



Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods Meeting

April 8, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.
Peter Kirk Room, City Hall
123 Fifth Avenue
(South entrance, Lower level)

AGENDA

7:00-7:05 Introductions and ratification of March meeting minutes

7:05-7:30 Kirkland Parks Foundation

Sally Otten, Executive Director, will introduce us to the foundation and their first project with the Kirkland Rotary and the City of Kirkland.

7:30-8:00 Councilmember Conversations

Jay Arnold and Doreen Marchione

8:00-8:10 Neighborhood Safety Projects

Update from Kari Page and review draft letter in support of Kirkland Way/Railroad Ave Improvements

8:10-8:20 Public Comments

8:20-8:30 ARC update

- Joint meeting of Kirkland & Redmond City Councils
- Metropolitan Parks District on ballot? Other funding options
- Next steps for KAN

8:30-9:00 Liaison Reports and Hot Topics


- Kari Page, Neighborhood Services Coordinator, Neighborhood Service Report
- KirklandKan.org website
- Liaison Reports
- Neighborhood Leaders

Upcoming Agenda Items:

- Fall Food Drive, committee lead/planning
- Joint Planning Commission meeting agenda. Please give input to lisaamcc@hotmail.com

Upcoming Events/Deadlines:

- WAAAIk For Our Champs event to at Marina Park on Saturday, April 4, 7AM - noon. A route map is posted online at www.kirklandwa.gov/specialevents.
- Study Session with Council on Transportation Master Plan, Tuesday, April 15
- Earth Day at Juanita Bay, Saturday, April 18, see Green Kirkland Partnership's page for details
- City Council decision on Neighborhood Safety Program, Tuesday, April 21



The Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods (KAN) is a coalition of the City's Neighborhood Associations. KAN fosters communication and awareness of issues affecting the neighborhoods among the Neighborhood Associations, the City and appropriate entities. KAN is an effective, collegial voice for the neighborhoods and a valued resource for the City.

This project was the top priority for the Everest neighborhood for the Neighborhood Safety Program, but because it is not a bicycle or pedestrian safety project, it did not fit the criteria for funding. Also, the available NSP funding would have been insufficient to resolve the problem. However, all members of the panel felt strongly that this safety issue needs to be addressed as soon as possible.

We request a study as well as money for implementation in the CIP. The project currently in the CIP is so costly that it hasn't competed well in the past. Instead, a study should be done to find a feasible and practical solution that can be implemented in the near future.

Thank you for your consideration.

DRAFT



2015 Neighborhood Safety Program Application

Workshop: January 22 | Application Deadline: February 9

(Note: One project location per application)

Contact Information

Neighborhood Association Everest Neighborhood Chair: Anna Rising

Mailing Address: 751 8th St S

Phone: 425-828-8969 E-mail: amrising@gmail.com

Project Coordinator: David Aubry

Mailing Address: 109 Slater Street South Kirkland, WA 98033

Phone: _____ E-mail: daubry@hotmail.com

General Project Information

Project Name: Intersection Kirkland Wy & RR Ave Project Location: Kirkland Way & Railroad Ave

Project Estimate: \$ \$35,000

1. Please describe the safety problem or issue this project will address. (75–100 words) Please submit photo(s) with your application to illustrate the location and safety issue.
Vehicles travelling eastbound on Kirkland Way cannot see vehicles turning ahead onto Rail Road Avenue because of the train trestle. Vehicles travelling west on Kirkland Way often cannot see approaching vehicles as they are turning left onto Railroad Avenue. The vehicles travelling eastbound are often approaching at very high rates of speed. Drivers (and passengers) often feel like they narrowly miss being in a very serious collision while making this turn. This is one of the main entrance/exit's to the Everest Nighborhood.

Technical Evaluation (0–100 points)

2. Please describe how this project will address this safety need with a viable and creative solution resulting in a lasting, positive community impact. (75–100 words)
Because it is cost prohibitive to widen the trestle, residents would like to see a warning sign with flashing lights cautioning eastbound drivers that vehicles are turning ahead. This light would be triggered when a westbound vehicle stops or slows down to turn. It is believed that this warning light would cause the eastbound drivers to slow down and would help to avoid a serious accident in the future. This would benefit all who travel this route and drivers who are entering the Everest Neighbrhood at this location.

