction in RED below. Re: Public Comment from Paul Stickney for Concurrency Public Hearing Record 5.7.19 Date: May 7, 2019 at 1:57 PM



To: Sammamish City Council citycouncil@sammamish.us

Cc: Planning Commission PlanningCommission@sammamish.us, Melonie Anderson manderson@sammamish.us, Lita Hachey Ihachey@sammamish.us, Tammy Mueller tmueller@sammamish.us, Aaron Antin aantin@sammamish.us, Jeff Thomas JThomas@sammamish.us, David Pyle dpyle@sammamish.us, Cheryl Paston cpaston@sammamish.us, Mike Sugg msugg@sammamish.us

Corrections in **RED** below.

On May 7, 2019, at 1:33 PM, Stick <<u>stick@seanet.com</u>> wrote:

Esteemed City Council Members,

I am forwarding a pdf of the public comment I gave to the Planning Commission on "Concurrency" at their meeting on 3.7.19. That public comment had a copy of an email from Don Gerend dated 1.15.19 as part of it, also attached here.

In addition, I am attaching a more engaging (color) package of the information I turned in to the City on 1.14.19 pertaining to the public hearing on 1.15.19 regarding ordinance O2018-477 and Sammamish Home Grown.

Concurrency is a symptom, it is not an ailment.

There are two fundamental **<u>underlying ailments</u>** causing concurrency (and other) **symptoms**:

- 1) Formost and highest ranking ailment unbalanced, unoptimized and unsustainable housing supplies relative to housing needs and wants for all generations living and/or working in Sammamish over recurring 80+ year cycles-of-life. (Solution = optimized, sustainable, generational *internal* Housing Balance.) ((Enrich & Sustain))
- Secondary ailment lack of capital spending on lane capacity road project needs and deficiencies ... a) Inherited from King County at Incorporation b) As identified in the 2003 comp plan. c) Identified on 6-year TIP's from 2000 to 2018. d) As identified in the 2015 Comp Plan. e) Listed on the 2016 TIP Master Project List.

Suggested rationale and solutions for these ailments are outlined in the 1.14.19 packet, attached.

Kind Regards,

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556

Concurrency Fudge Factor Input from Paul Stickney for Planning Commission Public Hearing 3719.pdf>

<Packet Delivered to CC 1.14.19.pdf>

Subject: Concurrency "Fudge Factor" Input from Paul Stickney for Planning Commission Public Hearing 3.7.19

- Date: March 7, 2019 at 1:30 PM
 - To: Paul Stickney paulstickney@realtyexecutives.com
 - Cc: Lita Hachey Ihachey@sammamish.us, Tammy Mueller tmueller@sammamish.us

Hello Planning Commissioners,

Some input for you on concurrency for the Public Hearing tonight, here is a four part summary:

- 1) Gerend Email of 1.15.19. (pdf attached)
- 2) "Fudge Factor" comment to the City Council on 9.4.18.
- 3) Comments on Capacity (C) #'s in your packet tonight. (The C of V/C.)

4) Summary and Closing Comment/Question.

1 - One. Gerend Email

Attached is Don Gerend's email that he sent the city on 1.15.19, It was sent as part of the public hearing on Interim Development Regulations. Parts of this email deal with the "arbitrary" nature of concurrency V/C.

2- Two. Fudge Factor of Past Concurrency

On September 4th, 2018, I gave an extemporaneous public comment about the City's previous concurrency standards and handed out a small piece of See's fudge to each City Council member.

The gist of my comment was to ask to WHAT EXTENT were some elements on Table T-8 + not having AM peak hour car trips as part of concurrency, expanding the concurrency pass/fail rate.

Further, I discussed this in two parts. How much was concurrency expanded on a few specific roads, and how much was it expanded over the entire road network. (Per Table T-8 + no AM peak calculations.)

To the best of my knowledge, these answers have not been given publicly.

I will refer to this as "Past Arbitrary Levels". (See Part 3 below).

3- Three. Is there an Arbitrary "Fudge Factor" in this Proposed Concurrency?

