

# **Neighborhood Safety Program Update**

## **Neighborhood Safety Program**

The City Council authorized the Neighborhood Safety Program as a way to help "reenergize neighborhoods through partnerships on capital project implementation..." In 2014, representatives from the Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods (KAN) and other neighborhood leaders worked with City staff to develop and implement the Pilot Neighborhood Safety Program. In June of 2014, the City Council authorized the implementation of the ongoing Citywide Program starting in 2015.

#### Goals:

- Provide incentive for neighborhood participations.
- Address safety needs.
- Foster neighborhood self-help and build a sense of community.
- Increase collaboration within a neighborhood, between neighborhoods, and with City government.
- Leverage funding with match contributions and/or other agencies.
- Collaborate with businesses, schools, Parent Teach Student Associations (PTSAs), Cascade Bicycle Club, Feet First, Kirkland Greenways, and other organizations.
- Create an equitable distribution of improvements throughout the City.

## **Funding:**

- Street Levy Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (\$150,000/year).
- Walkable Kirkland Initiative (\$200,000/year) 2015 through 2020.
- Private Development Fees and Projects when appropriate.
- Other City Programs when appropriate.

**Prioritization:** Neighborhood leaders and staff have worked closely to develop and continuously improve a prioritization process that adheres to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) criteria for funding safety improvements.

The TMP direction for the prioritization of sidewalks and crosswalks is used in the NSP process.

- **Improve safety**—Prioritize locations based on crash history and indicators of crash risk like adjacent street auto volume, speed and number of lanes.
- **Link to Land Use**—Choose sidewalks that expand and enhance walkability and places where current pedestrian volumes are high.
- Connect to the Cross Kirkland Corridor

  Make numerous strong links to the CKC.
- **Make Connections**—Give high priority to projects that fill gaps by connecting existing sidewalks.
- **Connect to Transit**—Complete walkways that allow easy access to transit, particularly regional transit.

- **Community input**—Because of the scale of pedestrian projects, gathering the on-the-ground knowledge through community input is particularly important in selecting pedestrian projects.
- Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.
- **Title VI**—It is the City of Kirkland's policy to ensure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from programs and activities.

For the specific data points under each of these categories, see Attachment A. See Attachment B for the Neighborhood Panel criteria.

The schedule for the 2019 NSP Program is as follows:

**Project Ideas Due:** December 3, 2018 **Project Conferences:** February 5 or 7, 2019 **Applications Available:** After Project Conference

**Applications Due:** February 15, 2019

Staff Review/Technical Scores: February 18–March 1, 2019

Neighborhood Panel Site Tour: March 5, 2019

Panel Review: March 19, 2019 Panel Decision: March 26, 2019

**Transportation Commission review:** March 27, 2019

City Council Decision: April 16, 2019 Projects Announced: April 17, 2019 Projects Completed By: June, 2020

Staff from various divisions and departments scope the projects, recommend the most appropriate solution for the safety concerns, and develop cost estimates. Some projects are dropped if the solution doesn't meet City standards, and others are re-designed to be more successful. All of the projects moving forward are supported by staff and City engineers.

Like last year, in an effort to be nimble for the changing bid climate, instead of focusing on specific cost estimates so early in the process (before engineering/bid documents are produced) staff provided very rough estimates and cost ranges for each project. Table 1 below lists all of the applications submitted for 2019 funding.

