

From: Norm Storme, Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods Coordinator

Dear Kirkland City Council:

At the direction of City Council (November 8th Study Session), the Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods (KAN) discussed the 2011/2012 Neighborhood Services Budget at the November 10th KAN meeting. There were seventeen people at the meeting representing eight (of the eleven) existing neighborhoods and two (of the three) annexation area neighborhoods. *What follows below, reflects the opinions and comments of those individuals in attendance at this meeting only.*

There was unanimous support for Council's decision to move \$15,000 of Neighborhood Connection Program funding to Human Services. Some members felt this may not be enough given the state of the economy and increasing needs for basic human services. However, this was not the final recommendation.

Recommendation: KAN recommends a \$615 base allocation to all neighborhoods (including the annexation area) plus a per capita overlay with the remaining funds (Option 2 below). They also encouraged Council to allow staff to investigate the blanket insurance policy.

NOTES FROM KAN MEETING:

KAN discussed three options for the remaining Neighborhood Services funding. All three options include a placeholder of \$3,500 from the Neighborhood Connection Program funding for a blanket insurance policy for all neighborhoods/events.

Option 1: Status Quo—\$615 per neighborhood

Option 2: Per Capita—\$615 base all neighborhoods (including new neighborhoods), plus per capita overlay

Option 3: Equal—\$1,000 per neighborhood (including new neighborhoods)

Option 1: Status Quo

Pros	Cons
Easy to administer.	Unfair to big neighborhoods.
Used to it.	Amount too small to bother with. Some neighborhoods went into hold mode.
Made neighborhood associations become more creative (e.g. partnering with businesses for picnic funds).	Limited options. Inhibited/limited neighborhood association building.
	Contrary to Council goals to increase participation.
	\$14,955 does little to help Human Services.
	Hurts neighborhoods.
	Increases incentive for neighborhoods to subdivide to receive more funds (e.g. existing Juanita neighborhood).
	The \$615 was already a decrease of funding as compared to prior years.

Option 2: Per Capita

Pros (verbatim)	Cons (verbatim)
More fair.	Don't want feeling of competing with other neighborhoods.
More funds for each.	Size does not equal involvement and use.
Larger geographic areas need more money for communications and projects.	Less money to Human Services.

Option 3: Equal \$1,000

Pros (verbatim)	Cons (verbatim)
More money than status quo.	Less money than per capita for some neighborhoods.
Same pros as Option 1	Same cons as Option 1

Dot exercise: KAN representatives used dots (one per neighborhood) to choose Option 1, 2, or 3.

Option 1: Status Quo—1 dots

Option 2: Per Capita—10 dots

Option 3: Equal—0

Although there appears to be almost a unanimous decision for Option 2, some members struggled between option one and two.

Additional notes:

KAN expressed that Matching Grant funds currently do help Human Services through communicating information about events such as food drives and the annual Turkey Trot.

KAN encouraged neighborhoods to consider giving additional Matching Grant funds and volunteer efforts to Human Services.

KAN will use the next meeting to discuss ways to get things donated and raise money for Human Services. This item will be on the January KAN meeting agenda.

There was overwhelming support from KAN to help human services through Neighborhood Association communications, outreach, and potential direct donations.