I am not a traffic engineer and not a traffic expert. I believe, however, you will understand the intent of my layman's comments below.

The current concurrency being proposed has "C" capacity numbers that are a mix of the Highway Capacity Manual and State of Florida Concurrency work.

The City has done extensive "tube" counts for many roads in 2016, 2017 and 2018.

My question is how do the "C" numbers in the proposed concurrency compare to the tube counts on the same roads for 2016, 2017 & 2018.

I see three answers, that can be refined into two basic answers.

A). "C" counts are close to tube counts. Cool. No further work needed.

B). "C" counts are either significantly higher or lower than tube counts. if this is the case, I highly recommend staff and consultant "show their work" and show, step by step, why the numbers are different. If it is B), show what the "Current Arbitrary Levels" are between the current "C" factors and the actual tube counts of 2016, 2017 and 2018.

It is important that there is a clear, easy to follow understanding of how these differences were determined and reconciled.

4. Four. Summary and Closing Comment/Questions.

Past concurrency did expand some capacity. We have not been told by how much. (We do not know the past "fudge factor")

The question is whether the current "C" is close or not. If so, great.

If not, to what extent does it either expand or restrict capacity?

Restated, is there a "fudge factor" in the proposed current concurrency, one way or the other — and if so, how much is it?

Kind Regards,

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556



Gerend Public Comm....19.pdf

Dear Council,

Attached are my comments regarding the Interim Development Regulations O2018-477. I have also copied them below. Regarding the Appendix C1 on housing Needs, the table on page 154 needs clarification of the vertical scale and the Gross Rents Chart on page 158 isn't very clear.

Regarding the 2 Planning Commissioners concept of multiple commercial zones, I personally feel that focus should rather be on moving the Town Center vision forward and doing studies of the existing three neighborhood shopping centers. I encourage strategic visioning, as PSRC is doing with the Vision 2050 regional planning. Their projected population increase of 1,800,000 (50% increase) for Central Puget Sound is a sobering figure. The goal of the GMA is to contain virtually all growth inside the urban boundaries, which puts a huge amount of pressure on cities to accommodate that growth. Yes, the core cities should take a higher percentage, and they are now (not without frustrations as neighborhoods are hugely impacted by density increase). I think that we all agree that Sammamish should push back when future targets are assigned through the County process, but realistically we should expect increases in the targets and prepare for them. The Town Center originally was to take about half of the target increases, with the other half spread throughout the City. With increased targets coming, preserving neighborhoods through increased setbacks and other reasonable restrictions (such as public easements around new subdivisions) makes sense, but it also makes sense to increase the density in the Town Center. This is a way of absorbing the increased targets with minimal impact on neighborhoods while also supporting a live, work and gathering place in the heart of Sammamish.

Best wishes for a good and productive 2019,

Don Gerend

Public Hearing Comments regarding Interim Development Regulations O2018-477

Don Gerend January 15, 2019

- 1. Section 14A.10.030(a) does not allow exclusions for additional units or Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's). I believe that ADU's should be encouraged throughout the City as a way of increasing the affordable housing available in Sammamish. By allowing additional units of this type without the expense of short platting and impact fees is a way of encouraging more affordable housing that the City so desperately needs. Please allow these as exclusions.
- 2. <u>Regarding the arbitrary threshold of 1.10 for V/C on corridors</u>, perhaps the council is realizing that indeed concurrency testing is more for revealing facilities or land use patterns that need review and attention than actual ways of determining when the cost/benefit ratio for improving facilities makes sense.

DG

Previous councils realized that to improve the East Lake Sammamish Parkway to a level that allowed northbound free flowing traffic in Sammamish would be prohibitively expensive and wouldn't achieve much benefit since the major congestion really was occurring in Redmond. Table T-8 gave arbitrary credit for widening shoulders and separate trails which resulted in ELSP passing concurrency. Current Council is setting arbitrary V/C = 1.1 which results in ELSP and Sahalee Way failing. The difference is that arbitrarily causing failure requires facilities to be built to remove that failure (are we talking \$80 million or more and not significantly improving the commute to Microsoft or beyond?).

