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I am pleased to announce the publication of the City of Kirkland’s 2012 Performance Measures Report.

The report is designed around the City Council’s ten goals for Kirkland—Balanced Transportation, Dependable Infrastructure, Economic Development, Human Services, Neighborhoods, Public Safety, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Financial Stability and the Environment—and the long-term goals associated with each of those goal-areas.

Our hope is that you will use this report to not only stay connected to City programs and services, but also to connect to other members of the community and get involved with the City’s community-based initiatives. One of those initiatives is Kirkland’s public involvement campaign: “Kirkland 2035: Your Voice. Your Vision. Your Future.” City leaders are developing that outreach campaign to hear how they would steer Kirkland into the next two decades. The contents of this report provide some context about where we are now as a City and how we should grow into the future.

The City Council and staff use this report to budget, develop business strategies, and to prioritize work projects. From public works to information technology, these measures stretch across all of our departments and service areas. Every City budget includes a copy of the performance measure report.

The Performance Measures Report is compiled each year to assess how the City is doing to achieve the community’s vision of being “an attractive, vibrant, and inviting place to live, work and visit.”

As I noted last year, we are excited to share our report card with you and look forward to improving every day to enhance Kirkland as a wonderful place to live, work and play.

Joan McBride
Mayor, City of Kirkland
The purpose of the City Council Goals is to articulate key policy and service priorities for Kirkland. Council goals guide the allocation of resources through the budget and capital improvement program to assure that organizational work plans and projects are developed that incrementally move the community towards the stated goals. Council goals are long term in nature. The City’s ability to make progress towards their achievement is based on the availability of resources at any given time. Implicit in the allocation of resources is the need to balance levels of taxation and community impacts with service demands and the achievement of goals. In addition to the Council goal statements, there are operational values that guide how the City organization works toward goal achievement:

- **Regional Partnerships** – Kirkland encourages and participates in regional approaches to service delivery to the extent that a regional model produces efficiencies and cost savings, improves customer service and furthers Kirkland’s interests beyond our boundaries.
- **Efficiency** – Kirkland is committed to providing public services in the most efficient manner possible and maximizing the public’s return on their investment. We believe that a culture of continuous improvement is fundamental to our responsibility as good stewards of public funds.
- **Accountability** – The City of Kirkland is accountable to the community for the achievement of goals. To that end, meaningful performance measures will be developed for each goal area to track our progress toward the stated goals. Performance measures will be both quantitative and qualitative with a focus on outcomes. The City will continue to conduct a statistically valid citizen survey every two years to gather qualitative data about the citizen’s level of satisfaction. An annual Performance Measure Report will be prepared for the public to report on our progress.
- **Community** – The City of Kirkland is one community composed of multiple neighborhoods. Achievement of Council goals will be respectful of neighborhood identity while supporting the needs and values of the community as a whole.

The City Council Goals are dynamic. They should be reviewed on an annual basis and updated or amended as needed to reflect citizen input as well as changes in the external environment and community demographics.

Kirkland is an attractive, vibrant and inviting place to live, work and visit. Our lakefront community is a destination for residents, employees and visitors. Kirkland is a community with a small-town feel, retaining its sense of history, while adjusting gracefully to changes in the twenty-first century.

**NEIGHBORHOODS**

The citizens of Kirkland experience a high quality of life in their neighborhoods.

Council Goal: Achieve active neighborhood participation and a high degree of satisfaction with neighborhood character, services and infrastructure.

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

Ensure that all those who live, work and play in Kirkland are safe.

Council Goal: Provide for public safety through a community-based approach that focuses on prevention of problems and a timely response.

**HUMAN SERVICES**

Kirkland is a diverse and inclusive community that respects and welcomes everyone and is concerned for the welfare of all.

Council Goal: Support a regional coordinated system of human services designed to meet the basic needs of our community and remove barriers to opportunity.

**BALANCED TRANSPORTATION**

Kirkland values an integrated multi-modal system of transportation choices.

Council Goal: Reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles and improve connectivity and multi-modal mobility in Kirkland in ways that maintain and enhance travel times, safety, health and transportation choices.

**PARKS AND RECREATION**

Kirkland values an exceptional park, natural areas and recreation system that provides a wide variety of opportunities aimed at promoting the community’s health and enjoyment.

Council Goal: Provide and maintain natural areas and recreational facilities and opportunities that enhance the health and well being of the community.

**HOUSING**

The City’s housing stock meets the needs of a diverse community by providing a wide range of types, styles, size and affordability.

Council Goal: Ensure the construction and preservation of housing stock that meets a diverse range of incomes and needs.

**FINANCIAL STABILITY**

Citizens of Kirkland enjoy high quality services that meet the community’s priorities.

Council Goal: Provide a sustainable level of core services that are funded from predictable revenue.

**ENVIRONMENT**

We are committed to the protection of the natural environment through an integrated natural resource management system.

Council Goal: Protect and enhance our natural environment for current residents and future generations.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Kirkland has a diverse, business-friendly economy that supports the community’s needs.

Council Goal: Attract, retain and grow a diverse and stable economic base that supports city revenues, needed goods and services and jobs for residents.

**DEPENDABLE INFRASTRUCTURE**

Kirkland has a well-maintained and sustainable infrastructure that meets the functional needs of the community.

Council Goal: Maintain levels of service commensurate with growing community requirements at optimum life-cycle costs.
Measuring performance provides a quantifiable way in which to see successes and areas in need of improvement. The City’s progress is measured against data from previous years, targets set in master plans and benchmarks with other communities. By measuring our programs using a variety of data, we can see how Kirkland’s present state relates to its past indicators and future plans.

Ultimately, the measures provide direction for resource allocation and help determine which policies and programs most effectively serve the community’s needs.

Performance measures offer transparency and allow the public to hold the City accountable. The report highlights important City programs and services to inform the community what the City is doing for you. The report provides insight into costs, successes, areas of improvement, and citizen satisfaction as determined by the biennial community survey.

**Format of Report**

Performance measures provide a logical connection between City resources and desirable community outcomes through a “so that” format. If the City devotes resources to a service area, then it should be able to achieve desired outcomes in line with the Council goal.

Each service area includes a performance measures chart of City inputs, outputs, results and outcomes, and an analysis of the measures based on benchmarks and targets. Each section provides a description of why the specific measures were chosen, how the City is performing, and how the City is working towards achieving the goals.

Data comes from budgeted funding in final budget and Capital Improvement Program documents, department program tracking, master plans, and community and business surveys in even years. Because of the expanded scope of this report, some measures have been developed this year or are being developed for future reports, and have not had data collected. Goals and performance measures will be reviewed annually.

**The Future of the Report**

In recent years the City has been working to develop its performance management framework to create greater consistency across all strategic documents, while measuring performance in a clear and concise manner that allows citizens to track how their city is doing.

This system will lead to changes in format, and potentially content, in next year’s performance report. These changes will include an at a glance graphical representation of how the City is working to be affordable, sustainable and responsive to community needs. These graphics can currently be found in the 2013-2014 Budget Message and their inclusion in future performance reports represents the increased consistency across different City reports.