**Table 1 – 2019 Neighborhood Safety Program Applications** 

3	010 Najahbaubaad Cafatu Dur A	COST ESTIMATE CATEGORY								
2	019 Neighborhood Safety Program Ap	pilications	Low (K)	Medium (K)	High (K)					
NSP#	Project Name	Rough Estimate	\$1-\$14	\$15-\$34	\$35-\$50+					
CH 1	Rapid Flashing Beacon on 108th Ave at NE 46th Street	\$131,200			\$35-\$50+					
EH 1	Rapid Flashing Beacon on NE 132nd Street at 129th NE	\$113,500			\$35-\$50+					
FH 1	Raised Sidewalk on corner of NE 134th Street at 87th Ave NE	\$43,200			\$35-\$50					
HL 1	Intersection Improvement on NE 87th Street at 114th Ave NE	\$42,750			\$35-\$50					
JN 1	Walkway on NE 120th Street between 93rd Pl NE and 96th Ave NE	\$42,000			\$35-\$50					
LV 1	Crosswalk on Lakeview Drive north of 64th Street	\$50,400			\$35-\$50					
NK 1	Walkway Improvement on 5th Street between 10th and 13th Avenues	\$49,700			\$35-\$50					
NRH 1	Rapid Flashing Beacon on 124th Avenue NE at NE 95th Street	*			*					
SRHBT 1	Crosswalk on 132nd Ave NE at NE 66th Street	\$56,800			\$35-\$50+					
TL 1	Traffic median island on Slater Ave NE at NE 119th Street	\$26,400		\$15-\$34						
	Total of Cost Estimates	\$555,950								

<sup>\*</sup>The Rapid Flashing Beacon on 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE at NE 95<sup>th</sup> Street is being installed as part of the 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE sidewalk project currently under construction.

### Attachments:

- A NSP Technical Criteria and Scoring
- B NSP Panel Criteria
- C NSP Map of 2019 Applications

Attachment A. 2019 NSP Project Team - Technical Criteria & Scoring			CH_1_Rapid Flashing Beacor on 108th Ave at NE 46th Street Lakeview	EH_1_Rapid Flashing Beacon on NE 132nd Street at 129th Muir	FH_1_Raised Sidewalk on corner of NE 134th Street Thoreau	HL_1_Intersection Improvement on NE 87th Street at 114th Ave NE Kirk	JN_1_Walkway or NE 120th Street between 93rd Pl NE and 96th Ave Juanita	n LV_1_Crosswalk on Lakeview Drive north of 64th Street Lakeview	NK_1_Walkway Improvement on 5th Street between 10th Kirk	NRH_Rapid Flashing Beacon on 124th Avenue Twain	SRHBT_2_Cross walk on 132nd Ave NE at NE 66th Street Franklin	TL 1 Traffic median island on Slater Ave NE at NE Frost						
sides of almost all streets. Because of the high co	size are a foundation for pedestrian activity. Kirkland's existing codes call for sidewalks on both st to construct sidewalks everywhere, they are missing in many points of Kirkland's system, it is funding to the most worthy projects first. Locations should prioritized using the following factors:	100	47	58	54	41	43	49	29	50	44	49	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improve safety—Prioritize locations based on crallanes.	sh history and indicators of crash risk like adjacent street auto volume, speed and number of	38	17	22	15	16	8	17	5	17	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crashes: Based upon Kirkland Police	Ped/Bike (1=6, >1=12)	12	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Department crash records from previous 5 years. Crash must match problem/issue.	Vehicle (1=1, >1=2) - counted only when the project is related to auto safety	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1						
Roadway Design: Based upon existing	No Sidewalk/Trails = 2 , Sidewalk 1 side = 1, Sidewalk on both sides =0 (0-2)	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0						