It is very apparent that setting the V/C at 1.1 is simply an arbitrary way of stopping development. To demonstrate how arbitrary it is, consider that the 2016 HCM Modified sets capacity on ELSP at 705 trips and the actual volume measured is 1198 trips or $1.70 \times capacity$. So, the actual capacity of the roadway is closer to the 1198 trips measured and perhaps that capacity reflects the fact of wide shoulders and the regional trail allowing adequate safety for bicyclists and pedestrians resulting in negligible reduction in throughput of traffic. The modified HCM should give credit of wide shoulders on both the ELSP and Sahalee Way. Of course, arbitrarily excluding ELSP from the concurrency test solves the issue there, but an arbitrary 10% credit for wide shoulders on Sahalee Way might allow Sahalee Way to pass the concurrency with a reasonable cost/benefit ratio for incremental improvements needed to lower the V/C.

From actual experience, in recent weeks when coming back to Sammamish during peak afternoon rush hour, I experienced backups on SR-520 west of Marymoor Park, but once I entered the City of Sammamish the traffic was freely flowing on ESLP at close to or even over the speed limit. This is a corridor which shows a PM peak V/C = 1.55. So the Council has set a V/C of 1.1 as a concurrency threshold even though the corridor is working at a V/C = 1.55. Hence the arbitrary decision to exclude ELSP from the corridor concurrency test. Clearly, the decision to set V/C at 1.1 for the concurrency threshold be revisited, or additional modifications should be included in the HCM calculations (such as 10% for wide shoulders) to eliminate the necessity of adding egregiously expensive projects to the TIP.



Public Hearing Comm...8.docx

- Subject: Housing and Concurrency. Come to a screeching halt, then embark on a new course.
 - Date: January 14, 2019 at 1:38 PM
 - To: Sammamish City Council citycouncil@sammamish.us
 - Cc: Planning Commission PlanningCommission@sammamish.us, Larry Patterson lpatterson@sammamish.us

Dear Sammamish City Council Members,

It's time to come to a screeching halt on the City's housing and concurrency positions.

Housing supplies should be balanced, the Housing Strategy Plan (that took about year to create) recognizes this.

Concurrency should <u>limit</u> the types of housing we have *internal* <u>surpluses</u> of ... and <u>not limit</u> the other types of housing we have *internal* <u>shortages</u> of.

Reverse the City's current course, then embark on a new course

The new course will <u>face and remedy underlying aliments</u>, rather than focusing on symptoms — which is what the current course is doing.

The New Course:

Pause the Housing Strategy Plan (HSP) and the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) right now. Take appropriate actions relative to concurrency, while you go through the process to amend the Comprehensive Plan. (Pause HSP & TMP)

Revise the Comprehensive Plan to modestly optimize private-built environment land-use policies and numbers (*internal* Housing Balance and services) immediately/as quickly as possible.

(Amend Comp Plan)

Finish the Housing Strategy Plan and do the Transportation Master Plan after the Comp Plan has been corrected by optimizing *internal* private-built environment land-uses (Housing Balance and services).

(Complete HSP & TMP)

Then, in the future, spend capital monies on road projects — only if/when needed <u>after</u> the full effects of revised land use policies and corresponding internal/external transit decisions are vetted and known.

(Road Capital \$? - Maybe)

Sincerely,

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556

Subject: Use of Power for Community Advantages.

- Date: January 14, 2019 at 1:38 PM
 - To: Sammamish City Council citycouncil@sammamish.us
- Cc: Planning Commission PlanningCommission@sammamish.us, Larry Patterson lpatterson@sammamish.us

To the City of Sammamish,

City Council: Representation, Votes and Power.

Housing Balance: Beneficial Community Advantages.