The fundamental basis on which this report is built will not change. The 10 goal areas will remain the same and many of the same performance measures will continue to be used. Tracking the same performance measures over time is essential as it allows departments and citizens to see how performance has changed against a prior standard.
The 2012 Performance Measures Report serves as a report card on the City’s progress toward the ten goal areas adopted by the City Council in 2009. The report shows the relative resources devoted to each area, the volume of outputs for each area and the outcomes or actual results. Measuring program outcomes can be the most challenging exercise but is the most meaningful as it expresses whether our efforts are accomplishing the intended results.

During the most recent reporting period from 2009 to 2011, the City experienced a series of financial challenges that required the City Council to make budget cuts in several priority areas. However, the City has worked hard to find ways to maintain levels of service despite reduced resources. The resulting cuts are evidenced in the changes in resource allocations in some areas.

The annexation of the North Juanita, Finn Hill and Kingsgate (now known as Evergreen Hill) neighborhoods in June 2011 increased the population of the City from 48,000 to 81,000. This large population growth means the City now provides services to a larger area and population, while bringing additional revenue.

**Neighborhoods** continue to evidence a high degree of satisfaction and participation in neighborhood programs. Communication channels such as listserv subscriptions and interactive websites have seen an increase in the number of subscribers. There was a decline in attendance and questions at City Council meetings in 2012. This followed a large increase in 2011 as citizens were engaged in the annexation process.

**Public Safety** services consistently rate as a high priority service and citizen surveys indicate that residents feel safe walking in their neighborhoods during the day and at night. Fire and EMS response times fall below the targets, although improved 911 dispatch and turn out protocols are improving response times.

**Human Services** has worked to maintain its level of spending per capita, which is largely provided through contracts with non-profit agencies and coordinated through a series of regional efforts. Funded agencies have continued to meet the goals set out for them in City contracts.

**Balanced Transportation** efforts continued in 2012 with the purchase of 5.75 miles of the BNSF railroad right of way, creating the Cross Kirkland Corridor from the South Kirkland Park and Ride to the City’s northern boundary in the Totem Lake Business District.

**Parks and Recreation** funding increased in 2012 following three years of budget declines. This was made possible after voters passed Proposition 2 in the November election.

**Housing** diversity and affordability are a function of local zoning regulations and regional investments made through A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH). The City has been able to maintain its annual contributions to ARCH at a level commensurate with other local jurisdictions. Local affordable housing options continue to be added at a slow but steady pace.

**Financial Stability** is measured by the City’s bond rating and reserve balances. The City Council used reserves to balance the 2009 and 2010 Budget in order to maintain services. Beginning in 2011, the City was able to begin replenishing reserves. General purpose reserve balances remain strong and the City’s underlying financial policies and practices were strongly endorsed by Standard and Poor’s AAA rating of the City’s credit.

**Environment** is a consideration in many of the City’s policies and operational practices. The City has established ambitious targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing waste to the landfill and improving natural habitat. Kirkland continues to have the highest solid waste diversion rate in King County due to its innovative and readily-accessible recycling programs.

**Economic Development** is most important during economically challenging times but also most difficult. The high rate of office vacancies and decreased employment directly reflect the recession’s impact on Kirkland. Citizens and businesses are satisfied with Kirkland as a place to do business and a place where residents have access to many of the goods and services they need.

**Dependable Infrastructure** is basic to a city’s purpose. In 2012 the citizens of Kirkland voted to pass Proposition 1, which provides funds for the City to improve the condition of streets. The City will proactively complete projects that will achieve the goals of the Levy as soon as possible.

The City Council will review the City’s performance on a regular basis to ensure they continue to express the community’s needs and measure the community’s progress towards the adopted goals and vision.
**GOAL**

Achieve active neighborhood participation and a high degree of satisfaction with neighborhood character, services and infrastructure.

### MEASURE | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Target
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Subscriptions/number of e-bulletins sent out | 802/161 | 917/139 | 1086/137 | 1154/340 | N/A
Neighborhood CIP funding | 0 | $25,000 | 0 | 0 | N/A
Number/amount of neighborhood matching grants | 7/$22,547 | 9/$5,493 | 11/$11,130 | 13/14,570 | N/A
Volunteer hours in neighborhood projects | $75,170 | $62,162 | $31,776 | $30,836 | N/A
Number of attendees at City Council neighborhood meetings* | 141 | 68* | 262* | 67 | 50+ per meeting
Number of questions submitted to City Council neighborhood meetings | 95 | 21 | 100 | 34 | N/A
KAN Neighborhood University attendees* | 45 | ** | 130 | 20 | N/A

---

Citizens surveyed are satisfied with neighborhood growth and character (satisfactory or better)

No survey in 2009 | 54% | No survey in 2011 | *** | 90%

Citizens surveyed are satisfied with neighborhood infrastructure and maintenance (satisfactory or better)

** | 90% | 81% | 90%

---

*There was one less City Council meeting with the neighborhoods in 2010 and 2012.

**Neighborhood University postponed from Fall 2010 to after Annexation May 2011.

*** Question not included in the 2012 Survey

---

**HOW DO WE MEASURE NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES?**

Citizen satisfaction with neighborhood services and infrastructure demonstrates how well the City understands the needs of residents and subsequently invests in neighborhood planning and capital improvements.

Rates of citizen participation in neighborhood activities reflect the neighborhood organizing work done through the Neighborhood Services Division.

E-bulletin communications, neighborhood funding and outreach programs demonstrate how the City actively connects residents with resources and stimulates participation in local government.
WHY DID WE CHOOSE THESE MEASURES?

These measures account for the neighborhood organizing work done through the Neighborhood Services Division of the City Manager’s Office. This is only one element of what influences a citizen’s satisfaction with government and their neighborhood. E-bulletin communications, neighborhood association funding, and outreach programs demonstrate how the City actively connects residents with resources and stimulates participation in local government.

WHAT IS THE CITY OF KIRKLAND’S ROLE?

The City is committed to supporting neighborhoods by:
- Providing neighborhoods with resources to address needs;
- Strengthening the relationship between City Hall and the neighborhoods;
- Supporting the neighborhood associations in expanding their membership;
- Increasing awareness of City services; and
- Building partnerships to improve Kirkland’s neighborhoods.

The Neighborhood Services staff provides outreach and resources through personal contact, e-bulletins and the City website. The City distributes neighborhood matching grants for neighborhood projects. Project creation and volunteerism enable residents to actively participate local government, build community and improve the quality of life in their neighborhood.

Neighborhood Services connects residents with citywide issues by coordinating City Council meetings in four neighborhoods per year. Citizens can talk directly to City Council members and ask questions regarding neighborhood and citywide issues.

The Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods (KAN), with the help of the City, leads yearly Neighborhood University sessions. These classes teach residents about city government, neighborhood organizing, and leadership. KAN meets five times a year to exchange information about neighborhood issues, network, provide educational opportunities for neighborhood leaders, and connect with city services.

WHAT ELSE INFLUENCES THESE MEASURES?

The City’s annual funding for Neighborhood Matching Grants has varied significantly over the past few years (from $3,500 to $615 to roughly $1,000 per neighborhood). Regardless of this variation, the neighborhood volunteer match has remained relatively constant and more than doubled the City’s funds. There was one less City Council Meeting in the neighborhoods in 2012 because of scheduling issues.