conditions of the roadway.	Number of Lanes (2=1, >2=2) (turn lane counts as one lane)	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2						
daily auto volume counts on selected	Under 3,000 average daily trips (0)						0		0									
	Between 3,001-15,000 average daily trips (3)		3	3	3	3	· ·	3	· ·	3	3	3						
by Kirkland Public Works. Counts are	Over 15,001 average daily trips (6)	6	J	J	J	ŭ		ŭ		J	J	J						
Roadway Speeds: Based upon posted speed	Speed limit 25 MPH and under (0)								0									
limits, study data (when available), and anecdotal information. If there is speed data	3 Speed limit 26–30 MPH (3)				3	3	3		•									
from NTCP, the 85th percentile.	Speed limit 31 MPH and above (6)	6	6	6				6		6	6	6						
project enhances the safety of the following	Bicycle (0-2) (2 if bicycle facility at this location)	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	2						
	Pedestrian (0-2) (2 if pedestrian facility is at this location)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2						
	Vehicular (0-2) (only if it addresses safety for a vehicle)	2				2	0		0			2						
	Transit (0-2) (only if transit is at this location)	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2						
Make Connections—Give high priority to projects	that fill gaps by connecting existing sidewalks.	16	0	4	12	4	8	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sidewalks: Existing sidewalk/gravel path	Sidewalk, paved shoulder, or gravel path on both sides (0)		0	0	•	0		0	<u>'</u>	0	0	0			•			
(not applicable in parks).	Sidewalk, paved shoulder, or gravel path on one side (4)				4													
	No shoulder or sidewalk either side: must walk in vehicle lane (8)	8					8		8									
School Walk Route: The project extends,	Not located on a School Walk Route (0)		0				0		0		0	0						
adds or completes a nonmotorized system identified in the School Walk Route gap	Improves School Walk Route where sidewalk (or extruded curb) exists on at least one side of the		U				U		U		U	U						
analysis data.	road (4) Improves School Walk Routes where no sidewalk (or extruded curb) exists on either side of the	8		4	0	4		4		4								
road (8)  Link to Land Use—Choose sidewalks that expand and enhance walkability and places where current pedestrian volumes are high.   Connect to Transit—Complete walkways that allow easy access to transit, particularly regional transit.   Connect to the Cross Kirkland Corridor—Make numerous strong links to the CKC.		18	18	14	10	12	12	14	12	14	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walkability: Based upon the TMP	Low—Walkability factor 1-5.5 (0) (Level 1 on map)																	
walkability scores for roadways in Kirkland. The walkability score is made up of the	Moderate—Walkability factor 6-9 (6) (Level 2 on map)																	
	High—Walkability factor of 9-13.5 (10) (Level 3 on map)			10	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10						
polict T-5.1 in the Transportation Master Plan).	Very High—Walkability factor of 13.5+ (14) (Level 4 on map)	14	14															
Link: The project connects to other	No link to Pedestrian/Bicycle/Transit Facility (0)											0						
multimodal facilitites. (Radar speed signs do not link = 0)	Link to Pedestrian OR Bicycle OR Transit Facility (2)					2	2		2			-						
	Link to Pedestrian AND Bicycle AND Transit Facility (4)	4	4	4	4	_	-	4	_	4	4							

