



---

## Concurrency tests

---

**Kate Langsdorf** <KLangsdorf@sammamish.us>

Fri, May 15, 2020 at 4:30 PM

To: Miki Mullor <miki@sammamish.news>, Cheryl Paston <cpaston@sammamish.us>

Cc: Dave Rudat <DRudat@sammamish.us>

Dear Miki,

Below is Cheryl's response to your inquiry. Please let us know if there's any other information you'd like from us, and have a great weekend!

All the best,

Kate

---

Dear Miki,

After the Council directed us to remove the Sahalee project from the traffic model last August, staff held internal discussions to figure out what the implications were for concurrency testing. It was determined that as long as a concurrency application did not make Sahalee worse, i.e. it would not be allowed to send a single additional PM peak hour trip down Sahalee by the pipeline year of 2025, the Concurrency Certificate could be approved. That is what we told Josh Anderson of DEA. He subsequently ran Concurrency Tests 13 and 14, neither of which resulted in a trip down Sahalee and that is what he stated in his email you copied.

However, Concurrency Test #15 did result in sending a trip down Sahalee in the PM peak hour, although it did not change the corridor's projected 2025 V/C ratio. As a reminder, the concurrency tests are run for the duration of the adopted six-year TIP. At that point, Josh asked us for clarification regarding which criteria to use to determine whether the project would "make Sahalee worse", i.e. a single trip or increasing the projected 2025 V/C ratio of either the segment or corridor. After additional internal staff discussions, we realized we had mistakenly used the single trip criteria and instead should have used the V/C ratio since that is on which our segment and corridor LOS standards were based ([SMC 14A.10.050](#)). We informed Josh about the change and that's reflected in the last email of his you copied. I just checked with Josh who confirmed that Concurrency Tests 13 and 14 did not change the projected 2025 V/C ratio for the Sahalee corridor or of its individual segments.

I realize we had inadvertently caused confusion about using two different criteria for determining what would make Sahalee worse, and it was certainly not intentional. I'm glad to report that none of the Concurrency Tests #13-15 have increased the projected V/C ratio for the Sahalee corridor or its segments up through the pipeline year of 2025.

Regards,

Cheryl Paston, P.E., M.A.

Acting Public Works Director

**Kate Langsdorf** | Communications Manager (Contract) | City of Sammamish

**office:** (425) 295-0555 | **email:** [klangsdorf@samamish.us](mailto:klangsdorf@samamish.us)

Sammamish City Hall, 801 228<sup>th</sup> [Ave SE, Sammamish, WA 98075](#)

---

**From:** Kate Langsdorf  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2020 3:52 PM  
**To:** Miki Mullor <[miki@samamish.news](mailto:miki@samamish.news)>; Cheryl Paston <[cpaston@samamish.us](mailto:cpaston@samamish.us)>  
**Cc:** Dave Rudat <[DRudat@samamish.us](mailto:DRudat@samamish.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concurrency tests

Thank you for writing, Miki! Cheryl will have a response for you by COB Friday at the latest, and possibly as early as tomorrow afternoon.

Have a great afternoon,

Kate

**Kate Langsdorf** | Communications Manager (Contract) | City of Sammamish

**d:** (425) 295-0555 | **le:** [klangsdorf@samamish.us](mailto:klangsdorf@samamish.us)

Sammamish City Hall, 801 228<sup>th</sup> [Ave SE, Sammamish, WA 98075](#)

---

**From:** Miki Mullor <[miki@samamish.news](mailto:miki@samamish.news)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2020 1:26 PM  
**To:** Cheryl Paston <[cpaston@samamish.us](mailto:cpaston@samamish.us)>  
**Cc:** Dave Rudat <[DRudat@samamish.us](mailto:DRudat@samamish.us)>; David Pyle <[dpyle@samamish.us](mailto:dpyle@samamish.us)>; Kate Langsdorf <[KLangsdorf@samamish.us](mailto:KLangsdorf@samamish.us)>  
**Subject:** Concurrency tests

**[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Ms. Paston -

This is to follow up on our ongoing investigation of handling of concurrency tests by the city.

Following the City Council's decision to not let you include the unfunded sahalee project in concurrency modeling, your department indeed stopped doing so, yet continued to issue certificates, even with Sahalee failing.

Attached for example is concurrency test #13 (of the total 11 tests we have reviewed).

In it, Mr. Anderson of David Evans & Associates ("DEA") stated:

Steven,

Enclosed is the memo report for Concurrency Test #13. The 2020-2025 TIP was incorporated into test #10. Recent City Council direction to remove the North Sahalee Way corridor project from Concurrency tests has also been incorporated into this test. Concurrency Test #13 passed, as there are no intersection failures, and no new trips on the now failing North Sahalee Way Corridor.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,  
Josh Anderson

Anderson takes the position that as long as in his judgment a development doesn't cause a concurrency failure to become worse (or trigger new failures) - the development passed the test.

Yet, in the the very same report, Adnerson states the following:

**Concurrency Evaluation: PASS**

**Model Basis:** The above concurrency test developments were added into the 2025 Citywide VISUM Pipeline Travel Demand Forecasting Model (pared with the 2016 base model) that incorporated Concurrency Test #12.

**Link Standard:** The City of Sammamish has developed their own methodology for calculating v/c, the methodology is being called "HCM modified". No roadway segment may exceed an HCM modified v/c of 1.40 in either the AM or PM analysis hours. No roadway corridor may exceed an HCM modified v/c or 1.10 in either the AM or PM analysis hours.

The above is consistent with SMC 14A.10.050 (3) that states:

"(3) In conducting the concurrency test in accord with this chapter, the City shall apply the level of service standards for the concurrency intersections as designated in subsection (1) of this section and for the concurrency corridors and segments in subsection (2) of this section. If any intersection, corridor or segment operates at or better than the level of service standards, the concurrency certificate shall be granted. If **any** concurrency intersection, **corridor or segment operates worse than the level of service standards, the concurrency certificate will be denied,**"

This scenario repeats itself in each of the following concurrency tests your department conducted since.

in subsequent tests (starting test #15), Anderson changed the language:

**Link Standard:** The City of Sammamish has developed their own methodology for calculating v/c, the methodology is being called "HCM modified". No roadway segment may exceed an HCM modified v/c of 1.40 in either the AM or PM analysis hours. No roadway corridor may exceed an HCM modified v/c or 1.10 in either the AM or PM analysis hours. There are no new or worsened failures of Sammamish segments or corridors for this current test.

Could you please explain on what basis these tests have passed and what supports Anderson methodology of allowing a failing link in a test ?

Sincerely

Miki Mullor

█

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.

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.