

Q1. The following ideas were suggested at our June meeting and they appear here in the order that they are listed in our minutes. Thinking about each of these items as something that KAN would consider spending its time on, let us know if you think each suggestion would be - Of great interest to you, we should definitely do this! Moderate interest, I'm interested if several others are too Low interest, I don't object but I don't see it as priority for KAN No interest at all, I don't think this is something KAN should do Not sure, I'd need to know more before I prioritize this item

	Great interest	Moderate interest	Low interest	No interest	Not sure	Total
Stone Soup Initiative - bringing more neighborhoods into involvement	45.45% 5	45.45% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	9.09% 1	11
Strengthening the adherence to Neighborhood Plans	54.55% 6	9.09% 1	18.18% 2	0.00% 0	18.18% 2	11
Neighborhood University, letting people know more about neighborhood plans	27.27% 3	36.36% 4	27.27% 3	9.09% 1	0.00% 0	11
Oversight on the use of City consultants for studies, particularly surveys, for cost savings and effectiveness	18.18% 2	27.27% 3	9.09% 1	27.27% 3	18.18% 2	11
Making Neighborhood Association meetings more effective and worthwhile and to increase involvement	81.82% 9	9.09% 1	9.09% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
Attracting younger generation involvement in Neighborhood Associations and meetings	54.55% 6	36.36% 4	9.09% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
Understanding the "General" elements of the Comp Plan and	18.18% 2	36.36% 4	36.36% 4	0.00% 0	9.09% 1	11

	Great interest	Moderate interest	Low interest	No interest	Not sure	Total
the relevance to the individual neighborhood plans						
Long term parking solutions to reduce spillover	36.36% 4	36.36% 4	27.27% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
Metropolitan Park Districts - to be more literate on how they operate	27.27% 3	45.45% 5	27.27% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
Creating a clearer and more effective neighborhood planning process	54.55% 6	36.36% 4	9.09% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
Proactive, rather than reactive, collaboration with the Planning Commission	54.55% 6	36.36% 4	9.09% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
Increasing use of transit	9.09% 1	18.18% 2	54.55% 6	18.18% 2	0.00% 0	11
Picnic standardization	0.00% 0	9.09% 1	63.64% 7	27.27% 3	0.00% 0	11
Neighborhood handbook, meeting standardization, speaker bank	20.00% 2	60.00% 6	0.00% 0	20.00% 2	0.00% 0	10
Walkability and sidewalks	9.09% 1	36.36% 4	27.27% 3	18.18% 2	9.09% 1	11
Work with registered nonprofit organizations for green space acquisition	30.00% 3	10.00% 1	30.00% 3	30.00% 3	0.00% 0	10
More help and support within each Neighborhood for the Neighborhood Safety Program	18.18% 2	54.55% 6	27.27% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11

I'm very interested in the Green Space acquisition personally and am having a hard time separating that out from if KAN should be involved. If one goal is to benefit and improve neighborhoods, then I think it makes sense.

With the Metropolitan Park District being on the ballot this Fall, it is critical to become more literate on this right away and take the information back to our n'hood associations. Increasing the effectiveness of our core mission of keeping our n'hoods informed and effective should be an ongoing 1st priority; also supporting the NSP.

Some of my "ratings" are based on the fact that JNA has had no leaders last several terms and I know, for example, our neighborhood would never look at it

Continued on next page

Q2 So that we can further prioritize, let us know your top 5 priorities. There's some overlap here so if some items are very close, choose the one(s) that resonate most for you.

	1st priority	2nd priority	3rd priority	4th priority	5th priority	Total
– Stone Soup Initiative - bringing more neighborhoods into involvement	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	3
– Strengthening the adherence to Neighborhood Plans	40.00% 2	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	40.00% 2	5
– Neighborhood University, letting people know more about neighborhood plans	100.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2
– Oversight on the use of City consultants for studies, particularly surveys, for cost savings and effectiveness	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	33.33% 1	3
– Making Neighborhood Association meetings more effective and worthwhile and to increase involvement	14.29% 1	57.14% 4	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	14.29% 1	7
– Attracting younger generation involvement in Neighborhood Associations and meetings	42.86% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	42.86% 3	14.29% 1	7
– Understanding the "General" elements of the Comp Plan and the relevance to the individual neighborhood plans	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	0.00% 0	2
–	0.00% 0	20.00% 1	60.00% 3	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	5