The new neighborhoods are actively participating in Neighborhood U, Civics Academy, Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods meetings and City Council meetings with the Neighborhoods.

Success Story

Construction of asphalt walkway connecting a neighborhood to the Rose Hill Business District and Lake Washington High School.

Without Neighborhood Connection Program funding, staff looks for creative ways to bring scarce resources together to address community concerns.

A group of neighbors in the South Rose Hill Neighborhood worked with the City to create a safe walking route on a busy street adjacent to the Rose Hill Business District. 122nd Avenue NE south of NE 85th Street is a cut through for Lake Washington High School and connection to the busy NE 85th Street Corridor. Spill over parking from nearby retail businesses often blocked the social trail along the road and forced pedestrians onto the street.

Street Improvement Opportunity Funds were used to pay for inhouse crews to install an asphalt walkway creating a continuous safe walking path from NE 80th Street to NE 85th Street.
Public Safety

**Goal**

Provide for public safety through a community-based approach that focuses on prevention of problems and a timely response.

**How do we measure public safety?**

Staffing and funding help the City to provide timely responses to emergencies. Response times and containing fires to the area of origin are proxy measures for good performance. The likelihood of a successful outcome is higher the faster emergency services can reach the site of the emergency. Factors that affect response times include the distances between a station and the incident, geographical barriers and traffic.

Measures from the Community Survey provide standard indicators of how citizens feel about public safety and how well they are prepared for emergencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Police Services Funding</td>
<td>$16,557,994</td>
<td>$15,613,828</td>
<td>$22,763,553</td>
<td>$24,139,113</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fire and Emergency Management Services Funding</td>
<td>$15,665,379</td>
<td>$15,480,119</td>
<td>$18,119,738</td>
<td>$18,137,506</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Police FTE’s (authorized) per 1,000 population</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid fire and EMS staffing per 1,000 population served²</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS response times under 5 minutes</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire response times under 5.5 minutes</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building fires contained to area of origin</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens have at least two working smoke detectors in their residence</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens are prepared for a three day emergency</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens feel safe walking in their neighborhoods after dark</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens feel safe walking in their neighborhoods during the day</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The number of police officers hired
² Includes King County Fire District 41 because City of Kirkland has contracted with King County to provide fire services
*Community survey occurs in even years
Overall, public safety was rated as both the most important, and highest performing area, by citizens of Kirkland in the 2012 Citizen Survey for Kirkland. This rating reflects both the standards of law enforcement and fire services as well as the fact that these areas remain a community priority.

Funding and staffing levels remained mostly consistent between 2011 and 2012, although there was a slight decrease in fire and EMS staffing per 1,000 people.

In 2012 the percentage of residents that reported feeling safe walking their neighborhoods during the day (98%) and at night (79%) was at or above target.

EMS response times remain at the same level as in 2011, and are below target. There was also a reduction in the percentage of fires that were contained to the building of origin.

There has been a slight increase in the percentage of Kirkland residents who have at least two working smoke detectors in their house, although there has been no increase in the percentage of residents prepared for a three day emergency.

In 2012 the Police Department continued its commitment to community-based, high visibility strategies to reduce crime and maintain a high level of confidence in public safety. By utilizing many resources from Federal, State and locally funded programs the department is able to proactively address safety concerns from traffic and pedestrian safety to motor vehicle and identity theft.

The department continues to operate with a high degree of efficiency by utilizing accurate localized data to drive operations towards a more effective deployment of resources.

The City also finalized plans for a new public safety building. The new location will be more centrally located to the new outline of the City. The Police Department, Court and Jail operations will all be located in one facility, naturally aligning efficiencies.

The Kirkland Fire Department is a highly trained and well equipped organization, with the protection of our resident’s lives, property and the environment as its focus. The Fire Department provides fire prevention inspections of commercial properties, fire related plan checks, fire investigations activities, emergency medical response and transport, fire suppression, hazardous material release responses, and emergency management to the over 80,000 residents of Kirkland. The members of the Kirkland Fire Department provide these services with the very highest degree of dedication and professionalism.

The Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program teaches citizens how to be prepared and trains them to be able to help others after a disaster. The 26-hour CERT course is taught by a trained team of first responders and other professionals. Training covers the Incident Command System, disaster preparedness, fire suppression, basic medical assessment and first aid, light search & rescue operations, and disaster psychology. The 8 week course is completed with a 4 to 5 hour drill that tests the CERTs on all aspects of the course.

CERT members understand the risks disasters pose to people and property. They have taken steps to reduce hazards and lessen the impact of disasters once they have occurred. When disasters overwhelm local response capability, they are trained to take care of themselves and give critical support to their family members, neighbors, and others in their immediate area until professionals arrive. When first responders arrive, CERT’s will be able to provide them with useful information and support. Later, they will be able to help City reestablish stability to the community. CERTs may also help with non-emergency projects that help improve the safety of their community.

The CERT program is administered by the Office of Emergency Management/Fire Department. The first class of CERTs graduated in early 2006 with close to 300 citizens having participated in the course since then, this includes three present City Council members. In 2012 the CERT Program graduated 42 citizens as CERT members. The program is primarily CERT Volunteer driven and has a very active “Leadership Team” to take the Kirkland CERT program into the future.
Support a coordinated regional system of human services designed to meet the basic needs of our community and remove barriers to opportunity.

### HOW DO WE MEASURE HUMAN SERVICES?

The City contracts with a range of non-profit agencies that have multiple funding sources. The City uses measures such as funding level, and funding per capita to help measure our commitment to the non-profits supported by the City. In addition, the non-profits have service delivery goals they are held accountable for meeting and the City tracks these outcomes.

Human services needs are not tied by City boundaries and the need for these services often outpaces a cities’ ability to pay for them. To help manage this problem the City collects anecdotal reports from agencies about the level of need and looks at numbers of people turned away to help determine the level of need at different organizations.

#### City funds human service agencies

So that...

The City supports programs that help people meet basic needs

So that...

Kirkland meets the needs of our community

### MEASURE 2009 2010 2011 2012 Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total human services funding</td>
<td>$2,440,583</td>
<td>$2,440,583</td>
<td>$2,202,081</td>
<td>$2,513,170</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services funding per capita</td>
<td>$49.80</td>
<td>$50.02</td>
<td>$32.29</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programs funded in each community goal area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Food to Eat and Roof Overhead</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supportive Relationships within Families, Neighborhoods and Communities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safe Haven from All Forms of Violence and Abuse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Health Care to Be as Physically and Mentally Fit as Possible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Education and Job Skills to Lead an Independent Life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Eastside residents requesting assistance that agencies were able to serve</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded agencies meet or exceed human services contract goals</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of applicant programs receiving funding from the City</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>100% of eligible programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Includes all human services funding as listed in the budget.

*Measure being developed for future reports
Demand for human services in Kirkland remains high. Programs supported by grant funding deliver numerous essential services to provide a safety net for Kirkland residents.

The City’s investment in human services has continued to increase. The number of funded programs has grown from seven in 1987 to 56 in the 2011-2012 biennium. The amount of funding has also increased to $2,513,170; a rise of $311,089 since 2011. The 2012 annexation of 31,718 new residents to the city did cause a fall in per capita funding for Human Services.