Transportation Master Plan Policy  List and converse adulting of the policy propried on the pr	Attachment A. 2019 NSP Project Team - Technical Criteria & Scoring			CH_1_Rapid Flashing Beacon on 108th Ave at NE 46th Street Lakeview	EH_1_Rapid Flashing Beacor on NE 132nd Street at 129th	FH_1_Raised Sidewalk on corner of NE 134th Street Thoreau	Improvement on NE 87th Street at	JN_1_Walkway or NE 120th Street between 93rd Pl NE and 96th Ave Juanita	n LV_1_Crosswalk on Lakeview Drive north of 64th Street	NK_1_Walkway Improvement on 5th Street between 10th	NRH_Rapid Flashing Beacon on 124th Avenue	SRHBT_2_Cross walk on 132nd Ave NE at NE 66th Street	TL 1 Traffic median island on Slater Ave NE at NE Frost						
Separt passeroe, microstree, the closely, assorber passeroe, and decidities. Serie (comp. Assorber passeroe)   Separt passeroe (comp. Assorber passeroe)   Separt passeroe (comp. Assorber passeroe)   Separt passeroe)   Separt passeroe (comp. Assorber passeroe)   Separt passeroe	Safe and convenient walkways of the appropriate size are a foundation for pedestrian activity. Kirkland's existing codes call for sidewalks on both sides of almost all streets. Because of the high cost to construct sidewalks everywhere, they are missing in many points of Kirkland's system, it is		100											0	0	0	0	0	0
Weighted annually based on applicants Weighted annually based based on applicants Weighted annually based based on applicant ba			16	8	14	11	3	9	8	0	12	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Margined annually based on applicant   Feed Reduced Mess of Clinotic, 194-201-C2, 2154-C3)   3   2   3   2   0   0   0   0   0   0   3   3   3   3	1	Minority (<17%=0; 18%-29%=2; 30%<=3)	3	2	3	2	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	ı					
Disable   C5%-0.054-200-2.1015/c-3)   3   0   3   2   3   2   2   0   0   2   2   3   3   4   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0	•	Free & Reduced Meals (<10%=0; 11%-20%=2; 21%<=3)	3	2	3	2	0	3	2	0	2	0	3						
Edwiry % Cher 65 (>1896-21)		Language Block Group (>2%=3)	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3						
Veterans (1986=2)   Vete		Disabled (<5%=0; 6%-10%=2; 10.1%<=3)	3	0	3	2	3	2	2	0	2	2	3						
Transportation Master Pfan: Community input—eccause of the sase of pedestrian projects, gathering the on-the ground knowledge through 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 9 3 3 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Elderly % Over 65 (>18%=2)	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2						
Consistency with Planes Based upon Neighborhood Planks), Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan, and Cross Kirdhaud Cornifor Mater Plan. (Regard to 1) points I RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.)		Veterans (>8%=2)	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0						
Neighborhood Planis), Part, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan, and Cross Kirlahand Cornic Ansater Plan, (Negative 10 points if RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.)  Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority ranking.  Transportation Master Plan. Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding and element of the grant project. (0–4)  Neighborhood Association support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association support in the project priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan. Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding and element of the grant project. (0–4)  Neighborhood Association support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority ranking.  Project Priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan. Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding and element of the grant project. (0–4)  Neighborhood Association support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association support: Project priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan. Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding and element of the grant project. (0–4)  Neighborhood Association support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association support: Project was revi			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ref8 does not meet standards for priority sites.)  Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association Support: Project Priority 1 (2)  Association and received a priority and received a priority and received a priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding and enable the priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)  No (0)  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance eases, if project includes minor maintenance as existing (2)  Treater maintenance as existing (2)  Association subject to the Neighborhood Association Support: Project 1 1 1 2  2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 2 2  2 2 2 2	Neighborhood Plan(s), Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan, and Cross Kirkland		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2						
Association and received a priority ranking.  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (In-quality manufacture)  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes minor maintenance = 2.	RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.)	Does not align with existing plan (0) or -10 if does not meet RFB/Crosswalk Standards																	
Association and received a priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0–4)  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance eachs. If project includes minor maintenance = 2.  Association and received a priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  4  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0	Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood	Project Priority 1 (2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2						
should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes minor maintenance = 2.  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (3)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (3)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (3)  Some maintenance as existing (4)  Some maintenance as existing (5)  Some maintenance as existing (6)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (2)  Some maintenance as existing (3)  Some maintenance as existing (4)  Some maintenance as existing (5)  Some maintenance as existing (6)  Some maintenance as existing (6)  Some maintenance as existing (7)  Some maintenance as existing (8)  Some maintenance as existing (9)  Some maintenance as exis		Project Priority 2 (0)									_								
Candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)   No (0)   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0			4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
an element of the grant project. (0-4)   No (0)   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0		t Yes (4)	4																
Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes minor maintenance = 2.  Greater maintenance than existing (0)  Same maintenance as existing (2)  0 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		'		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
City maintenance needs. If project includes minor maintenance = 2.  Same maintenance as existing (2)  2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Maintenance		4	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
minor maintenance = 2. Same maintenance as existing (2) 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	City maintenance needs. If project includes	Greater maintenance than existing (o)		0	0					0	0								
Less maintenance than existing (4) 4						2	2	2	2			2	2						
accommendate than existing (4)		Less maintenance than existing (4)	4																