It's time to blend these two. Use your council power to attain the advantages of optimal *internal* Housing Balance and services - <u>after being fully informed.</u>

- Land use is the key factor that drives most everything in Sammamish.
- Our Comprehensive Plan has private-built land uses that are out of balance with the needs and wants of our community over recurring cycles-of-life.
- Our Comp Plan DOES have Sammamish's regional growth target number that we as a City negotiated with King County.
- Our Comp Plan does NOT have the estimated number of additional large single-family homes that can be built in Sammamish. (Estimated at 6K to 10K+.)
- Our Comp Plan does NOT have the over 120 specific housing 'needs' gap numbers between housing supplies and *internal* economic & demographic groups.
- Our Comp plan does NOT have statistically valid survey results of what different, diverse and smaller housing types our residents want based on planned and unplanned changes that occur during their cycle-of-life. (Out of balance housing supply shortages appear to be between 4K and 16K, or more.)
- We as a community have NOT discussed the pros and cons of lessening housing types we have surpluses of and increasing housing types we have shortages of.
- We as a community have NOT discussed short, mid and long term consequences of maintaining our current unbalanced land uses versus modestly balanced land uses.
- The informed opinions and consensus of our citizenry on optimal Housing Balance is not known as our citizens have never been made aware of this information.
- Over the last 19 years, land-use decisions have been made without knowing all of this information. This has been intentional, prescriptive, biased and wrong.
- Get this information, then use the power of your position to revise land-use numbers and policies to attain the sustainable, advantageous benefits of *internal* Housing Balance. (Lessen certain types of housing; increase other types of housing; right-size economics & services)
- This will represent the best interests of the majority of those living and/or working in Sammamish, holistically and sustainably, over time — and keep our town strong.
- Amending the Comp Plan will make the prospects for Sammamish far better than where we are today, improve property values and our coveted community character.

Kind Regards,

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556

The New Course:

Pause HSP & TMP Amend Comp Plan Complete HSP & TMP Road Capital \$? — <u>Maybe</u>

• • •	Direction and Purpose. — Sent	
Paul Stickney @ Direction and Purpose.	🛅 Sent - Seanet	1:40 PM Details
1.54	Planning Commission, Larry Patterson	Details

Dear Sammamish City Council Members,

This is all about the positives of "**modest optimal balance**" ... not the negatives of "growth" or "unwanted development".

Specifically the two emails I just sent, along with this one (and the two *draft* one-page pdf's attached below) outline a path to move Sammamish from 'Better' towards 'Best' by means of *internal* Housing Balance.

Amend the Sammamish Comp Plan to enable real, sustainable and resilient wealth over time for our residents, the environment, finances, transportation, the region and enriching our community character.

Two documents are attached. Please, carefully read both. They are only one-page each — and contain credible, tenable **direction and purpose**.

Please call or email me to discuss this wonderful path forward.

Best Regards,

Paul 425-417-4556

The New Course:

Pause HSP & TMP Amend Comp Plan Complete HSP & TMP Road Capital \$? — <u>Maybe</u>



1. Bettering Sammamish.pdf



2. Collab...ion.pdf

Based on Internal Housing Balance materials that have been presented to the City Bettering Sammamish – Action and We/Me Tagline Benefits

The Action to Take:

Amend the 2015 Sammamish Comprehensive Plan (at light speed) to modestly optimize privatebuilt environment land-use numbers and policies (*Internal* Housing Balance) that will primarily:

- $\sqrt{}$ Decrease some types of additional larger single-family housing. (About 2,000+ fewer)
- $\sqrt{}$ Increase wanted types of many different, diverse and smaller housing. (About 8,000+ more)
- $\sqrt{}$ Right-size economics and services (Suitably, based on Housing Balance decreases & increases)
- $\sqrt{}$ Pause major planning efforts with land-use basis pick-up after optimizing the Comp Plan.

