



CITY OF KIRKLAND

City Manager's Office

123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3001

www.kirklandwa.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Transportation Commission

From: Jim Lopez, Deputy City Manager for External Affairs
Julie Underwood, Director of Public Works
Don Robinson, Senior Community Engagement Coordinator

Date: April 25, 2023

Subject: 2023 NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY PROGRAM RECOMMENDED PROJECTS

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Transportation Commission review the recommended Neighborhood Safety Program projects for 2023, prior to City Council taking action on the recommended projects at their May 2, 2023 meeting.

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION:

The City Council authorized the Neighborhood Safety Program (NSP) to help "re-energize 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 program.

The goals of the NSP are to:

- Provide incentives for neighborhood participation;
- 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/Teacher Student Associations (PTSA's), Cascade Bicycle Club, Feet First, Kirkland Greenways, and other organizations; and
- Create an equitable distribution of improvements throughout the City.

Funding for the Neighborhood Safety Program

Since 2014, the NSP funding level has remained the same at \$350,000 per year. Of this, \$150,000 per year is dedicated funding from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety allocation from the 2012 Street Levy.

Historically, the Walkable Kirkland Initiative provided the remaining \$200,000 per year to the program budget. The Walkable Kirkland Initiative was created through one-time funding that ended in 2021. To replace what had been provided by that Initiative, the Council approved the recommendation to use the School Zone Speed Cameras Program revenue for the 2021 NSP.

Staff recommends the continued use of the School Zone Speed Cameras (SZSC) revenue for the 2022-2024 NSP program cycles. The attached fiscal note provides for a transfer of \$200,000 of SZSC funds for the 2022 and 2024 program, and \$175,000 for the 2023 programs (see Attachment A).

Table 1: Neighborhood Safety Program Fund Source

2022/2023 Program	Project #	Project Name	Budget
	NMC 0062022	2022 Ped Safety (Street Levy)	150,000
		2022 Add'l Budget (SZSC)	200,000
		2022 Total	350,000
	NMC 0062123	2023 NSP Improvements (Street Levy)	150,000
		2023 NSP Improvements (REET 1)	25,000
		2023 Add'l Budget (SZSC)	175,000
		2023 Total	350,000
		2022/2023 Program Subtotal	700,000

2024 Program	Project #	Project Name	Budget
	NMC 0062124	2024 NSP Improvements (Street Levy)	150,000
		2024 Add'l Budget (SZSC)	200,000
		2024 Program Total	350,000

The upper portion of Table 1, above, shows funding for a 2022/2023 program. The NSP was put on pause for 2022 because the pandemic and both personnel changes and vacancies had an impact on staff work plans and priorities. However, the 2022 program had funding. As the NSP resumes for the 2023 cycle, staff proposes to combine 2023 funding with the \$150,000 that had been funded for 2022, plus adding what had been funded for 2022 for a total budget of \$700,000. For the 2022/2023 cycle, this means the funding level of \$700,000 allowed four high priority projects, two of which are of greater cost than usual for the NSP (see Table 2, below).

The total projected cost of the recommended 2022/2023 projects is \$632,000. The next project in priority order is of moderate priority is has a projected cost of \$240,000 (see Table 2). Accordingly, the difference between the funding amount of \$700,000 and the projected expenditures of \$632,000 will be retained for contingency.

2023 Neighborhood Safety Program Schedule

The NSP schedule has remained relatively unchanged over the years. The program will continue to use the same engagement process with neighborhood association representatives.

Below is an overview of the 2023 NSP timeline:

Project Idea Forms Due: December 2, 2022
Project Conferences: February 2-3, 2023
Applications Due: February 14, 2023
Staff Review/Technical Scores: February 21, 2023
Panel Review Meeting: March 2, 2023
Panel Decision: March 14, 2023
Transportation Commission Presentation: April 25, 2023
City Council Presentation: May 2, 2023
Projects Completed By: 2024

Review and Prioritization

Neighborhood leaders and staff work closely each year to continuously improve a prioritization process that adheres to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) criteria for funding safety improvements. The TMP criteria include:

- Improved 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 generally should have a higher priority. However, caution must be exercised so that high cost, high value projects are also considered.
- Title VI**—Give priority to projects that serve higher risk populations. Higher risk includes populations with inactivity and/or poor health including people living in poverty, minorities, the elderly, and or/people with disabilities.