The percentage of funded agencies reaching or exceeding their targets remained high at 94%. The City will continue to work with funded agencies to ensure this number gets to the target of 100%.

The City collects regular reports from the agencies about the difference they make in Kirkland, including the case study on this page. We are working on measures that will help to capture to quantify this impact in the future.

The City of Kirkland acts as a catalyst for local human services organizations by providing funding, leadership and other assistance to those making a difference in the lives of Kirkland residents. The City works both on its own and with other cities in King County to enable human services agencies to access funding and to evaluate their progress and the value they deliver to the city and region.

This support includes:

• Participation in a pooled funding program where cities’ funds are placed in a common account to streamline the application and reporting process for each program the cities jointly fund.
• Launching a regional outline data collection system that allows for consistent information and a better alignment of programs and funding.
• Coordination of a neighborhood food drive each fall, where food and cash donations are raided to benefit local food banks. Members of the Kirkland Youth Council host its own food drive after the community food drives each year.

The Human Services Division staff represents Kirkland on a number of regional collaborative efforts.

• Eastside Human Services Forum
• Alliance of Eastside Agencies
• Eastside Homelessness Advisory Committee
• King County Alliance for Human Services
• North/East King County Funders Group
• Eastside Healthy Start
• Eastside Winter Shelter Task Force
• Committee to End Homelessness
• King County Community Development Block Grant Consortium
• Eastside Easy Rider Collaborative
• Eastside Refugee and Immigrant Coalition
• Kirkland Nourishing Network

Additionally, the City helps to coordinate neighborhood food drives each fall, where food and cash donations are raided to benefit local food banks. Members of the Youth Council host their own food drive after the community food drives each year.

When Tyler first came to Friends of Youth, he had been couch surfing for years while working to graduate from Mount Si High School. After he lost his access to friends’ couches, he tried sleeping in a tent in the woods. But when it got too cold, he got on a bus and ended up in Bellevue. There, he asked about a place to sleep at Friends of Youth’s emergency shelter for young adults. Without the help he found, Tyler would have had no other option but to remain in the woods and go hungry.

Instead, he found a welcoming staff, warm meals cooked by volunteers, and a safe place to sleep and recover from the stress of being homeless before talking to counselors about the full range of housing, treatment and employment programs offered at Friends of Youth. Staff were able to find him a space in one of the non-profit organization’s 80-plus housing units, New Ground Kirkland, for single adults ages 18-21. Through supportive case management services at New Ground, Tyler found a job and started work in September 2012 at a local pizza restaurant in Bellevue. He proved to be such a diligent worker that within a month, he was promoted to a managerial position.

At age 22, Tyler has recently “graduated” from Friends of Youth programs. His “diploma” is the satisfaction of moving into his own apartment.

“It feels amazing to have a place of my own,” Tyler said. “It’s a lot of paperwork you have to go through, though, to get an apartment,” and that is what makes the assistance of Friends of Youth programs so valuable in helping young people achieve self-sufficiency.

For Tyler, the guidance and encouragement he found at Friends of Youth made all the difference. “Honestly, I don’t think I would have made it this far without getting help from Friends of Youth.”
**GOAL**

Reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles and improve connectivity and multi-modal mobility in Kirkland in ways that maintain and enhance travel times, safety and transportation choices.

**HOW DO WE MEASURE BALANCED TRANSPORTATION?**

Kirkland’s Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategic Plan and Active Transportation Plan establish specific transportation goals.

Measuring funding level and the rate of project completion demonstrates the City’s progress providing the infrastructure needed to create a balanced and mobile transportation system.

Measuring the number of crashes and residents satisfaction with the level of active transportation facilities reveals the difference these changes are making for residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Capital Improvement Program Transportation funding devoted to Active Transportation</td>
<td>28.76%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete sidewalk construction on at least one side of all school walk routes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>81.1% ²</td>
<td>83% ²</td>
<td>88% ²</td>
<td>100% by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of proposed Intelligent Transportation Systems projects completed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100% of ITS Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of bicycle network construction improvement projects completed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100% by 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of arterials that are complete streets</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents surveyed are satisfied with maintenance of active transportation facilities</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile crashes involving bikes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile crashes involving pedestrians</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total trips using active transportation mode (transit, pedestrian, bicycle)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35% of trips in transit/other mode by 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major arterial travel times</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Active Transportation Facilities include sidewalks, bike lanes, pedestrian flags, in-pavement lights, etc
² Does not include new neighborhoods
³ No data available
** Community Survey occurs in even years
*** Measure being developed for future reports
HOW ARE WE DOING?

A second grant of $2.2m has enabled the second phase of Kirkland’s ITS to move forward, centered around the Totem Lake area. This should help further reduce congestion and improve travel times on roads. The City has now completed 9% of proposed ITS improvements.

The percentage of school walk routes with completed sidewalk construction on at least one side has improved from 83% in 2011 to 88% in 2012. The percentage of completed bicycle network improvements and arterials has remained the same. Automobile crashes involving bikes and pedestrians declined from 2011 to 2012. However, previous year’s data shows variation in these numbers, suggesting this is likely to be random fluctuation rather than a downward trend.

WHAT ARE WE DOING?

Providing a reliable, safe and efficient transportation system in Kirkland is achieved by maximizing the efficiency of the existing transportation network and encouraging alternative modes of transportation that help reduce congestion.

The City monitors traffic and increases mobility through intelligent transportation systems that use tools such as signal timing, traffic monitoring, real-time traffic information and transit signal priority. Since 2009 the City has received $4M in grant money to partially fund the first and second phases of the Intelligent Transportation Systems technology being deployed in Kirkland.

The City purchased 5.75 miles of the abandoned BNSF railroad right-of-way through Kirkland in 2012 to create the Cross Kirkland Corridor. The first phase involves creating an interim trail and Master Plan, both of which are in progress at the start of 2013. The Corridor is a valuable component of balanced transportation in Kirkland and may encompass trail and transit options in the future. For now, development of an interim trail is a top priority as well as completing a comprehensive Master Plan for the public’s valuable resource.

Kirkland’s Active Transportation Plan will be absorbed into the new Transportation Master Plan as it is developed and written during 2013-14. The Transportation Master Plan is part of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and gives targets and goals as the City moves forward in seeking to improve traffic and pedestrian safety.

In 2012, the Proposition 1 Streets Levy was passed by a majority of our residents. In addition to street maintenance, the Levy will generate approximately $300,000 of funding per year for pedestrian and biking safety, including safe routes to school and repairing up to 14 crosswalks with new highly visible warning lights.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) – Technology “drives” traffic improvements

Traffic flow is nearly always a topic of conversation when you live in one of the favorite cities in the Puget Sound. Kirkland’s proximity to Lake Washington, with its beautiful shoreline, parks, and trails, attracts residents and businesses alike. And with that comes snarled traffic and frustration with long drive times to important destinations.

Kirkland is incorporating the latest ITS technology to monitor traffic in order to keep up with the demands of drivers, bikers, and pedestrians in Kirkland for safer streets and improved traffic flow. This technology makes it possible to monitor traffic real-time and to make adjustments to traffic signals in order to alleviate problems when and where they occur. Drivers will also be able to access driver information in a real-time environment.

