

**Candidate Questions RE: SEIS**  
**Posted July 11, 2025**

**Bold text indicates the candidate's submission. Non-bold text is the City's response.**

**1. What is the financial impact to the city between the No Action and Action Alternatives?**

Future Town Center infrastructure needs associated with the action alternative are addressed in the Capital Facilities Chapter of the draft Town Center Plan beginning on Page 94 (PDF Page 101 of 115). The draft Town Center Plan is available on the [project website](#).

**2. Please help with the following questions on the Draft SEIS for TC. If the answers are covered in the DSEIS doc itself please point out the pages (apologies in advance for missing these)**

**a. Does Sammamish have 2 peaks in the morning and 2 in the afternoon (school times and office times)?**

City of Sammamish has two peak traffic times in the day that present the most traffic—one in the morning and another in the evening. The morning peak traffic period is 7 – 9 a.m., and the evening peak period is 4:30 – 7:30 p.m. This is consistent throughout the city.

**b. The LOS for ELSP signal connecting 202 is F. Did we take regional development in to account when calculating the LOS for alternate action?**

Regional growth is taken into account. The referenced intersection is outside the City's jurisdiction, so the City cannot mitigate its LOS failure.

**c. TC is in the middle of 520 and I90. What is the trip assignment model of the traffic from TC to either of these freeways?**

The trip assignment to/from the south and to/from the north is about 50% of total Town Center – regional trips, meaning if Town Center produces 100 trips targeting regional destinations, around 50 trips will head north and 50 trips will head south.

**d. What was the total trip generation volume from TC?**

Total trips for “no action” alternative are 2,642 trips for a.m. peak and 2,612 for p.m. peak. Total trips for “action” alternative are 3,293 trips for a.m. peak and 3,566 for p.m. peak.

**e. What were the assumptions used to reduce this volume due to density and transit services?**

No reductions were assumed.

**f. What are the origin and destination of the trips in the DSEIS?**

There are five types of trips: Home to Work trips, Work to Home trips, Home to Other, Other to Home trips, and Non-home based trips. An example of this last one is work to shopping center trips.

**g. What is the traffic assignment across different roads from TC? How much is predicted through 228, Inglewood Hill and Louis Thomson?**

An equilibrium assignment process is used in the model to allocate vehicle trips on road network. This is explained in detail in the [Transportation Master Plan - Appendix B](#). There isn't one number that can be provided to show the projected traffic on a specific road. Traffic originating in Town Center will use surrounding road network, then will start dropping in volume per road segment and intersection depending on the attraction of nearby destinations.

**h. What is the funding sources for the various road improvements in both options discussed in DSEIS?**

One funding source is expected to be transportation impact fees. The [agenda bill](#) for the July 15 Council meeting notes that, "with a range of 3,000 to 4,000 units, approximately \$27 million to \$36 million in street impact fee revenue are estimated to be generated using the current rates to fund any City initiative around transportation infrastructure in Town Center." Additionally, other funding sources may be available, such as grants.

**Given that the comment for DSEIS is only till July 9th I would appreciate some amount of clarity to the questions above, to enable me to write a public comment.**

**3. Page 13 has this "The No Action Alternative would see existing low- to moderate-density development patterns continue, with slowed progress towards increasing housing capacity restricted by a lack of opportunities for financially feasible development."**

**a. For whom is there lack of opportunities for financially feasible development?**

Developers who would build the type of housing needed to provide diverse and affordable housing – apartments and condominiums. These types of housing are built in low-rise, mid-rise, and mixed-use types of developments. If these types of construction are not financially feasible then other forms of development will move forward, eliminating opportunity to address known housing supply issues.

**b. What is the definition of financially feasible?**

Same response as item 5.a below. Since development (housing and commercial/retail space) is built by private developers, whether a project is financially feasible is up to the property owners and developers. Generally, if no development is happening under the development regulations that are in effect, then a project is not financially feasible. To better understand how changes to development regulations can influence the feasibility of different forms of development (town homes, low-rise, mid-rise, mixed-use) are modeled and the anticipated return on investment is calculated based on market dynamics and inputs. An overview of how developers assess project viability was provided to the Council at the October 1, 2024 City Council Meeting. See Agenda Item #17 @ <https://sammamishwa.civicweb.net/Portal/MeetingInformation.aspx?Org=Cal&Id=4675>

**4. Page 16 shows area difference between No action and Action alternative. How are we increasing the total parking in Action Alternative? What areas in the No Action alternative are getting converted to Parking?**

In the Urban Core area, the plan proposes a grid street network which requires shorter block lengths and results in more on-street parking to supplement private garage and surface parking spaces. For private/site development State law restricts parking requirements. In this past Washington State Legislative cycle the Legislature passed a parking reform bill that precludes a city from requiring parking with private development. See SB 5184. It should be noted that developers generally will not build projects that are not marketable and parking is a component of development however due to changes in state law we no longer can require parking.