Attachment B. 2019 NSP Project Team - Panel Criteria			on 108th Ave at NE 46th Street	Street at 129th	FH_1_Raised Sidewalk on corner of NE 134th Street	Improvement on NE 87th Street at 114th Ave NE	JN_1_Walkway on NE 120th Street between 93rd Pl NE and 96th Ave	on Lakeview Drive north of 64th Street	Improvement on 5th Street between 10th	Beacon on 124th Avenue	SRHBT_2_Cross walk on 132nd Ave NE at NE 66th Street	median island on Slater Ave NE at NE	-					
			Lakeview	Muir	Thoreau	Kirk	Juanita	Lakeview	Kirk	Twain	Franklin	Frost						
sides of almost all streets. Because of the high cost	tize are a foundation for pedestrian activity. Kirkland's existing codes call for sidewalks on both to construct sidewalks everywhere, they are missing in many points of Kirkland's system, it is unding to the most worthy projects first. Locations should prioritized using the following factors:	100	47	58	54	41	43	49	29	50	44	49	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improve safety—Prioritize locations based on crash lanes.	h history and indicators of crash risk like adjacent street auto volume, speed and number of	38	17	22	15	16	8	17	5	17	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ped/Bike (1=6, >1=12)	12	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Department crash records from previous 5 years. Crash must match problem/issue.	Vehicle (1=1, >1=2) - counted only when the project is related to auto safety	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1						
Roadway Design: Based upon existing	No Sidewalk/Trails = 2 , Sidewalk 1 side = 1, Sidewalk on both sides =0 (0-2)	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0						
conditions of the roadway.	Number of Lanes (2=1, >2=2) (turn lane counts as one lane)	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2						
Volume: Based upon TMP 2 way 24-hour	Under 3,000 average daily trips (0)						0		0									
daily auto volume counts on selected roadways and site specific traffic studies	Between 3,001-15,000 average daily trips (3)		2	2	2	3	o o	2	· ·	2	2	2						
by Kirkland Rublic Works Counts are	Over 15,001 average daily trips (6)	6		3	J	3		3		3	3	3						
	Speed limit 25 MPH and under (0)								0									
limits, study data (when available), and anecdotal information. If there is speed data	Speed limit 26–30 MPH (3)				3	3	3		· ·									
from NTCP, the 85th percentile	Speed limit 31 MPH and above (6)	6	6	6	J	J	J	6		6	6	6						
project enhances the safety of the following —	Bicycle (0-2) (2 if bicycle facility at this location)	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	2						
	Pedestrian (0-2) (2 if pedestrian facility is at this location)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2						
	Vehicular (0-2) (only if it addresses safety for a vehicle)	2	1 -	_	_	2	0	-	0	-	-	2						
<b>†</b>	Transit (0-2) (only if transit is at this location)	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2						
Make Connections—Give high priority to projects t	hat fill gaps by connecting existing sidewalks.	16	0	4	12	4	8	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sidewalk, paved shoulder, or gravel path on both sides (0)		0	0		0		0	<u></u>	0	0	0					1	
(not applicable in parks).	Sidewalk, paved shoulder, or gravel path on one side (4)			v	4	v		· ·		· ·	· ·	ŭ						
<u> </u>	No shoulder or sidewalk either side: must walk in vehicle lane (8)	8	-		7		8		8									
School Walk Route: The project extends,	Not located on a School Walk Route (0)																	
adds or completes a nonmotorized system	Improves School Walk Route where sidewalk (or extruded curb) exists on at least one side of the		0				0		0		0	0						
	road (4) Improves School Walk Routes where no sidewalk (or extruded curb) exists on either side of the road (8)	8		4	o	4		4		4								
Link to Land Use—Choose sidewalks that expand and enhance walkability and places where current pedestrian volumes are high.   Connect to Transit—Complete walkways that allow easy access to transit, particularly regional transit.   Connect to the Cross Kirkland Corridor—Make numerous strong links to the CKC.		18	18	14	10	12	12	14	12	14	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walkability: Based upon the TMP walkability scores for roadways in Kirkland.	Low—Walkability factor 1-5.5 (0) (Level 1 on map)																	
The walkability score is made up of the	Moderate—Walkability factor 6-9 (6) (Level 2 on map)		1		6													
	High—Walkability factor of 9-13.5 (10) (Level 3 on map)		1	10	Ū	10	10	10	10	10	10	10						
polict T-5.1 in the Transportation Master Plan).	Very High—Walkability factor of 13.5+ (14) (Level 4 on map)	14	14															
	No link to Pedestrian/Bicycle/Transit Facility (0)		1									0						
multimodal facilitites. (Radar speed signs do not link = 0)	Link to Pedestrian OR Bicycle OR Transit Facility (2)		1			2	2		2			Ü						
·	Link to Pedestrian AND Bicycle AND Transit Facility (4)	4				-	-		-									