Its Bettering Tagline Benefits (Randomly presented – a mix of "We" and "Me"):

- Qualitative and quantitative advantages for those living and/or working here AND for the City. (We)
- Have Town Center (TC) favorably built-out over the next 3-8 years. (Already 10+ years overdue) (We & Me)
- Immense value, benefits and wealth for our residents and the Community. (We)
- Trust ... standing ... just cause ... fundamentally correct. (Me)
- Sammamish bright prospects by progressing from 'Better' > towards 'Best'. (We)
- Holistic changes from modestly optimized Housing Balance that are favorable and sustainable. (We)
- Elevate our community character and overall desirability well beyond where it is today. (We)
- Improve and strengthen real estate property values. (We & Me)
- Lessen the need for local tax increases (or new taxes) over time. (We)
- 20 years of Sammamish institutional knowledge / 5 years at near expert level. (Me)
- Legal position for revising and improving the 2015 Comprehensive Plan right now. (We & Me)
- Game plan and rationale to attain land-use 'Positive Decreases' + 'Positive Increases'. (We & Me)
- Residential real estate expert in the Eastside Cities having seen over 70,000 homes. (Me)
- Wealth Factors: TC Land Owners & Developers = 1-10 / Citizens & City = 100-1000+ (Me & We)
- Optimized private-built environment land-uses will benefit nearly everything in Sammamish. (We)
- Community understanding and buy-in for far better short, mid + long range results/aspirations. (We)
- Positively facing, managing and enriching private built land-uses within Sammamish. (We)
- Regional and State recognition for increased funding, status, influence and commendations. (We)
- Overall a *far* better (and stronger) path/vision for our town than the current Comp Plan. (We)
- Holistically and sustainably a *much* more appealing community with elevated quality of life. (We)

City Council Draft

Paul Stickney 1.14.19

Based on Internal Housing Balance materials that have been presented to the City "What To Do" Recommendations – For Collaboration

• Have Housing Balance be a major topic at the council mini-retreat in February. Set dates for study sessions/special meetings to have comprehensive critique, input, discussion, deliberation and action.

• Amend the comprehensive plan ASAP to *modestly optimize* numbers and policies pertaining to the private-built environment (*internal* Housing Balance) to fundamentally achieve three things:

- $\sqrt{}$ Decrease some types of additional larger single-family housing. (About 2,000+ fewer)
- $\sqrt{}$ Increase wanted types of many different, diverse and smaller housing. (About 8,000+ more)
- $\sqrt{}$ Right-size economics and services. (Suitably, based on Housing Balance decreases & increases)
- Pause major planning efforts with land-use basis pick-up after optimizing the Comp Plan, including: - Housing Strategy Plan. -TMP. -Urban Forestry. -Town Center Plan. -Other(s).
- Determine 'near absolute' zoned capacity numbers for additional large single-family housing. (6K to 10K+)
- > Determine surplus and deficient housing need gap #'s for 120+ categories appropriate to Sammamish.
 - > Conduct statistically valid surveys to ascertain community housing wants over recurring cycles-of-life.
 - > Discern pros and cons for the community by meeting various levels of housing needs and wants.
 - > Examine pros & cons consequences from having enduring *internal* Housing Balance over time.
 - > Weigh fully informed public input and consensus on sustainable, internal Housing Balance (HB). (Out of balance internal economic and demographic group housing shortages appear to be between 4K and 16K, or more)

• Develop ONE "R-Zone" that is scalable, from the most restrictive for types of single-family housing we have the greatest surpluses of, to the least restrictive to encourage production of housing supplies we have shortages of. (Smaller detached homes; Duplex, triplex, fourplex; Cottage; Zero lot-line; Townhome; PUD; Mixed-use; Others)

• Immediate and short-term re-evaluation and adjustments to Town Center density caps to meet both past and current housing/economic shortages based on optimized internal Housing Balance policies and numeric targets as called for in the modified Comprehensive Plan after it has been amended.

• In-City TDR program based on the "NEW" R-Zone criteria – if owners develop at less than the new scalable baselines, or if property owners choose permanently not to develop their property.

• ADU policies – likely minimized due to storm water, traffic, trees and neighborhood character issues.

• Long-term housing supply visioning. Options planning for the 4 to 5 years between now and the next Comprehensive Plan in about 2023. (No changes alternative; Existing Centers only; Neighborhood kernels; Others?)