Projects are reviewed by the NSP staff Project Team as well as a Neighborhood Panel of representatives from the neighborhoods. Both groups conduct their own scoring process to generate two sets of scores: 1) Technical Score, and 2) Neighborhood Panel Score. The Technical Score is the first part of a project's score, and the specific sub-criteria applied by the NSP staff team to each project (see Attachment B, Project Team Scoring Criteria). The second part of each project's score is from the Neighborhood Panel, which uses a set of criteria based on Neighborhood Benefit, Community Benefit, and Project Partnerships (see Attachment C). Each Neighborhood Panel member scores each project, and the average of the Panel members' scores for each project determines each project's Neighborhood Panel score. The Technical and the Neighborhood Panel scores then are added for each project, resulting in a final combined score for each project. All the projects then are ordered highest to lowest by their combined scores, with priority placed on the highest scores.

Project Recommendations

As illustrated in Table 2, there are four priority levels for NSP projects, with the highest priority being very likely to be funded. Funding for the projects in the second tier will be determined after more specific engineering estimates are completed and project bids are submitted. For the last several years, approximately three projects (out of an average of 10 projects per year) have exceeded the target NSP project limit of \$50,000. The NSP project submission limit was raised to \$100,000 for the 2023 cycle to accommodate the lack of 2022 cycle. Continuing with precedent, neighborhoods were allowed to submit projects that exceeded the target NSP project limit because they addressed important safety concerns. In 2023, five of the fifteen projects exceed the target NSP project limit.

Table 2: Neighborhood Safety Program Project Recommendations

2023 Project Recommendations				
Points	NSP #	Project Name	SRTS	Estimated Cost
Top Priority				
125	23NSP01	MK-1 Crosswalk/Sidewalk Extension on Waverly Way and 2nd to Heritage Park		\$ 40,000
122	23NSP02	MB-1 RRFB on Lake St S & 10th Ave S		\$ 240,000
111	23NSP03	EH-1 RRFB on 124th Ave at Kingsgate Library		\$ 320,000
108	23NSP04	NK-1 7th Ave Walkway (3rd & 4th)		\$ 32,000
Moderate Priorities				
105	23NSP05	MB-2 RRFB on State Street & 2nd Ave S		\$ 240,000
104	23NSP06	SRHBT-3 Sidewalk Connection on NE 80th at 126th Ave NE		\$ 31,000
101	23NSP07	JB-2 RRFB on NE 116th St at 101st Pl NE	X	\$ 300,000
98	23NSP08	FH-1 Crosswalk on NE 132nd St at Finn Hill Middle		\$ 55,000
95	23NSP09	SRHBT-2 Crosswalk on 116th Ave NE between NE 67th & NE 60th		\$ 52,000
Lower Priorities				

93	23NSP10	CH-2 Sidewalk Segment on 111th Ave NE & 62nd St		\$ 90,000
89	23NSP11	JB-1 Sidewalk Segment on NE 140th to Helen Keller Elementary	X	\$ 90,000
85	23NSP12	FH-2 Sandberg Elementary Bicycle Buffer Striping 84th Ave NE		\$ 4,000
85	23NSP13	HL-1 Speed Radar at 116th Ave NE & NE 95th		\$ 96,000
76	23NSP14	SRHBT-1 Speed Radar on 70th between 128th & 129th		\$ 144,000
74	23NSP15	CH-1 School Zone Flashers on 108th Ave NE & NE 52nd Street		\$ 20,000

Four neighborhoods both did not apply for funding this year nor have a representative participate in NSP Panel scoring: Everest, Lakeview, North Rose Hill, and Totem Lake.

The average cost of projects has increased significantly, particularly for those projects involving rapid flashing beacons or radar speed signs. Construction costs in the area have increased in the past two years because of inflation. Furthermore, the cost of RRFB equipment, posts, and mast arms have increased substantially because of increases in material cost and supply chain delays. This has resulted in fewer projects being funded. Table 3, below, shows an overview cost breakdown of average cost, number of funded projects, and total cost of projects.

Table 3: Overview Cost of NSP Projects

Year	Average Cost	Number of Funded Projects	Total Cost of Projects
2014	\$49,697	8	\$397,572
2015	\$47,928	12	\$575,134
2016	\$32,780	14	\$458,920
2017	\$48,559	8	\$388,473
2018	\$39,642	10	\$396,418
2019	\$78,777	7	\$551,439
2020	\$111,744	4	*\$446,977
2021	\$112,800	3	**\$338,400
2023	\$116,933	4	**\$632,000

*High level cost estimates for the top priority projects (based on 75% engineer's estimate, including in-house and consultant costs).