ITS involves implementation of technology to improve traffic flow. It has several components, including advanced traffic signal controllers (the ‘brain’ of the traffic signal), closed-circuit video cameras, video detection, APS (Accessible Pedestrian Signals), changeable lane assignment, traveler’s information, and other applications. All of the field devices are monitored and adjusted in a “Traffic Management Center” in a real-time environment. Approximately 87% of funding comes from federal grants and 13% is contributed by the City. Because of a second grant, it will be possible to partially fund the second phase in the Totem Lake area. The goal is for all of Kirkland to experience a smooth ride home.


## Parks and Recreation

**Goal**

Provide and maintain natural areas and recreational facilities and opportunities that enhance the health and well-being of the community.

### Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE staff for parks maintenance and recreation programs</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park maintenance FTE’s per 100 acres developed land</td>
<td>5.719</td>
<td>5.156</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of volunteers</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer hours</td>
<td>16,006</td>
<td>21,865</td>
<td>14,751</td>
<td>13,901</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>$2,518,500</td>
<td>$1,220,500</td>
<td>$888,000</td>
<td>$1,028,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Operating &amp; Maintenance Funding</td>
<td>$3,835,398</td>
<td>$3,754,612</td>
<td>$3,726,109</td>
<td>$4,135,489</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Operating &amp; Maintenance Funding</td>
<td>$2,209,598</td>
<td>$2,072,283</td>
<td>$1,879,750</td>
<td>$2,067,630</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents with neighborhood park within 1/4 mile radius</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of natural area in restoration</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>379 acres by 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of recreation classes meeting minimum enrollment</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens rate City parks as satisfactory or better</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Community survey occurs in even years

### How do we measure Parks and Recreation Services?

The budget and the number of FTE staff available to the Parks Department helps measure how often the City is able to maintain the parks. Given the important contribution that volunteers make to City’s work, the number of volunteers and their total number of hours is also tracked.

The Park, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan sets targets that provide benchmarks by which to measure the development and maintenance of Kirkland’s parks and natural spaces, including:

- Residents should have access to a neighborhood park within a quarter mile of their home.
- All 379 acres of natural areas should be restored to their natural state by 2028.

The plan is being updated through public input in 2013. Recreation services are measured by subscription rates. Tracking recreation class attendance demonstrates how well they match residents’ preferences.

Citizen satisfaction with the parks, as determined by the Community Survey, provides another measure of how well the park system meets the community’s needs.
How Are We Doing?

Following voter approval in 2012, Proposition 2 will enable levels of maintenance to be restored in 2013. Despite the reductions in services incurred between 2009 and 2012, citizens continue to be satisfied with their parks.

83% of recreation classes met the minimum enrollment target, an improvement from 2011 and a good indication that the classes offered meet the demands of citizens.

Annexation decreased the percentage of residents with a park within a ¼ mile radius in 2011. This number remained unchanged in 2012.

What Are We Doing?

Parks and recreation services enhance the quality of life and health in a community. Despite its importance to the community, parks and recreation services have had to face the reality of shrinking resources. Maintenance standards in some parks were reduced as have some of the programs offered by the department.

For much of 2012, department leadership worked with community members to determine the most immediate needs in the parks system. The Park Funding Exploratory Committee developed a levy package to address reductions in maintenance and recreation programming, to ensure ongoing care and restoration of the City’s urban forests through the Green Kirkland Partnership, to provide for needed renovation of the City’s aging park facilities such as Edith Moulton Park, Waverly Beach Park and the Juanita Beach Park Bathhouse, to develop an interim bicycle and pedestrian trail on the Cross Kirkland Corridor and to acquire land for future neighborhood parks in areas of the city where new parks are needed.

In November, 2012, Kirkland voters approved this park funding package and will begin to see the positive impact on its park system in early 2013.

In 2012, the Green Kirkland Partnership collaborated with Pearl Jam to offset the band’s carbon footprint from world touring by funding a 9-acre forest restoration in Crestwoods Park. This project accounted for a significant increase in the total number of trees planted annually in restoration projects: from 837 trees in 2011 to 3,538 trees in 2012. The City also installed rain gardens in Juanita Beach Park that allow water to soak into the ground while providing beautiful landscape features.

Pee Wee Soccer in Kirkland!

The pee wee soccer league, now in its third year, has been a great addition to the City’s fall and spring course offerings. The program is designed to develop and improve soccer skills for ages 3 to 6, while focusing on sportsmanship, socialization and having fun.

For its inaugural season, in fall of 2010, the goal was to attract a total of 40 youth; over 90 registered. Following annexation in 2011, the program expanded from its original location at Emerson High School field to 132nd Square Park in the City’s new Evergreen Hill (Kingsgate) neighborhood. The league is currently offered at both locations, over 250 children expected to participate each season.

Children are placed on teams and are assigned a volunteer coach. The program meets for seven weeks with the activities including practices and games. Allowing participants to play a “real” game with referees, substitutions and a running clock sets this program apart from other pee wee soccer offerings in the area. This gives children an opportunity to thoroughly “Experience It!”
**Housing**

Ensure the construction and preservation of housing stock that meets a diverse range of incomes and needs.

### Measure 2009 - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City contributions to ARCH Housing Trust Fund (A Regional Coalition for Housing)¹</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$286,570</td>
<td>$282,301</td>
<td>$294,337</td>
<td>$442,098</td>
<td>$159,000 to $269,000²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Percent of annual average Growth Management Act low income housing target met (units affordable to those earning less than 50% of King County median income)**
  - 44% 0% 56%* 84%* 100% (based on 69 units per year)

- **Percent of annual average Growth Management Act moderate income housing target met (units affordable to those earning between 50-80% of King County median income)**
  - 50% 14% 24%* 2%* 100% (based on 49 units per year)

- **Total number of low and moderate income units brought online**
  - 59 7 51* 59* 118 units per year

¹Includes General Funds, Community Development Block Grant Funds, and reallocation of affordable housing loans that have been repaid.
²The City’s target range after the 2011 annexation increased to $280,000 - $350,000.
*ADU and housing market survey units not included.

**City funds affordable housing**

So that...

City has a sufficient stock of affordable housing to meet the needs of the community

---

**How do we measure affordable housing?**

King County’s Countywide Planning Policies determine the affordable housing targets for cities based on a variety of factors, including the projected affordable housing needs of low and moderate income households, the existing stock of market rate and subsidized housing, and the number of jobs by wage level and location.

Kirkland’s progress towards meeting those targets include affordable housing units that have been built as a result of:

- Housing Trust Fund contributions
- Housing regulations that the City has adopted, such as Accessory Dwelling Units, density bonuses and tax exemptions.
- Private housing development with market rents at affordable levels.
In 2011 the City made total contributions to ARCH of $294,337. In 2012 contributions rose significantly to $442,098.

The high ARCH contribution in 2012 included both an increase in City contributions due to the annexation of North Juanita, Finn Hill and Kingsgate (now known as Evergreen Hill) neighborhoods, as well as a one-time increase in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) consortium funds allocated to ARCH.