- Traffic and Roads **complete reversal** putting new optimized Comp Plan land-uses as highest ranking:
 - A) Private-built environment land-uses are modestly balanced (HB) FIRST and FOREMOST.
 - B) Multi-modal, connectivity and trails based on the chosen optimized private-built land-uses.
 - C) Transit external, internal and private based on internal (HB) choices made.
 - D) Create TMP based on decisions made in A, B, and C and their forecasted, associated effects.
 - E) TMP capital road project \$ spending only AS/IF/WHEN needed. (Based on revised, optimized Comp Plan)
- Other topics as appropriate.

Delivered Documents 1.14.19

On 1.14.19. I delivered eight (8) copies of a six page document to the City of Sammamish, about 3:30pm in the afternoon.

Email #1 – 1 page -Housing and Concurrency. Come to a screeching halt then embark on a new course

Email #2 - 2 pages – Use of Power for Community Advantages

Email #3 – 1 page – Direction and Purpose

PDF Attachment #1 to Email 3 – 1 page. (1. Bettering Sammamish) Bettering Sammamish – Action and We/Me Tagline Benefits

PDF Attachment #2 to Email 3 – 1 page. (2. Collaboration) "What To Do" Recommendations – For Collaboration

Subject: Concurrency. Desired Land Uses. Past << Present >> Future. (For the Concurrency Public Hearing of Thursday, May 23rd)

Date: May 19, 2019 at 3:58:38 PM PDT

To: Sammamish City Council <citycouncil@sammamish.us>

Cc: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@sammamish.us>, Jeff Thomas <JThomas@sammamish.us>, David Pyle <dpyle@sammamish.us>, Cheryl Paston <cpaston@sammamish.us>, Mike Sugg <msugg@sammamish.us>, Aaron Antin <aantin@sammamish.us>, Rita Badh <RBadh@sammamish.us>, Kellye Hilde <khilde@sammamish.us>, Debbie Beadle <dbeadle@sammamish.us>, Sharon Gavin <sgavin@sammamish.us>, Melonie Anderson <manderson@sammamish.us>, Lita Hachey <lhachey@sammamish.us>, Tammy Mueller <tmueller@sammamish.us>

Dear City Council Members,

There are some noteworthy perspectives on the concurrency process the City has been going through — that are pertinent for you to reflect on, and carefully consider.

The city has been focusing on a major symptom (concurrency) and not on the two two higher ranking ailments causing this symptom - unbalanced housing supplies & economic services, plus not much capital spending on past lane capacity road projects.

Sammamish has created a concurrency standard where virtually all new housing development cannot move forward. This may be appropriate for housing types the city has internal surpluses of ... it is not appropriate for housing types the city has internal shortages of.

Concurrency does not drive desired land-uses.

Desired land-uses drive concurrency.

The City's concurrency determinations have not fully dealt with these topics:

> Discuss the consequences of the lack of capital spending on identified needs and deficient lane capacity road projects since Sammamish incorporated in 1999.

> Factor in the magnitude of car trip generation based on single-family housing and multi-family housing as planned for in the Sammamish Comprehensive Plan.

> Have up-to-date, vetted estimates of the costs of road projects (and feasible means of thier funding) for the current 6 year TIP and the 2016 20-year TIP master TIP list. (I have observed vast variation in costs discussed on different meeting dates.)

> Plan for OPTIMIZED internal housing supplies to meet needs and wants of all generations and cultures, over recurring cycles of life, by limiting some types of housing we have surpluses of, and increasing other types of housing we have shortages of — relative to all economic and demographic groups in Sammamish.

> Considering the facts of how housing supplies have grown further out of balance, and have been minimized, since 1999, under Sammamish governance.

> Traffic modeling to compare how traffic flows would have been today, had the vast majority of past identified lane capacity road projects been built.

- > Contemplate single-family home build out capacity numbers based these land uses:
 - -Vacant R4/R6 lands.
 - -Underdeveloped R4/R6 lands (typically tracts of 1 acre or more)
 - -Redevelopment R4/R6 lands (typically homes on 1/2 to 1 acre lots)
 - -R1 lands without critical areas likely upzoned to R4/R6 in future.

