



Comprehensive Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan

Community Conversation

December 15, 6:30 p.m.











No decisions have been made.

We want your input!

Your Project Team



PNW Regional Office Gresham, Oregon



Jeff Milkes, MS, CPRP **Project Manager**



Tom Diehl, MS, CPRP Principal-in-Charge



Dave Peterson, MS, PLA GRASP® Team Leader



Caylon Vielehr **GIS Analyst**





Clayton Beaudoin, PLA, ASLA



Derrick Eberle, PLA, **ASLA**



Bryon Scott, ADAC



Boulder, Colorado



Chris Cares, Principal **Founding Partner**



Renton, Washington



Matt Anderson, RA



How many people are with you, watching and participating in this Community Conversation?

Have you provided input in the master planning effort so far? (stakeholder or focus group meeting, taken the survey, etc.)?

Key Elements of a Community Parks and Recreation Strategic/Master Plan



Strategic Kick-Off

- Critical Success Factors
- Key focus areas
- Meeting schedule
- Identification of Key Stakeholders
- Gathering of All Relevant Documents
- Briefing with Decision Makers





4 Stages of Public Engagement

Information Gathering

- Needs Assessment
- Staff
- Stakeholders
- Public Meetings
- Focus groups
- Interviews
- Surveys
- · Online engagement
- Inventory
- All Assets
- All Program Locations
- Other Providers
- Level of Service Analysis
- GIS component-based mapping
- Quality, Quantity, Functionality
- Community Profile
- Historical & Planning Context
- Demographics
- Trends

Findings & Visioning

- Presentation/Feedback Sessions
 - Staff
- Stakeholders
- Decision Makers
- What We Have Discovered
- Key Issues Matrix
- Key Ideas and Themes for Improvement
- Analysis
 - Programming
 - Operations
 - Maintenance
 - Marketing & Communications
 - Financial Resources



Praft Recommendations

- Summary Findings
- Strategies
 - · Long-Term Vision
 - Short-Term Action
- Implications
- Financial
- Operational
 Maintenance
- Recommendations
- Action Plan
- Tasks
- TimingCosts
- Review & Revisions



Final Plan

- Review
- StaffPublic
- Decision Maker
- Distribute/Post



Implementation

- Action Plan
 Appual
- Annual Review



Typically our Strategic/Master Slans include a 5-year focus on operations, 10-year focus on capital, and 20 year strategic vision. Other elements and tools are added as needed for a community-specific plan.

Plan Process & Schedule



Public Engagement Participation

1 of 2

3,674
Participants

•	Focus Groups	38
•	Stakeholder Interviews	12
•	City Staff and Leadership SWOT	43
•	Community Conversation Webinar	48
•	Youth "Catch the Butterfly" Input	118
•	Human Services Commission	5
•	Kirkland Park Board	7
•	Youth Summit	23

Public Engagement Participation

2 of 2

•	Input from the Everest and Moss Bay neighborhoods	121
•	Dog Off-leash input meeting	75
•	Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion perspectives meeting	7
•	Dog Off-Leash pop-up comments received	136
•	Senior Council comments	11
•	Additional written comments	29
•	Survey – Random Invitation	656
•	Survey – Open Link	2345

Community Profile - Demographics




Kirkland Population

92,077

Population
Source 2021 Eari Business Analyst

We will also be looking at King County Demographic Data




Source: 2021 Esri Business Analyst

Age Distribution of Kirkland Residents

Age Group	2010	2021	% Change
Age 0-4	6.22%	5.20%	<mark>-1.02%</mark>
Age 5-9	5.60%	5.50%	-0.10%
Age 10-14	5.24%	5.90%	0.66%
Age 15-19	5.24%	5.20%	-0.04%
Age 20-24	5.88%	5.40%	-0.48%
Age 25-29	8.93%	7.20%	
Age 30-34	8.32%	7.40%	-0.92%
Age 35-39	8.05%	8.30%	0.25%
Age 40-44	7.79%	7.50%	-0.29%
Age 45-49	7.95%	6.80%	\
Age 50-54	7.64%	6.50%	
Age 55-59	6.72%	6.80%	0.08%
Age 60-64	5.74%	6.40%	0.66%
Age 65-69	3.79%	5.40%	/ <mark>1.61%</mark>
Age 70-74	2.35%	4.40%	2.05%
Age 75-79	1.73%	2.80%	1.07%
Age 80-84	1.34%	1.60%	0.26%
Age 85+	1.46%	1.70%	0.24%