Transportation Master Plan Policy  Under continuent washings and the package and the package and the processing codes can fire seemants and the processing	Attachment B. 2019 NSP Project Team - Panel Criteria				on NE 132nd Street at 129th	FH_1_Raised Sidewalk on corner of NE 134th Street	Improvement on NE 87th Street at 114th Ave NE	JN_1_Walkway or NE 120th Street between 93rd Pl NE and 96th Ave	on Lakeview Drive north of 64th Street	Improvement on 5th Street between 10th	Beacon on 124th Avenue		TL 1 Traffic median island on Slater Ave NE at NE						
Set and consequence analoxage of the page registres one as an a localization of page of the following frequency in the followin				Lakeview	Muir	Thoreau	Kirk	Juanita	Lakeview	Kirk	Twain	Franklin	Frost						
Frame protection monthly from the performance of the cased upon Monthly (127%-05), 588-279%-279%-279%-279%-279%-279%-279%-279%	Safe and convenient walkways of the appropriat sides of almost all streets. Because of the high c	e size are a foundation for pedestrian activity. Kirkland's existing codes call for sidewalks on both ost to construct sidewalks everywhere, they are missing in many points of Kirkland's system, it is	100	47	58	54	41	43	49	29	50	44	49	0	0	0	0	0	0
## DOINT (A.P.O.K. a. COP) Report Card, Weighted annually based on applicants.  ## Weighted annually based on applicants.  ## Proc. & Recinered Michig (ESTIN-CE); 137.70(1-2); 237.75(-2)] ## Proc. & Recinered Michig (ESTIN-CE); 137.75(-2)] ## Proc. & Recinered Michigan (ESTIN-CE);			16	8	14	11	3	9	8	0	12	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weighted annually based on applications   Feek Redicted Models (1001400, 1101-20014-02, 2131-0-3)   3   2   3   2   0   3   2   0   3   3   3   3   3   3   3   3   3		Minority (<17%=0; 18%-29%=2; 30%<=3)	3	2	3	2	0	2	0	0	3	3	2						
Disable   (55%-10, 6%-101%-2; 101%-2;)   33   0   3   2   3   2   2   0   0   2   2   3   3   2   3   2   3   3   2   3   3	·	Free & Reduced Meals (<10%=0; 11%-20%=2; 21%<=3)	3	2	3	2	0	3	2	0	2	0	3						
Elderly W. Over 65 (18%-27)   2   2   0   0   0   0   0   2   2   0   2   2		Language Block Group (>2%=3)	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3						
Veterans (		Disabled (<5%=0; 6%-10%=2; 10.1%<=3)	3	0	3	2	3	2	2	0	2	2	3						
Transportation Master Plan: Community input. Because of the scale of pedestrian projects, gathering the on-the-ground knowledge through 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 3 3 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0  Consistency with Plans Based upon Melighorhood Plan(), Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan, and Corros Kirkland Corridor Master Plan: (Negative 10 points) RPB does not meet standards for priority sites.)  Neighborhood Association Support: Projects Was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority ranking.  Project Priority 1 (2) Project Priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding About generally when a higher priority, However, causion must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant can element of the grant project. (C-4) No (0)  Maintenance  Very 64)  Greater maintenance then essisting (0) City maintenance ed Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance recks. If project includes  Greater maintenance than essisting (0) City maintenance recks if project includes  City maintenance recks. If project includes  Greater maintenance than essisting (0) City maintenance recks. If project includes  Greater maintenance than essisting (0) City maintenance recks. If project includes  Greater maintenance than essisting (0) City maintenance recks. If project includes  Greater maintenance shall be a sixting of the projects of the sixting of the projects of the project includes  Greater maintenance than essisting (0) City maintenance recks. If project includes  Greater maintenance recks. If project includes		Elderly % Over 65 (>18%=2)	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2						