Neighborhood Panel Evaluation (0–50 points, 10 bonus points)

Neighborhood and Community Benefit (0–25 points)

3. Describe how and who will benefit from the project including those located within a ½ mile of the project (e.g. school, hospital, retirement facility, hospital, park, bus stop). Please use additional sheet if necessary.

Residents and visitors of the Everest Neighborhood who enter at this neighborhood entrance would feel a greater sense of safety when making this turn onto Railroad Avenue. This is one of the routes that drivers take to get to Everest Park and during Spring through Fall and many vehicles make this turn as parents take their children to Little League practice. This safety enhancement would also benefit residents of nearby neighborhoods who travel this route.

Neighborhood Association Support (0–10 points)

4. Priority Ranking for this Project (Priority 1 or 2) 1

Please outline the process your neighborhood used to select and prioritize this project.

This project was the top vote getter for the “suggest a CIP project” for the city. The issue of the safety at this intersection has frequently been brought to the city’s attention over the last 15-20 years and residents discuss their concerns about it at social events and Neighborhood meetings. The project was suggested at the November Neighborhood meeting and information regarding the three proposed projects was given to residents via email and the printed newsletter (hand-delivered to all households) in January. The attendees of the January Neighborhood Association meeting chose this as their #1 safety concern.

Project Readiness and Feasibility (0–15 points)

5. Did the Project Coordinator attend Neighborhood Safety Program Workshop? Yes ___ No X

6. Did City staff evaluate scope and ongoing maintenance of project? Yes X No ___

Please attach the **Project Scope** form that includes the project scope prepared by City staff.

7. Did City staff evaluate cost of project? Yes X No ___

Please attach the **Project Scope** form that includes a cost estimate of the project prepared by City staff.

Community Support (0–5 bonus points)

8. Does this project have (or need) community support? Yes X No ___ Do not know ___

If so, please demonstrate how you acquired that support.

Yes, please see answer #4. In addition, the Moss Bay Neighborhood Association has expressed support for this project.

Project Partnership Contributions (0–5 bonus points)

9. Will there be financial contributions or volunteer hours for this project? If so, please list below.

There is not an opportunity for volunteer hours to be contributed

Description	Non-City Contributions		
	Grant (\$)	Donation (\$)	Volunteer Hours (#)
Total Partnership Contribution			

Please submit Neighborhood Safety Program Application to:

City of Kirkland

Kari Page, Neighborhood Outreach Coordinator

123 5th Avenue

Kirkland, WA 98033

For any questions or further information, please contact Kari Page at kpage@kirklandwa.gov or (425) 587-3011.

Kirkland City Council / Redmond City Council
 Joint Meeting
 March 31, 2015

Topic: Indoor Recreation Facilities

	Kirkland	Redmond
Planning Status:	Indoor Recreation Facility Plan completed in 2007. Study to secure replacement of Aquatic Center at Juanita High School began in 2013. Planning for future aquatic, recreation, and community (ARC) Center is ongoing.	Recreation Facility Study completed in 2011. Recreation Building Master Plan process began in 2013. Assessment of existing recreation facilities and plans for future growth needs is ongoing.
Facility Type:	Multi-purpose community recreation center with 32-meter pool (option to 50-meter)	Multi-purpose community recreation center with 25-yard pool. Option to also expand existing facilities (senior center).
Facility Size:	87,000 – 105,000 sq ft	86,000 – 115,000 sq ft
Estimated Cost:	\$48 - \$67 million	\$69 - \$71 million
Land Acquisition Included:	No	No
Siting Status:	Preference for Totem Lake area. City seeking private property.	Preference for downtown/civic campus. Siting analysis in progress.
Funding:	Considering Metropolitan Park District (see attached)	No decisions at this time.
Timing	Considering November 2015 ballot measure	No decisions at this time.
Partners:	Desired. Outreach to potential partners. No commitments at this time.	Desired. Outreach to potential partners. No commitments at this time.