The City continues to move closer to meeting the affordable housing targets established in the Countywide Planning Policies. In particular, there has been constant progress toward the low income housing goals. In 2012 the City reached 84% of the low income housing target.

Kirkland continues to take a multi-faceted approach to creating a diverse housing stock that meets a variety of income ranges and needs. In 2012, the City amended the transportation and park impact fee exemptions for affordable housing. The amendments enacted state legislation for which the City had lobbied for several years. The changes allow the City to exempt 80% of the transportation and park impact fees for units targeted to those earning 80% or less than King County median income without having to repay those fees from City funds, as was previously required. This adds another tool to the City’s growing list of regulations to encourage and enable affordable and diverse housing. Previously adopted tools include:

- Accessory Dwelling Units
- Small lot single family allowances
- Cottage and carriage housing regulations
- Affordable housing requirements with offsetting density bonuses
- Multifamily residential tax exemptions
- Standards for transit-oriented development at South Kirkland Park and Ride (see case study)

In addition, the City sees a significant return on its annual investment in the ARCH Housing Trust Fund. All of the low income units and about 10% of the moderate income units that the City has been given credit for producing are a result of financial contributions made by the City to affordable housing projects within Kirkland and other ARCH cities through the ARCH Housing Trust Fund.

### Transit-Oriented development comes to South Kirkland Park and Ride

The City made significant progress on the South Kirkland Park and Ride transit-oriented development in 2012. This project includes:

- Development of 58 affordable apartments by Imagine Housing;
- Development of 186 market rate apartments and 6,700 square feet of commercial space by Polygon Northwest; and
- Construction of a 530 stall parking garage and new transit center by King County METRO.

In early 2012, the affordable housing portion of the project was awarded nearly $1,000,000 in funding from the ARCH Housing Trust Fund, including contributions from Kirkland and 10 other member cities. The project also received federal, state and county funding. In April of 2012, the Design Review Board approved the residential and commercial portion of the project in Kirkland. (The new METRO parking garage is located on the Bellevue portion of the property.) Approval was granted for a four story building for the affordable housing and a five story building for the mixed use building with market rate housing over ground floor commercial.

King County METRO has begun construction of the park and ride garage and it is expected to be completed by the middle of 2013. The residential portion of the project is anticipated to be complete by late 2014.

This project is the culmination of over a decade of policy and planning work, from the vision for a transit-oriented development at a Kirkland park and ride identified by the City’s Housing Task Force in 2002, through Comprehensive Plan amendments approved by the City Council in 2008 to allow mixed use buildings to be part of the South Kirkland Park and Ride redevelopment, to new zoning and design regulations for the Yarrow Bay Business District adopted by the City Council and Houghton Community Council in 2011.
**Financial Stability**

**GoAL**
Provide a sustainable level of core services that are funded from predictable revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum balance in General Purpose Contingency Reserves</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80% of budgeted reserve target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Rating</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of funding allocated to high priority services (Stars and Imperatives)¹ | * | 93% | * | 94.2% | 80% of rated services |

¹ Citizens rated City services by their importance and how well the City provided them. “Stars” have high importance and high performance ratings; “imperatives” have high importance and lower performance ratings.

*Community survey occurs in even years

**2012 Survey with 2013-14 Budget**

**How do we measure financial stability?**

Standard and Poor’s credit rating provides an external assessment of the City’s financial stability, and this measure is used in partnership with revenue and expenditure forecasts to create a picture of the City’s stability.

The City also maps the percentage of money that goes to priority areas the citizens have chosen as the most important. Demonstrated in the Kirkland Quadrant, the “stars” and “imperatives” are the areas citizens have rated as “high performance, high importance” or “high importance, low performance.”

The City also closely monitors available funding for reserves, which demonstrates the City’s ability to respond to basic services through economic cycles and meet unforeseen needs.
Contingency reserves were used to help balance the budget during the economic downturn, leading to a decrease in the minimum balance in the reserves. The Council began replenishing reserves with the start of the economic recovery in 2011. Replenishment to target will be a focus over the next several budget cycles.

Standard and Poor’s AAA credit rating is the highest rating that can be achieved by a municipality and saves Kirkland taxpayers money through lower interest rates when borrowing. Kirkland has retained its AAA rating in recent years. The rating reflects factors including community demographics, use of best practices and financial strength.

Despite constrained budgets the City has continued to invest in areas that the community has highlighted as a priority. The most recent data shows that 94.2% of spending on the areas surveyed was allocated to high priority areas. Further, the City has also made long term decisions, such as the voter enacted 2012 Streets and Parks Levies, to facilitate greater spending on areas citizens have highlighted as important.

Balancing affordability, sustainability and responsiveness to citizen needs means that the City is able to ensure improvements are made in a financially responsible manner, while sufficiently prioritizing areas citizens are most concerned about.

Financial stability is essential to the City of Kirkland. The City prioritizes maintaining a stable financial base from which to fund core services, and ensures all major decisions are affordable. Kirkland establishes strong financial management policies by:

- Realistically estimating revenues and expenditures
- Consistently monitoring and amending the budget based on actual performance
- Creating a long-term financial plan
- Ensuring long-term capital improvement funding
- Managing investments and debt
- Maintaining reserves to offset economic downturns

The City’s Biennial Budget is an essential planning document and provides strategic insight into current spending allocations and future spending priorities. The City is also working to further integrate the budget with the overall performance management framework to ensure that the spending decisions are responsive to citizen needs and council priorities, as well as sustainable and affordable.

Property Tax Levies

In 2012, two property tax levy lid lift measures were passed in Kirkland. Proposition 1 will provide funding for Street Maintenance and Pedestrian Safety, while Proposition 2 will help fund maintenance, restoration, and enhancement of the City’s Parks.

The streets measure was initiated internally through discussions of the slow decline in the city’s pavement condition index (PCI) and the impacts of budget cuts on transportation programs during the Great Recession.

The parks measure was initiated by a group of citizens concerned that the significant budget reductions to the parks & community services budget necessitated by the economic downturn, including a 20% reduction in parks maintenance staffing, would jeopardize parks in Kirkland.

Once these two priority areas had been identified, the City sought to establish the most effective way to fund improvements. As the general fund reserves were still being replenished and over 90% of spending on the areas surveyed was already committed to high importance services, it would not have been possible to use existing revenues to fund these needs. In addition, to maintain a stable financial outlook and protect Kirkland’s AAA bond rating, new on-going revenues needed to be added to support the higher levels of on-going service being proposed. Therefore, the City decided to ask voters to approve a property tax levy lid lift to fund these two improvements.