**5. Page 18 has "Residential projects are subject to limitations on both density and overall unit capacity, and rely on a complex system of incentives to reach financial viability. However, with these incentive programs either running their course or being exhausted already, few projects are able to reach financial feasibility."**

**a. What is the definition of financial feasibility?**

Same response as item 3.b above. Since development (housing and commercial/retail space) is built by private developers, whether a project is financially feasible is up to the property owners and developers. Generally, if no development is happening under the development regulations that are in effect, then a project is not financially feasible. To better understand how changes to development regulations can influence the feasibility of different forms of development (town homes, low rise, mid rise, mixed use) are modeled and the anticipated return on investment is calculated based on market dynamics and inputs. An overview of how developers assess project viability was provided to the Council at the October 01, 2024 City Council Meeting. See Agenda Item #17 @ <https://sammamishwa.civicweb.net/Portal/MeetingInformation.aspx?Org=Cal&Id=4675>

**b. Who is taking the call on whether it is financially feasible or not?**

Financial feasibility is modeled based on current and forecasted market dynamics and inputs. This modeling is reliant in an assumption of a certain return on investment. As stated above, private developers and private property owners who are the ones who build the City's housing and commercial/retail space and ultimately decide what is feasible. An overview of how developers assess project viability was provided to the Council at the October 01, 2024 City Council Meeting. See Agenda Item #17 @ <https://sammamishwa.civicweb.net/Portal/MeetingInformation.aspx?Org=Cal&Id=4675>

While a return on investment figure is helpful, it's important to keep in mind that a developer takes into consideration an assessment of project risk which involves market absorption and uncertainty, material and labor cost, debt cost, regulatory delays, land carry, equity investment, and requirements by capital partners. As a result, a higher rate of return may be expected as a component of the project's risk assessment.

- c. **For whom are we deciding whether it is financially feasible or not (developer, city, residents?)**

This is for the developer as that is who is building the City's housing and commercial/retail space. If there is not an adequate return on investment, a developer will not build it.

- d. **What are the incentive programs that are running their course and exhausted?**

Affordable Housing Bonus Pool and Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs).

- e. **Does the Action Alternative open us to incentive programs and what are they?**

Yes, the Action Alternative proposes use of several incentives, including simplified development regulations, simplified development permit process, additional density to promote deeper affordability, and addition of a Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE) program.

## **6. On the Transportation section**

- a. **Why is the No Action option evaluated against Network Versions A, B and C?**

**Can we evaluate them and get numbers similar to the Action Alternative?**

The network versions A, B and C are part of the Action Alternative. Table 6 represents the No Action Alternative roadway network, which is the current road network included in the current plan. The Action Alternative includes consideration of Network Alternatives A, B and C. Alternative A is shown in Table 7, Alternative B in Table 8, and Alternative C in Table 9.

**Of particular concern is Section 4.4**

**"At this stage in the process, transportation improvements and multimodal network expansion preferences have not been evaluated in detail, and no final street type or alignment options have been selected"**

- b. **How is an SEIS being presented without detailed evaluation when we are literally doubling the housing?**

The SEIS does study the potential impacts and mitigation strategies associated with the no action and action alternatives.

- c. **The General strategies provided in the schedule are inadequate in the absence of a major employer in the TC itself?**

This appears to be a statement. If we are mistaken, we kindly ask you to clarify the request and re-submit it through the JotForm. Staff will be happy to provide a response.

- d. **PSRC RGC: From PSRC doc (<https://www.psrc.org/media/2643>)**

**"Urban Growth Centers play an important regional role, with dense existing jobs and housing, high quality transit service, and planning for significant growth.**

**As you see, the first requirement is jobs and the third one is high quality transit service. With neither of these in TC and simply putting dense housing and**

**hoping for GRC seems a dream! So how confident are we about this status being granted to Sammamish TC?**

The concept of the City pursuing a regional growth center designation is included on Page 52 of the City's Comprehensive Plan or with Policy LU 10.4. This was added as a strategy to help align the City's growth plans with regional infrastructure investments and was intended to help position favorably as a grant applicant for regional and County infrastructure investments. This was intended to apply first and foremost to Town Center as we already have a subarea plan in place and are going through the process of updating that plan. It was also intended to apply to the concept of a broader network of planned areas and corridor segment: Inglewood Subarea, Town Center Subarea, and Pine Lake Subarea – these are all identified in the City's award winning Comprehensive Plan as areas of consideration for future long term growth. The idea being that the City could pursue this type of designation across these areas and if achieved would result in recognition on a County or regional level which then results in the City being a recipient of regional infrastructure investment to support that designation in the long term which would result in funding to support delivery of infrastructure over time.

In response to the question, just because we have aspirational policy statements in our Comprehensive Plan towards some form of growth center status, whether at the County level or the regional level, there is a formal criteria based process that we would need to follow and would need to formally file application to petition for consideration. Ultimately the City's inclusion as a County or regional center is not up to the City. This is just a starting place. However, if accomplished it would open up the door to a different level of County or regional infrastructure investment. Currently, the Town Center Subarea is just a locally designated center and that does not result in our being a competitive grant applicant. This change would allow us to compete for County and regional grant dollars/funding.

It should be noted that we use the term "regional growth center" as the catch all and to broaden the opportunities, however there are different forms (sizes and intensities) of growth centers at the regional and county level. The most applicable to Sammamish today is the concept of a "countywide center" which is designated at the County level.

This policy from the King County Countywide Planning Policies summarizes this well:

**DP-4** Focus housing growth in the Urban Growth Area within cities, designated regional centers, countywide centers, locally designated local centers, areas of high employment, and other transit supported areas to promote access to opportunity. Focus employment growth within designated regional and countywide manufacturing/industrial centers and within locally designated local centers.