For more information:

Kirkland ARC Center: www.kirklandwa.gov – Search: ARC

Redmond Recreation Building Master Plan: <http://www.redmond.gov/PlansProjects/Parks/RBMP/>

Discussion Questions

1. If Kirkland voters approve a MPD in 2015 or 2016 as the funding mechanism to build the proposed ARC, would Redmond consider partnering with Kirkland on a similar timeline?
2. An MPD has authority to invest inside or outside the MPD borders (see attached). If Redmond can partner on a similar timeline, should the concept of a Redmond MPD or an expanded Metropolitan Park District encompassing both communities be further explored?
3. Are there other opportunities for Redmond and Kirkland to cooperate or partner on meeting the health, wellness, and indoor recreation needs of their respective communities?

Metropolitan Park District

Metropolitan Parks District (MPD) (RCW 35.61), a metropolitan park district may be created for the management, control, improvement, maintenance, and acquisition of parks, parkways, boulevards, and recreational facilities. MPDs have the authority to levy up to \$0.50 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation for operations and maintenance and another \$0.25 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation for capital projects, for a total of \$0.75 per \$1,000.

The purpose of an MPD is "to manage, control, improve, maintain and acquire parks, parkways, boulevards and recreational facilities within a defined area." MPDs are also permitted access to property taxes available to Junior Taxing Districts, thus granting an MPD an increment of taxing authority that is not otherwise available to cities. In effect, an MPD provides new resources that are outside the competition with other City departments for General Fund resources.

Tacoma voters approved an MPD one month after the original law was enacted in 1907. In 2001 the State amended the legislation in order to make the creation of MPDs more accessible for all cities, counties and unincorporated areas. The new legislation made it possible for an MPD to be created within a single jurisdiction and allowed existing city councils or county commissioners to act as the governing board of the MPD. As of 2015 there are 17 metropolitan park districts in Washington. The City of Seattle is the most recent city jurisdiction to form an MPD, with Seattle voters approving the Seattle Park District in November 2014.

At the Kirkland City Council retreat in February 2015, the Council received a presentation from Foster Pepper attorney Alice Ostdiek on the mechanics and merits of an MPD, as a potential funding mechanism for the Aquatic Recreation and Community Center (ARC).

Kirkland asked Ms. Ostdiek whether a Kirkland-only MPD could invest funds outside the boundary of the MPD if a partnership opportunity with Redmond or Bellevue emerged but on different timelines than the City of Kirkland is contemplating. Ms. Ostdiek provided the following analysis: "Such an arrangement outside the boundaries would be fine (so long as the Metro Park District is not exercising eminent domain outside of its boundaries). Some specific statutory references:

- RCW 35.61.130(2) references the power to "regulate, manage and control the parks...[etc.]...under its control...." (i.e., no reference to being located within its boundaries).
- RCW 35.61.130(3) specifically grants "...the power to improve, acquire, extend and maintain, open and lay out, parks, parkways, boulevards, avenues, aviation landings and playgrounds, within or without the park district...and may pay out moneys for the maintenance and improvement of any such parks, parkways, boulevards, avenues, aviation landings and playgrounds as now exist, or may hereafter be acquired, within or without the limits of said city and for the purchase of lands within or without the limits of said city, whenever it deems the purchase to be for the benefit of the public and for the interest of the park district, and for the maintenance and improvement thereof and for all expenses incidental to its duties..."
- RCW 67.20.010 provides that: "Any...separately organized park district acting through its board of park commissioners or other governing officers...shall have power, acting independently or in conjunction with the United States, the state of Washington, any county, city, park district, school district or town or any number of such public organizations to acquire any land within this state for park, playground, gymnasiums, swimming pools, field houses and other recreational facilities, bathing beach or public camp purposes and roads leading from said parks, playgrounds, gymnasiums, swimming pools, field houses and other recreational facilities, bathing beaches, or public camps to nearby highways by donation, purchase or condemnation, and to build, construct, care for, control, supervise, improve, operate and maintain parks, playgrounds, gymnasiums, swimming pools, field houses and other recreational facilities, bathing beaches, roads and public camps upon any such land, including the power to enact and enforce such police regulations not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the state of Washington, as are deemed necessary for the government and control of the same. The power of eminent domain herein granted shall not extend to any land outside the territorial limits of the governmental unit or units exercising said power."