Kirkland Ethnic Character




Source: 2021 Esri Business Analyst

Kirkland Ethnic Character Trends

	2010	2021	% Change
Hispanic Population	6.72%	8.08%	1.36%
Population of Two or More Races	4.46%	5.48%	1.02%
Other Race Population	2.70%	3.20%	0.50%
Pacific Islander Population	0.25%	0.30%	0.05%
Asian Population	11.33%	17.25%	5.92%
American Indian/Alaska Native Population	0.42%	0.40%	-0.02%
Black/African American Population	1.72%	2.12%	0.40%
White Population	79.12%	71.24%	-7.88%

Source: 2021 Esri Business Analyst

Kirkland Household Income



King County Health Rankings

King County ranked 2nd of 38 Washington Counties in Health Outcomes

Source: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, *County Health Rankings 2020, http://www.Countyhealthrankings.org*

Kirkland Individuals with Disabilities

7.5%

Live with a Disability

Source: 2021 Esri

Business Analyst

Hearing difficulty – 2.3%
Vision difficulty – 0.9%
Cognitive difficulty – 3.0%
Ambulatory difficulty – 3.4%
Self-care difficulty – 1.3%
Independent living difficulty 3.1%

Themes From Public Engagement

- DEI focus and access for all Kirkland community members
- Aquatics, sports activities and facilities
- Connected trails & walking opportunities
- Dog parks
- Senior program opportunities
- All-inclusive amenities in parks
- Pickleball
- Greater access to programs, sports fields, etc.



Top Priorities – Public Engagement

- Accessible parks/programs for all Kirkland residents (equity)
- Partnership opportunities (funding, programs, facilities)
- Pickleball
- Improved communication and promotion
- Safe connectivity of green spaces
- Ensure maximum green space to balance future development
- Synthetic turf fields (lighted)
- Indoor public aquatic facility
- Greater access to programs and services
- Remain adaptable as demographics change
- Support activities that can be done at all stages of life

Top Activities to Add/Enhance – Public Engagement

- Learn to swim/senior & other aquatics programs
- Pickleball
- Senior programs
- Alternative sports cricket, rugby, lacrosse
- Family friendly programs
- Outdoor recreation programs
- Group fitness programs indoor/outdoor
- Life skills enrichment classes
- Kayak and paddleboard rentals
- Sports Tournaments requires additional sports fields
- Water sport camps (sailing, paddle board)
- Lifelong recreation programs
- Adult Sports softball, soccer, volleyball

Top Amenities – Public Engagement

- Pickleball courts (lighted)
- Additional restrooms/open year around
- Synthetic turf fields (lighted) & multi-use all weather facilities
- Indoor aquatic center and longer access to outdoor pools/additional pools
- Dog parks (off leash)
- Large covered outdoor space for events and programs
- Outdoor fitness stations
- Drinking fountains that fill water bottles and provide for pets
- Picnic shelters (small and large) to provide shade
- Community gardens (pea patches)
- Covered play areas
- Preserving usable green space
- Splash pad

Trends Relevant to Kirkland



National Sports Trends

Sports Trends


Water Sport	5 Year Avg. Annual Growth
Stand Up Paddling	1 20.2%
Kayaking (whitewater)	↑ 6.0%
Recreational Kayaking	↑ 5.2%
Rafting	-1.4%
Water Skiing	-3.8%
Jet Skiing	-5.0%

Team Sport	5 Year Avg. Annual Change
Rugby	↑ 16.5%
Baseball	1 0.4%
Swimming on a Team	1 0.1%
Fast Pitch Softball	↑ -2.7%
Touch Football	-3.5%
Ultimate Frisbee	-8.7%