Consistency with Plans: Based upon Melphomode Plans(b, Pran, Recreation, and Open Space (PRCS) Plan, and Cross kirishad Cornidor Master Plan, tregestate 1 points if RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.)  Melphomode Association support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received by the Neighborhood Association and received by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority ranking.  Transportation Master Plan: (Respiration of the grant project with a good potential grant can didate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project (1-4) or an element of the grant project (1-4) or an element of the grant project induces.  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project Impacts to existing City match or an element of the grant project induces. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the second of the grant project induces. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching eneeds in figure in the grant project includes. Grant matching energy in the existing plan (2) or a company of the grant project includes. Grant matching energy in the existing plan (2) or a company of the grant project includes. Grant matching energy in the existing plan (2) or a company of the grant project includes. Grant matching energy in the existing plan (2) or a company of the grant project includes. Grant matching energy in the existing plan (2) or a company of the grant project includes. Grant matching energy in the existing plan (2) or a company of the grant project includes. Gra		Veterans (>8%=2)	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0						
Neighborhood Planic, Park, Recreation, and Corridor Master Plan. (Negative 1g points) if RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.)  Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority raining.  Project Priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding—Projects paired with a good potential grant candidates. (NF) funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0–4)  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing plan (2)  2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
REB does not meet standards for priority sites.)  Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association Support: Project Priority 1 (2)  Association and received a priority ranking.  Froject Priority 2 (0)  Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding phough a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0–4)  Maintenance of Project Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes City maintenance as in project includes City maintenance as in project includes Series and the project inclu	Neighborhood Plan(s), Park, Recreation, ar Open Space (PROS) Plan, and Cross Kirklan		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2						
was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority ranking.    Project Priority 2 (0)	RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.)	Does not align with existing plan (0) or -10 if does not meet RFB/Crosswalk Standards																	
Association and received a priority ranking.  Fransportation Master Plan: Cost/likeliness to receive grant funding—Projects that have lower cost or that are good candidates for grant funding should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be city match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes  Greater maintenance than existing (0)  Greater maintenance than existing (0)  Greater maintenance and so considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant can be city match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)  No (0)  O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	Neighborhood Association Support: Project	t Project Priority 1 (2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2						
should generally have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.  Project is paired with a good potential grant candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)  Maintenance  Maintenance  Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes  Greater maintenance as evisiting (0)  For projects are also considered.  O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Project Priority 2 (0)																	
Candidate. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0-4)   No (0)   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0			4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
an element of the grant project. (0-4) No (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Project is paired with a good potential gran	t Yes (4)	4		•			•		•	•	•	•						
Maintenance of Project: Impacts to existing City maintenance needs. If project includes  Greater maintenance than existing (0)  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O	· ·	No (0)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
City maintenance needs. If project includes Company maintenance of the Comp	Maintenance		4	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Como maintenance de quintina (2)		Greater maintenance than existing (o)		0	0		•	•	•	0	0								
				1		2	2	2	2			2	2						
Less maintenance than existing (4) 4		Less maintenance than existing (4)	4																





