Both measures provide money that will help to improve the condition of streets in Kirkland and to continue funding Kirkland’s renowned parks system and the attendant quality of life it provides. By seeking funding for areas that the citizens consider important and by carefully assessing the financial situation in Kirkland before making these decisions, the City was able to create a funding stream that does not jeopardize future financial stability.
**Environment**

**Goal**

Protect and enhance our natural environment for current residents and future generations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with NPDES Stormwater Permits</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion rate(^1)</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City building electricity use (kilowatt/hour)</td>
<td>2,875,575 kWh</td>
<td>2,581,213 kWh</td>
<td>2,674,348 kWh</td>
<td>2,669,158 kWh</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City building natural gas usage (therm)</td>
<td>68,507 therm (+16% change)</td>
<td>55,557 therm (-19% change)</td>
<td>66,795 therm</td>
<td>61,944 therm</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree canopy coverage</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity in Forbes Creek(^2)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity in Juanita Creek(^2)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste entering landfill from residences</td>
<td>14,320 tons (0%)</td>
<td>13,726 tons (-4.1%)</td>
<td>17,861 tons (+30.0%)</td>
<td>22,109 tons (+23.8%)</td>
<td>Annual 2.5% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reduction in City’s greenhouse gas emissions as a percent of 2005 levels</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%**</td>
<td>80% below 2005 levels by 2050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Diversion rate - percent of waste materials diverted from the landfill to be recycled, composted or reused. Includes single family and multi-family residences.

\(^2\) BIBI scores of 10-15 indicate very poor, 18-26 indicate poor stream conditions. Scores are an average of the 3-4 testing sites’ scores in each creek.

* No data available due to data collection occurring less than annually.

**Data includes the service areas comprised of the new neighborhoods - Juanita, Finn Hill, and Kingsgate.

---

**How do we measure environmental sustainability?**

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit compliance encompasses the wide range of actions the City undertakes to improve surface water quality.

The Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI) provides a standard measure for the health of streams, which are vital ecosystems. This index is a measurement of human impact on a stream. The score can range from 10 to 50. A value of 50 indicates that a stream’s biology is equivalent to what would be found in a “natural” stream in the region with little or no human impact (ecologically intact, able to support the most sensitive organisms); 10 indicates poor biological conditions within the stream (unable to support a large proportion of once-native organisms).

Recycling diversion rates and waste entering the landfill measure the effect of the City’s waste reduction efforts.

High-resolution satellite imagery and remote sensing and geographic information system (GIS) mapping is used to determine the amount of tree leaf surface covering a large area. Urban tree canopy coverage is a gauge of growth balanced with development and natural resource protection. Low canopy coverage is linked to increased flooding, energy use and urban heat island effects and a decline in air quality.

The annual greenhouse gas emissions inventory of City operations measures our progress towards reducing emissions to 80% of 2005 levels by 2050.
Since the NPDES Phase II Stormwater Permit became effective in 2007, Kirkland has maintained 100% compliance. B-IIB scores remain in the poor to very poor range in Juanita and Forbes Creek. However, these conditions are “population measures,” therefore improvement requires concerted long term effort by multiple jurisdictions in our region. The City will work long term to improve the conditions in both creeks.

In 2012, for the sixth consecutive year, Kirkland single family residents achieved the highest recycling diversion rate among cities in King County at 66%. While the multifamily sector continues to be a challenge for many cities, the multifamily diversion rate increased to 17.9% which contributed to the increase in the City’s combined residential diversion rate to 53.3% in 2012. Kirkland’s tree canopy coverage increased from 2002 to 2010 and following annexation has reached its 40% target.

The City has made substantial progress towards meeting its long term emissions goal. We are pleased to report that an interim goal of a 10% reduction by 2012 was met despite the service area expanding from 11 to 18 miles, an additional 30,000 new citizens, an increase in City streets from 149 miles to 265 miles, and a 17% increase in City employees as a result of recent annexation. The City has continued to decrease its building electricity usage and its natural gas usage in 2012. Both of these numbers have declined each year since at least 2009.

These reductions have been made possible through increasing energy efficiency, reducing waste and increasing recycling, encouraging alternative commute options and enhancing the fleet’s fuel efficiency.

In 2012, the City supported installation of Low Impact stormwater development features such as rain gardens, cisterns, green roofs and permeable pavement. 15,039 tons of material were removed from the City stormwater system, protecting streams and lakes from pollution that runs off of streets and parking lots. Flood reduction and response was also a priority in 2012, as the City set up a sand bag filling station to help citizens protect themselves from flood waters, and developed plans for new culverts to relieve flooding in the Totem Lake area. A tributary of Juanita Creek (informally known as Billy Creek) was restored to reduce sediment delivery to downstream properties which will help to reduce flooding and property damage.

The Planning Department along with the Public Works, and Fire and Building Departments worked to formulate zoning codes that encourage sustainable actions by all citizens including the development community. These Green Codes promote electric cars and their infrastructure, solar panels, energy efficiency, allow clustering of houses and give density credits for use of Low Impact stormwater facilities. The City is one of the first in the State of Washington to use Green Codes, which have been successful and well used.

The City continued to expand its food scrap and recycling programs to businesses and multi-family residences by providing collection services at no extra cost and offering recycling materials and educational outreach to participants. Through special recycling events and programs in 2012, Kirkland diverted from the landfill 19 tons of electronic waste, 13,670 pounds of batteries, and 114 tons of reusable and hard-to-recycle materials including 2,450 pounds of polystyrene foam.

Kirkland remains committed to building its successful recycling program. In 2012, 160 businesses participated in Kirkland’s Commercial Organics Program, recycling 330 tons of food scraps and compostable service ware. The City continues to reduce waste through its biannual recycling collection events and by increasing opportunities for Kirkland residents to divert materials, such as the new ‘Used Cooking Oil Recycling Station’ established at the North Kirkland Community Center in 2012.

Having met the 40% tree canopy goal with annexation, the City drafted an Urban Forest Strategic Management Plan in 2012. This document provides a sustainable framework for efficient and consistent management of Kirkland’s urban forest.
Economic Development

Goal

Attract, retain and grow a diverse and stable economic base that supports city revenues, needed goods and services and jobs for residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of businesses helped with consultant services</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space vacancy rate</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>Eastside: 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging tax revenue</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$205,583</td>
<td>$220,145</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new businesses</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to ExploreKirkland.com</td>
<td>148,442</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>105,570</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Green Businesses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual number of jobs</td>
<td>30,631</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses are satisfied with Kirkland as a place to do business</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents are satisfied with the availability of goods and services in Kirkland</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No data available due to website server crash
**Community survey occurs in even years
*** No data available

How do we measure economic development?

Net new businesses and office space vacancy rates are both indicators of the health of the local business economy. Kirkland’s vacancy rates have decreased as the economy continues to recover from the recession. Lodging tax revenue measures the vitality of the hospitality industry, which in turn supports other tourism assets such as restaurants and retail shops. Internet visits to the ExploreKirkland.com website demonstrate the public’s interest in Kirkland and often translate to actual visits and extended stays in our city. The City’s Green Business Program promotes business adoption of efficient and environmentally sound practices, hopefully resulting in more sustainable businesses that can weather difficult economic times and perpetuate stable City services.
HOW ARE WE DOING?

The City helps to grow the Kirkland economy by recruiting and retaining businesses, promoting Kirkland as a business location, and supporting arts and tourism. Together, these activities enhance the quality of life that residents of Kirkland enjoy and have come to expect.

The program ministers to small and large businesses. It has invested in a Retention Consultant who provides free services to small businesses in the areas of permitting, marketing, networking and expansion. New businesses are welcomed and can take advantage of a monthly orientation program. Technical assistance is provided one-on-one or through seminars and other educational and networking opportunities. By the same token, the City facilitates CEO-level networking and input on City policy through a quarterly Kirkland Business Roundtable. In past years, the Roundtable has weighed in on Totem Lake redevelopment policy and supported the Cross Kirkland Corridor.