**Preliminary high level cost estimates for the top priority projects (based on recent bids for similar projects).

Status of Prior NSP Projects:

Work on the projects from the 2020 NSP is almost complete:

- 2020 Project #1 at the intersection of Market Street and Central Way is completed.
- 2020 Project #2 is an RRFB at the intersection of 84th Avenue NE and NE 137th Street is completed.
- 2020 Project #3 is the RRFB at the intersection of Central and Main. Staff is currently waiting for a cost estimate from PSE to carry out their work in the area which consists of providing power to the RRFB system. Once the power is provided, the City's Contractor will complete the project by pouring the sidewalk at the southwest corner of the intersection.

Staff is in the process of selecting a consultant to design and produce the plans for the 2021 NSP projects. Staff anticipate that the cost of the projects will increase due to the construction cost escalation caused by inflation. The crosswalk at Edith Moulton is scheduled to be constructed this summer, and the other two projects (RRFBs) are expected to be constructed in the 1st quarter of 2024. The final cost of projects will be communicated once it is available.

NEXT STEPS:

Following the presentation to the Transportation Commission and a City Council briefing about the 2023 NSP on May 2, 2023, staff will seek the Council's approval by motion of the prioritized NSP project list. Staff also will seek the Council's authorization to use of School Zone Speed Cameras Program revenue for the NSP through the 2024 cycle.

Attachment A: Project Team Scoring Criteria

Attachment B: Panel Scoring

Attachment A

2023 NSP Project Team Scoring Criteria

Transportation Master Plan Policy

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 important that clear priorities are used to assign funding to the most worthy projects first. Locations should be prioritized using the following factors:

Improve safety—Prioritize locations based on crash history and indicators of crash risk like adjacent street auto volume, speed and number of lanes.

Crashes: Based upon Kirkland Police Department crash records from previous 5 years. Crash must match problem/issue.	Ped/Bike (1=6, >1=12)
	Vehicle (1=1, >1=2) - counted only when the project is related to auto safety
Roadway Design: Based upon existing conditions of the roadway.	No Sidewalk/Trails = 2, Sidewalk 1 side = 1, Sidewalk on both sides = 0 (0-2)
	Number of Lanes (2=1, >2=2) (turn lane counts as one lane)
Volume: Based upon average annual daily traffic counts (AADT) and site specific traffic studies by Kirkland Public Works.	Under 3,000 average daily trips (0)
	Between 3,001-15,000 average daily trips (3)
	Over 15,001 average daily trips (6)
Roadway Speeds: Based upon posted speed limits and study data (when available). If there is speed data from NTCF within last 5 years, the 85th percentile.	Speed limit 25 MPH and under (0)
	Speed limit 26–30 MPH (3)
	Speed limit 31 MPH and above (6)
Motorized and Nonmotorized Safety: The project enhances the safety of the following modes. Crosswalks/RFBs only enhance safety of pedestrian mode.	Bicycle (0-2) (2 if bicycle facility at this location)
	Pedestrian (0-2) (2 if pedestrian facility is at this location)
	Vehicular (0-2) (only if it addresses safety for a vehicle)
	Transit (0-2) (only if transit is at this location)
Make Connections —Give high priority to projects that fill gaps by connecting existing sidewalks.	
Sidewalks: Existing sidewalk/gravel path (not applicable in parks).	Sidewalk, paved shoulder, or gravel path on both sides (0)
	Sidewalk, paved shoulder, or gravel path on one side (4)
	No shoulder or sidewalk either side: must walk in vehicle lane (8)
School Walk Route: The project extends, adds or completes a nonmotorized system identified in the School Walk Route gap analysis data.	Not located on a School Walk Route (0)
	Improves School Walk Route where sidewalk (or extruded curb) exists on at least one side of the road (4)
	Improves School Walk Routes where no sidewalk (or extruded curb) exists on either side of the 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.	
Walkability: Based upon the TMP walkability scores for roadways in Kirkland. The walkability score is made up of the following factors: proximity to parks, transit, schools, certain kinds of retail (See policy T-5.1 in the Transportation Master Plan).	Low—Walkability factor 1-5.5 (0) (Level 1 on map)
	Moderate—Walkability factor 6-9 (6) (Level 2 on map)
	High—Walkability factor of 9-13.5 (10) (Level 3 on map)
	Very High—Walkability factor of 13.5+ (14) (Level 4 on map)
Link: The project connects to other multimodal facilities. (Radar speed signs do not link = 0)	No link to Pedestrian/Bicycle/Transit Facility (0)
	Link to Pedestrian OR Bicycle OR Transit Facility (2)
	Link to Pedestrian AND Bicycle AND Transit Facility or CKC(4)