Aerobic Activity	5 Year Avg. Annual Change
High Impact Intensity Training (HIIT)	♠ 9.3%
Cross-Training Style Workouts	↑ 6.6%
Row Machine	1 5.8%
Stair Climbing Machine	↑ 5.6%
Aquatic Exercise	♠ 5.0%
Tai Chi	↑ 5.0%
Strength Activity	5 Year Avg. Annual Change
Kettleballs	7.0%
Individual Sports	5 Year Avg. Annual Change
Triathlon (Off-Road)	1 7.1%
Martial Arts	↑ 11.2%
MMA for Fitness	↑ 11.1%
Trail Running	♠ 9.6%
Boxing for Competition	♠ 9.5%
Adventure Racing	↑ 7.3%
Boxing for Fitness	↑ 6.2%
Racquet Sports	5 Year Avg. Annual Change
Cardio Tennis	9.1%
Pickleball	↑ 8.5%

Source: 2018 Sports, Fitness, and Leisure Activities Topline Participation Report, 2012 - 2017


Kirkland Adult Fitness Participation



Kirkland Adult Team Sport Participation



Kirkland Adult Outdoor Recreation Participation



Kirkland Outdoor Participation by Ethnic Background

Asian:

- (1) 25.5% Running, Jogging, and Trail Running
- (2) 20% Hiking
- (3) 16.2% Road Biking, Mountain Biking, and BMX

Hispanic:

- (1) 21% Running, Jogging, and Trail Running
- (2) 15.4% Road Biking, Mountain Biking, and BMX
- (3) 14.3% Car, Backyard, Backpacking and RV camping

African American:

- (1) 17.3% Running, Jogging, and Trail Running
- (2) 10.9% Road Biking, Mountain Biking, and BMX
- (3) 9.9% Freshwater, Saltwater, and Fly Fishing

Caucasian:

- (1) 19.4% Hiking
- (2) 17.9% Freshwater, Saltwater, and Fly Fishing
- (3) 16.5% Running, Jogging, and Trail Running

Survey Summary



Methodology

Primary methods:

1 = Statistically Valid (Invitation Survey)

Mailed postcard and survey with an option to complete online through password protected website

2 = Open Link Survey
Online survey available to all residents of Kirkland

4,864 Postcards & 4,822 Surveys Delivered



656 - Invitation Surveys Completed +/- 3.8% Margin of Error



2,345 - Open Link Surveys Completed



Survey Demographics

81% are regular park users 83% own their homes 14% need ADA services 40% own a dog 5% are Hispanic/14% Asian 90% are registered voters

Key Findings



PARK USAGE

City parks are the most widely used facilities, services or programs provided by Kirkland Parks and Community Services. 66% of Invite respondents and 73% of Open link respondents use City parks at least a few times a month or more. Open link respondents are more likely to be users.



COMMUNICATION

There is some room for improvement to better leverage communication efforts and information dissemination about parks and recreation to further create awareness in Kirkland. 23% of overall respondents indicated that communication is not effective, with an average score of 3.3 (on a scale of 1 to 5).



IMPORTANCE

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being very important, Invite respondents rated parks and open spaces (4.7), trails in parks and/or city trail systems (4.7) and restrooms (4.4) as the most important facilities and amenities to their households. Programs and services were less important overall with special events rating the highest at 3.6.



NEEDS MET

In terms of facilities meeting the needs of the community, invite respondents rated all facilities and amenities and all programs and services above average (3.0). Parks and open spaces rated the highest for facilities at 4.1 and special events rated the highest for programs and services at 4.0.

Key Findings



INCREASE USE

Year-round restrooms, Recreation Center or Indoor Aquatic Complex, and better lighting (parks, trails, and facilities) are the top 3 items that if addressed would increase use at parks and recreation in Kirkland. Expanded hours of operation and lower pricing/user fees were more important to lower incomes and the Hispanic population.



FUTURE NEEDS

New parks in the North area of Kirkland and an indoor aquatics center are the most important needs for improvement for Kirkland Parks and Community Services over the next 5 to 10 years. Little interest/support in building new athletic fields or converting to synthetic turf (or developing more niche facilities for cricket, futsal, rugby, etc.) exists.