Tourism programs promote the recreational and leisure opportunities in Kirkland, and bring outside revenues into the City. Moreover, exposure to Kirkland through a business trip or attendance at an event may lead to a decision to relocate a home or business here. This past year the City developed a short tourism video that has been widely distributed throughout the region, and is used by many Kirkland businesses to promote themselves. The City has overhauled the ExploreKirkland.com website so that it is easier to use and better showcases the beauty that is Kirkland. In addition, the Tourism Development Committee funds events year-round that bring tourists and their dollars to Kirkland.

WHAT ARE WE DOING?

The City helps develop the economy of Kirkland through supporting businesses and promoting tourism. Kirkland’s Economic Development Program promotes a quality business climate for Kirkland businesses, assists businesses in locating in Kirkland and provides a liaison with City departments. The success of economic development efforts is highly dependent on the general economic climate, regional policies and competing cities’ policies regarding business. Local programs help sustain businesses through economic cycles by being responsive to business needs.

In the most recent survey, businesses highlighted room for improvement in taxes and licensing fees, parking, signage requirements, networking opportunities and outreach about City business services. To address businesses’ concerns, the Business Retention Consultant provides outreach services to current businesses in the areas of real estate searches, zoning, permitting and business planning, including:

- Referrals to City staff, networking organizations and professional services
- One-on-one technical assistance
- Educational seminars
- Issue resolution between business and the City

The Kirkland Business Roundtable facilitates CEO-level discussion of economic challenges, opportunities and strategies for economic development in Kirkland. The City initiated KirklandFirst.org, encouraging residents to support local, Kirkland-based businesses and products while the Green Business program aids businesses in adopting environmentally-friendly practices and other cost-saving measures.

Tourism programs and events are promoted through the ExploreKirkland.com website, Facebook page and advertising in local and national publications. The City also offers networking opportunities to tourism purveyors.
DEPENDABLE INFRASTRUCTURE

GOAL
Maintain levels of service commensurate with growing community requirements at optimum life-cycle costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Capital Projects Funding</td>
<td>$6,666,200</td>
<td>$5,456,000</td>
<td>$11,515,600</td>
<td>$10,708,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer Capital Project Funding</td>
<td>$4,547,900</td>
<td>$2,001,300</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance FTE</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer Maintenance FTE</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pavement Condition Index* for Major and Minor Arterial Streets* | 52 | 50.3 | 60.8 | 60.8 |

Pavement Condition Index for Collectors and Neighborhood Streets* | 68 | 68 | 76.1 | 76.1 |

Citizens surveyed rate street maintenance as satisfactory or better | ** | 94% | ** | 89% |

Sewer inflow and infiltration rate | *** | *** | *** | *** |

Water Main Breaks | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Sewer Obstructions | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

*Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a rating of the general condition of pavements based on a scale of 0 to 100. A PCI of 100 represents a newly constructed road with no distresses; a PCI below 10 corresponds to a failed road requiring complete reconstruction; a PCI of 41 or better equates to “fair or better”. Data: 2009 PCI based on 2008 survey; 2010 Collector PCI based on 2010 Collector survey and 2008 Neighborhood Street survey

**Community survey occurs in even years

***Measure being developed for future reports

HOW IS OUR PERFORMANCE?

The level of maintenance the City can perform is dictated by the Capital Projects Funding and the number of man hours, measured in full time equivalent (FTE) positions.

The pavement condition index (PCI) and the number of water main breaks and sewer obstructions demonstrate if the City is successfully maintaining infrastructure at required levels of service. The amount of storm water infiltration into the sanitary sewer system provides a picture of the state of repair of the sewer system.

Citizen satisfaction with streets helps determine if the City is meeting the community’s infrastructure needs.
In 2010, the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for major and minor arterial streets fell below the target level of service and the PCI for collectors and neighborhood streets was close to the target level of service. Both measures improved with the addition of the annexation area but remained unchanged from 2011 and 2012.

Recent citizen surveys have indicated a gap between performance and importance ratings, for street maintenance. To close this gap and to improve the PCI index the City proposed a streets levy, which provides funding to improve the PCI and should close the gap between performance and importance in future years.

The Public Works Department maintains a comprehensive system of roads and sidewalks. The Prop 1 Levy will provide additional resources to address the gap between the priority and performance of well-maintained streets expressed by the citizens of Kirkland in the annual survey. Streets Levy funding will be used to leverage State and Federal government grants to improve safe walking routes to elementary and middle schools. An example of a completed project is the sidewalk improvements and new flashing crosswalk near Lakeview Elementary School in 2013. As more walk route needs are identified and improved, walking will become a more viable option in all school areas.

Professional personnel and reliable facilities ensure that citizens do not experience lapses in water or sewer service. When possible, improvements are made in conjunction with other projects in order to keep costs down. For example, with the construction of the new bridge at NE 116th and 120 Ave NE, water main replacements were completed as well.

Wastewater and Storm Drain personnel not only maintain a safe and effective sewer system, they also improve the infrastructure in ways that should improve business vitality and growth. One such project is the culvert replacement project currently underway in Totem Lake that will reduce flooding and control groundwater runoff.

All improvement projects are managed by a team of engineering professionals in the Capital Improvement Program which are currently working on high profile projects such as the Cross Kirkland Corridor Interim Trail and the construction of the new Public Safety Building in Totem Lake.

The City Council continues to explore and implement ways to help the City keep pace with infrastructure needs. Kirkland citizens can expect to maintain a high quality of life because of professional, reliable, and cost effective management of the City’s infrastructure resources.

Kirkland taxpayers confirmed their priority to increase street maintenance and enhance pedestrian safety by passing the Proposition 1 Streets Levy in November of 2012 by a margin of nearly 55%. Now the real work begins to implement projects that address the concern voters feel about street maintenance and pedestrian safety in Kirkland. The City intends to proactively complete projects that will achieve the goals of the Levy as soon as possible. Here are some of the projects coming in 2013-14.

**Prop 1 Streets Levy Projects for 2013-14**

Kirkland taxpayers confirmed their priority to increase street maintenance and enhance pedestrian safety by passing the Proposition 1 Streets Levy in November of 2012 by a margin of nearly 55%. Now the real work begins to implement projects that address the concern voters feel about street maintenance and pedestrian safety in Kirkland. The City intends to proactively complete projects that will achieve the goals of the Levy as soon as possible. Here are some of the projects coming in 2013-14.

**Street Preservation**

Kirkland Public Works Department will double preventative maintenance on residential streets by applying “slurry seal” to the roads to prevent further erosion and restore a smooth driving surface. In addition, proactive pothole repair will reduce future road failures. Resurfacing of arterial streets will be doubled in 2013-14, reducing the backlog of deferred street maintenance.

**2013 Crosswalk Initiative**

As many as 14 existing pedestrian crosswalks will be upgraded to state of the art flashing light crossings which have been proven to be more visible to drivers. Also, ADA-compatible wheelchair ramps added with new construction projects will make walking a more viable option for people. Ultimately, as people feel comfortable and safe, they may add more pedestrian and biking options to their daily errands and routine.
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