2023 NSP Project Team Scoring Criteria

Transportation Master Plan Policy

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 important that clear priorities are used to assign funding to the most worthy projects first. Locations should be prioritized using the following factors:

Title VI—Health Equity Need: Projects that would serve populations at a higher risk for inactivity and/or poor health outcomes, including people living in poverty, minorities, the elderly, and/or people with disabilities.

Equity and Social Justice: Based upon WDOH Environmental Public Health Data. (https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/wtnibl/WTNIBL/) When project site is between two zones, using the larger value of the two zones.	People of Color (0-3=0pts; 4-6=2pts; 7-10=3pts)
	Population Living in Poverty (<=185% of Federal Poverty Level) (0-3=0pts; 4-6=2pts; 7-10=3pts)
	ACS: Limited English (LEP)(>=6=3pts)
	Population with Disability (>=3=3pts)
	Population 65+ Living Alone (0-3=0pts; 4-6=2pts; 7-10=3pts)
	No access to a Private Vehicle (>=6=2pts)

Transportation Master Plan: 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.

Consistency with Plans: Based upon Neighborhood Plan(s), Citywide Connections, Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan, and Cross Kirkland Corridor Master Plan, Active Transportation Plan, Safer Routes to School Action Plan. (Negative 10 points if RFB does not meet standards for priority sites.) SRTS needed to be the specific site. Neighborhood Plans had to mention the street and problem directly. Not just general improve pedestrian safety.	Aligns with existing plan (2)
	Does not align with existing plan (0) or -10 if does not meet RFB/Crosswalk Standards

Neighborhood Association Support: Project was reviewed by the Neighborhood Association and received a priority ranking. All projects get 2 points unless they are submitting 2 projects then one gets 1 point.	Project Priority 1 (2)
	Project Priority 2 (0)

Transportation Master Plan: Cost/likelihood 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 or CIP project. NSP funds can be City match or an element of the grant project. (0–4)	Yes (4)
	No (0)

Maintenance

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)
	Less maintenance than existing (4)

Attachment B

2023 Neighborhood Safety Program Panel Scoring

Neighborhood Safety Program The City Council authorized the Neighborhood Safety Program (NSP) in June 2014. The purpose of the Program is to reenergize Neighborhood Associations by empowering them to work collaboratively to identify, prioritize and address pedestrian and bicycle safety issues in Kirkland neighborhoods. The Program is funded by voter approved 2012 Streets Levy (\$150,000 per year) and City Council's Walkable Kirkland Initiative (\$200,000 per year until 2020). Each year there is a total of \$350,000 available for projects citywide under \$50,000.	100
Neighborhood Benefit/Support (Up to 60 points)	
Neighborhood Benefit: Consider the following factors when deciding how many points to assign to each project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many people does this project benefit? • Do the beneficiaries include school kids or other vulnerable populations? • How unsafe is the current situation? • Does the benefit justify the cost? • Does the project create an important pedestrian or bicycle connection (e.g., to a business district, park, or school)? Neighborhood Support: Is there support for the project within the neighborhood (e.g., businesses, schools, and PTsAs)? Were adjacent neighbors who will be impacted by the project contacted (e.g., street lights)? Were letters, emails, or a petition submitted with the application?	60
Community Benefit/Support (Up to 30 points)	
Community Benefit: Consider the following factors when deciding how many points to assign to each project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this project benefit people outside the neighborhood? • Does the project create a community-wide connection? Community Support: Is there broad community support for the project outside the neighborhood (e.g., businesses, schools, PTsAs, and community groups)? Were letters, emails, or a petition submitted with the application?	30
Neighborhood/Community Project Partnership (Up to 10 points)	
Neighborhood(s) or community organization(s) are contributing to this project (e.g. donations or volunteer hours) and their roles have been identified.	10