	1st priority	2nd priority	3rd priority	4th priority	5th priority	Total
Long term parking solutions to reduce spillover						
Metropolitan Park Districts - to be more literate on how they operate	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1
Creating a clearer and more effective neighborhood planning process	0.00% 0	100.00% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4
Proactive, rather than reactive, collaboration with the Planning Commission	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	16.67% 1	33.33% 2	16.67% 1	6
Increasing use of transit	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0
Picnic standardization	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0
Neighborhood handbook, meeting standardization, speaker bank	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	2
Walkability and sidewalks	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1
Work with registered nonprofit organizations for green space acquisition	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2
More help and support within each Neighborhood for the Neighborhood Safety Program	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	20.00% 1	20.00% 1	60.00% 3	5

hard to do

We need to make the NSP suggestions easier and apparent th at someone making a suggestion is willing to champion the project. The neighborhood board cannot do all projects. I wish there could be some accountability for the neighborhood chair.

Q3. Consider the following statement: A successful Neighborhood Association informs and inspires their members and creates a sense of community. They evolve over time with older members becoming more or less active and emerging issues bringing new people in. With this ever changing climate, my association would benefit from a series of training sessions targeted at getting to know each other, building trust, finding common goals and creating a common vision for your neighborhood.

Answer Choices –	Responses –
– Strongly agree	36.36% 4
– Somewhat agree	36.36% 4
– Neither agree nor disagree	9.09% 1
– Somewhat disagree	9.09% 1
– Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
– Don't know	9.09% 1
Total	

I agree, if we had the participants! First, we need to figure out how to get more people involved, and then train them

Not sure how the turn-out would be. If there's a hot issue, that's when people come. Common goals and vision sound good, but most neighbors don't want to take the time on that. Not sure how to bring in people other than "the same ones who do everything."

Agree with the opening statement. To be useful, training sessions should not be too general. I think the issues find us. Training in how neighborhoods can be effective in responding to these issues as they arise could be most useful. Communication ideas are always helpful. In neighborhoods with more up-to-date plans, the vision was studied and created during that process.

But each new chair needs to be educated.

Q4. We've been discussing a joint meeting of KAN and the Planning Commission to occur later this year. Consider what short or long term results you'd like to have come from that meeting. In other words, instead of topics to discuss, what would you most like to achieve? Let us know as many as 3 possible hoped-for outcomes.

Most hoped for:

Ongoing working partnership with them

Define terms of Neighborhood Plans

Shift Planning Commission role from where it is a puppet for planning department & city council to where it advocates for existing residents

Better understanding of the duties of the PC, how much power it has, where it fits.

Better understanding of how the planning Commission makes its decisions

Understanding of the value KAN can provide the Commission

Become informed of what P.C is working on earlier in the process.

Communication of projects occurring in the neighborhood.

Planning Commission sees KAN as a partner and a resource and values and acts on our preferences and goals

Neighborhood Plans prioritized over the requests via PAR/CAR

Also hoping for:

KAN to have an active voice and advisory role in Planning

Establish schedule of Neighborhood Plan updates

Establish respected relationship between PC & KAN

Get a better feel for the type of people who serve on the PC, their motives for serving.

Learn how to influence the decision making.

Specific input on the neighborhood planning process

Develop a watchdog system that would keep KAN (and thus n'hood) members informed about what is happening at P.C. level. This could be a two-way street. I think we miss things by getting involved too late or not recognizing the significance to neighborhoods.

Get input from residents but then respond.

That the PC will not be a rubber stamp for the Council

The two groups considering each other as a resource rather than discrete groups

And also hoping for:

KAN to have active engagement with City Planners to ensure adherence to plans & goals

Strengthen Neighborhood Plan enforcement (aka fewer developer amendments/variances granted)

Have PC consider KAN as an informed resource

A better relationship with KAN and thus the neighborhoods to get people's voices heard.

Identify how further collaboration may occur

Increase P.C. interest in having KAN weigh in on issues.

What is the benefit of a neighborhood plan.