> Long term transportation modeling to determine the contrasting effects of various land-use scenarios at <u>future</u> build out. Starting with what the current comp plan + zoned capacities allow, and then running several wide-ranging alternatives based on optimized housing supplies / economic services / transportation systems.

Analysis:

It would be one thing if Sammamish had spent several hundreds of millions of dollars on the majority of its identified lane capacity road project needs and deficiencies over the last 20 years, and we still had the same traffic issues. This did not happen.

It is quite another to limit growth based on V/C, when few lane capacity ("C") road improvements have been made in Sammamish, relative to all the projects listed in the 2003 Comp Plan, 6-Year TIP's from 2000-2019, the 2015 Comp Plan and the 2016 Master TIP project list.

It is also quite another thing, that in the majority of cases, measured road capacities are significantly greater than the ("C") factors being used by the City's concurrency.

This current concurrency was chiefly reverse engineered by a council majority; lacks complete, comprehensive information; **does not identify a clearly defined**, **and agreed to, long term desired land-use vision for the City;** nor have these policies benefited from <u>fully informed</u> public opinion and consensus.

Regarding the city's concurrency policies, set standards at this time to

- > Severely limit types of housing our community has current internal surpluses of.
- > Allow types of housing our community has past and current internal shortages of.
- > Support policies to attain "<u>housing affordability</u> <u>though balanced, sustainable</u>. <u>housing</u>" as called for by the Sammamish ccmp plan vision statement.

Take actions to advance the "Enrich & Sustain" platform to alter our Comprehensive Plan desired land-uses by: optimizing Housing Supplies >> then Economic Services >> then Transportation Systems >> for VAST 6-Sector Wealth.

Kind Regards,

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556 stick@seanet.com

PS. Please email, text or call to talk with me about the "Enrich & Sustain" platform for Sammamish. ("Enrich & Sustain Maxims" is attached as a pdf)

Enrich & Sustain

Community & Neighborhoods & Lifestyles

Optimize

Housing » Economics » Transportation

7 – 7 – 7

3-Q-I-Q

Regardless & Overarching

Common Cause

Subject: Email Copy of last nights materials turned in for the Concurrency Hearing at City Council Meeting 3.23.19.

- Date: May 24, 2019 at 11:50 AM
 - To: Sammamish City Council citycouncil@sammamish.us
 - Cc: Planning Commission PlanningCommission@sammamish.us, Rick Rudometkin rrudometkin@sammamish.us, Jeff Thomas JThomas@sammamish.us, David Pyle dpyle@sammamish.us, Cheryl Paston cpaston@sammamish.us, Mike Sugg msugg@sammamish.us, Aaron Antin aantin@sammamish.us, Rita Badh RBadh@sammamish.us, Kellye Hilde khilde@sammamish.us, Debbie Beadle dbeadle@sammamish.us, Sharon Gavin sgavin@sammamish.us, Melonie Anderson manderson@sammamish.us, Lita Hachey Ihachey@sammamish.us, Tammy Mueller tmueller@sammamish.us

Public Comment Concurrency Hearing City Council Meeting 5.23.19

Paul Stickney, 22626 NE Inglewood Hill Road.

In honor of Karen Moran, and hoping her a speedy recovery from her surgery, I will start with a famous quote of hers.

"JUST TELL ME". OK, I will.

Concurrency issues are symptoms of two ailments, 1) unbalanced, unoptimized housing supplies ... and 2) lack of spending on lane capacity road projects in the past.

But the 800 lb gorilla in the room is growth. All this fuss over concurrency the last couple of years is really about growth.

Growth boils down to desired land uses for Sammamish, over time.

This concurrency is in error, as it is not based on desired land-uses.

Our comprehensive plan is in error, as it is not based on desired land-uses.

Thee are four primary positions on desired land-uses:

- > 1. No Growth
- > 2. Minimize growth as much as possible
- > 3. Modestly optimize growth
- > 4. Maximize growth.

Let's toss out #4, this is not a good option for our City.

What is missing from positions 1, 2 & 3 of desired land-uses?