That more residents will be motivated to give feedback to the PC and that they will feel heard and that their opinions are valued and acted upon

That a joint meeting becomes an annual event that benefits both groups and more importantly, our neighborhoods and our City

Continued on next page

**Q5. Now, some questions about the Neighborhood Safety Program (NSP).
First let us know about your personal involvement – select all that applied for
you in 2015 –**

Answer Choices	Responses
– Participated in the neighborhood association project identification, scoping, or selection process	80.00% 8
– Submitted a project idea	40.00% 4
– Completed a project application	20.00% 2
– Attended the workshop	20.00% 2
– Participated on the Neighborhood Safety Panel	30.00% 3
– Helped my own Neighborhood Association to prioritize its own submission(s)	70.00% 7
– None of the above, did not participate	0.00% 0
Total Respondents: 10	

Q6. The NSP motivated and energized our Neighborhood Association

Answer Choices	Responses
– Strongly agree	18.18% 2
– Somewhat agree	36.36% 4
– Neither agree nor disagree	18.18% 2
– Somewhat disagree	18.18% 2
– Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
– Don't know	9.09% 1
Total	11

we pretty much supported a project from another neighborhood. But, I like and support the concept!

On question 5, I can't recall. I seem to remember identifying projects, but maybe not.

No effort by our chair to solicit projects or show follow-up.

The program also very much disappointed our NA because the issue that our residents felt most passionately about (the dangerous intersection at Kirkland way and Rail road Ave) was not seen as an item of concern by the City and no plans to improve this very dangerous area seem to be in the works

Q7. Based on my involvement, the NSP process felt open, transparent, fair and resulted in important safety projects for Kirkland's neighborhoods.

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	54.55% 6
Somewhat agree	9.09% 1
Neither agree nor disagree	9.09% 1
Somewhat disagree	27.27% 3
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
Don't know	0.00% 0
Total	11

Seemed cumbersome

The number of suggestions demonstrated that it was fair and open.

It felt like it was all of those things for all the projects that got funded

Q8. The technical and neighborhood panel project ranking criteria was meaningful, easy to understand, and reflected the goals of the program.

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	18.18% 2
Somewhat agree	45.45% 5
Neither agree nor disagree	0.00% 0
Somewhat disagree	9.09% 1
Strongly disagree	18.18% 2
Don't know	9.09% 1
Total	11

But I can't recall the specifics.

I would need to review it again to refresh my memory of the criteria, but it seemed to work pretty well.

I feel like the ranking process is too confusing and difficult. With so many projects it is very hard to keep them all straight. It is also hard to rank such a large list

It was still hard to follow some of the actual submittals to know what was being proposed. Thankfully staff had it all well thought out with visuals so that we could see the actual site and understand each proposal.

Q9. The neighborhood panel meetings were productive, efficient and resulted in a broad and in-depth debate on each project.

Answer Choices	Responses
– Strongly agree	27.27% 3
– Somewhat agree	36.36% 4
– Neither agree nor disagree	9.09% 1
– Somewhat disagree	0.00% 0
– Strongly disagree	9.09% 1
– Don't know	18.18% 2
Total	11

I am not sure if broad and in-depth is accurate because of the time limitations. We had a lot to go through in limited time.

I say somewhat because some of the programs that I didn't see a lot of value in (it didn't sound like they would impact many people) got funded.

Q10. In your opinion, how could the Neighborhood Safety Program process be improved?

Answer Choices	Responses
– No changes	25.00% 2
– I've entered some suggestions below	75.00% 6
Total	8

not sure, but somehow easier to submit and review

Be very clear about the role of City Staff and at what points and for what reasons it will change the program criteria.

More one-on-one staff involvement at the outset to identify a range of projects that are likely feasible. So each neighborhood would sign-up for an appointment to meet with the staff team and review potential projects together. Also, need to raise the \$50K cap as there is little that can be done for that amount.

One thing I liked about the process we used is that we used one of our regular meetings to review and make the final selections for projects the neighborhood would submit. Prior notices on email attracted quite a few people to that meeting, and it seemed that people felt they were heard and had a say. It was a challenge getting through everything, but it worked and people were energized and involved.

More publicity around submitting ideas. Also the knowledge that project needs an advocate.

I would somehow like to see the scoring process improved - I am not sure what that is. Also, there doesn't seem to be questions as to how many people each project would impact. I got the sense that for a few of the projects in Juanita that very few people would benefit

A short youtube video (2 minutes max) of each site in advance of the meeting would help, so that we could better "see" prior to the meeting. The NSP panelists who were not on KAN seemed to be the most challenged, in my observation, as some seemed more in touch with their own project and advocating for that, in some instances even to the point of raising the most challenges to the proposals of other neighborhoods. Some orientation on project philosophy and purpose, for panelists not already on KAN, might have been helpful. To be fair, this was true only for some of the NSP-only participants.