What has never informed any of these three positions? Two things.

1) Full information on what is wanted and needed for housing options and economic services over time. 2) Informed public consensus based on housing and economic wants and needs, the pro's and con's, and consequences of no growth ... contrasted to minimum growth ... contrasted to optimal growth.

Consequences on what? EVERYTHING.

Consequences on ALL six equal sectors that make up our City People. Environment. Transportation. Money. Region. Character.

I contend that **optimizing** is leaps and bounds better for the community over time. It will lessen housing we have too much off, add housing we don't have enough of, and then, right size economics and transportation. This will create IMMENSE additional **wealth and benefits for our city**.

Here are my recommendations:

- 1) Adopt concurrency as presented before you tonight.
- 2) Appropriately exempt housing projects that our community has shortages of right now.
- 3) Begin the TMP based on what is on the ground today.
- 4) Do not spend money on major road projects at this time.
- 5) Face, head on, desired land-uses, based on equal inputs from all 6-major sectors.
- 6) Finish the TMP and readjust concurrency based on desired land-uses consensus.
- 7) Only spend money on major road projects in the future if needed. (They likely won't be.)



Subject: Solution. "Just Tell Me". Date: September 16, 2018 at 3:40 PM



To: Sammamish City Council citycouncil@sammamish.us

Cc: Planning Commission PlanningCommission@sammamish.us, Human Services Commission HSCommission@sammamish.us, Jeff Thomas JThomas@sammamish.us, Larry Patterson lpatterson@sammamish.us, Dick Birgh rbirgh@comcast.net

Dear City Council Members,

Recently at a Citizens for Sammamish meeting, Council Member Karen Moran relayed a story where she told someone, who was talking to her about an issue, to get to the main points and ... **"Just Tell Me".**

This email will do that - Just Tell the City:

Traffic concurrency is but <u>one</u> of many symptoms the City is facing.

The main ailment in Sammamish is LAND USE.

The solution, is to correct LAND USE in the Comp Plan.

Change housing policies, *right here and now*, from 19+ years of Level 2, to a minimum of Level 4**, on the 'Nuttiness Continuum'.

How? Inform yourselves with **"The Chew"**, then change numbers** in the Comp Plan to modestly optimize the Private-Built Environment:

- Reduce housing types that we have surpluses of - through downzoning.

- Increase housing types that we have shortages of through upzoning.
- <u>Right-size</u> economics & affluence based on optimized housing choices.

Changing from Position 2 to Position 4^{**} will create **immense and extraordinary** wealth/advantages/benefits/positives for Sammamish:

Thousands of <u>households can stay</u> in Sammamish as planned and unplanned changes occur in their lives - and not have leave the community they cherish.

Hundreds of <u>acres are preserved</u> from development and instead used for open space, trails, wildlife habitat, recreation and urban forestry.

Millions fewer square feet of impervious surface & less storm water run-off.

Billions of dollars retained by our own, living and/or working in the City

Hundreds of Millions of revenue to the city to enable community desires and to cure short-term - and long standing - capital deficiencies.

Tens of Thousands <u>fewer car trips</u> every day below those currently planned and zoned for. (Millions fewer trips per year.)

Hundreds of Thousands of <u>hours saved</u>, each and every month, by our residents from significantly fewer trips off the plateau.

CRITICAL MASS is reached for truly <u>suitable and effective transit</u> ... regionally, to Redmond & Issaquah and an *Internal* City network.

Community Character & Identity are areatly improved ... and sustained!

Resolve to modestly optimize Private-Built Environment LAND USE in the Comp Plan - by changing it from its long-standing position of Level 2 to a minimum of Level 4**

Doing this "at light speed" will achieve wide-ranging and far-reaching value, harmony, excitement and inspiration for our Community right now - and for recurring generations to come.

Sincerely and Kind Regards,

Paul Stickney 425-417-4556

Change Comp Plan numbers **from approximately 27,000, or more, single-family homes and 4,000-5,000 multi-family homes **to** 25,000, or less, single-family homes and about 12,000 multi-family homes.