FUNDING SOURCES

More than half of respondents indicate that they would probably or definitely support a bond referendum for specific projects, indoor aquatic facility and an indoor recreation center. They would also support increased user fees. More than half of respondents would probably not support any new or ongoing expanded tax.



ADA-ACCESSABILITY


4% of overall respondents have a need for ADA-accessible facilities and services. Of the respondents who have a need for ADA-accessible facilities and services, 57% have experienced challenges in accessing parks or programs.

.

Satisfaction with Parks and Services


Satisfaction (Scale 1 to 5)	% Very Satisfied	Satisfaction Rating
Parks	86%	4.4
Amenities available in parks	83%	4.2
Recreation facilities	78%	4.1
Recreation programs	75%	4.1

Actions to Increase Participation




Actions to Increase Usage

Individuals of Low or Modest Income



Importance of Facilities and Amenities



1 - Not at all important

_

- 3

4

5 - Very important

Facilities and Amenities – Needs Being Met

	Overa	II
Parks and open spaces	n=2,061	3.9
Diamond athletic fields (baseball, softball, etc.)	n=1,078	3.8
Trails in parks and/or city trail systems	n=2,009	3.8
Volleyball courts	n=762	3.6
Rectangle athletic fields (soccer, football, etc.)	n=1,068	3.6
Lifeguarded beaches	n=1,362	3.6
Tennis courts	n=1,047	3.6
Community Centers	n=1,087	3.5
Basketball courts	n=822	3.5
Outdoor pool	n=1,350	3.4
Community gardens	n=1,052	3.3
Restrooms in parks	n=1,912	3.3
Off-leash dog areas	n=1,222	3.1
Pickleball courts	n=740	3.1
Synthetic turf fields	n=772	3.0


1 - Not at all 2 3

4 5 - Comple

5 - Completely

Facilities/Amenities Importance and Performance Matrix





Importance of Programs and Services

	Ove	erall
Special events (Summerfest, races, etc.)	n=2,522	3.5
Environmental and outdoor programs	n=2,527	3.4
Fitness programs	n=2,533	3.2
Aquatic programs	n=2,516	3.2
Health and wellness programs	n=2,512	3.1
Sports programs	n=2,513	3.0
Arts, crafts and dance programs	n=2,516	2.9
Senior program and services	n=2,515	2.8
After-school and summer programs	n=2,514	2.8
Special interest/education programs	n=2,498	2.7
Teen programs	n=2,500	2.6
Adaptive/special needs programs	n=2,493	2.3
Culturally-specific programming for seniors	n=2,499	2.2

1 - Not at all important

_

_

-

5 - Very important

Programs and Services Needs Being Met

	Overall	
Special events (Summerfest, Oktoberfest, races)	n=1,462	3.9
Sports programs	n=860	3.6
Senior program and services	n=650	3.5
Health and wellness programs	n=700	3.4
Fitness programs	n=781	3.4
Arts, crafts and dance programs	n=772	3.4
Teen programs	n=530	3.4
After-school and summer programs	n=663	3.4
Special interest/education programs	n=531	3.3
Environmental and outdoor programs	n=771	3.3
Culturally-specific programming for seniors	n=403	3.3
Adaptive/special needs programs	n=388	3.2

1 - Not at all


3

4

5 - Completely

Programs and Services Importance and Performance Matrix





Importance of Program Categories by Income

Overall

- 1. Senior Programs
- 2. After School Programs
- 3. Enrichment Programs
- 4. Teen Programs
- 5. Specialized Programs

Household Income under 25K


- 1. Senior Programs
- 2. Enrichment Programs
- 3. After School Programs
- 4. Teen Programs
- 5. Specialized Programs

Household Income 25-75K

- 1. Senior Programs
- 2. Enrichment Programs
- 3. After School Programs
- 4. Teen Programs
- 5. Specialized Programs

Income isn't a significant factor


Most Important Needs for Improvement



1 - Not at all important 2 3

5 - Very important

Top 3 Priorities



Importance of Parks and Programs by Income

Overall

- 1. Indoor aquatics center
- 2. Parks in North Kirkland
- 3. Indoor recreation center
- New parks in my Neighborhood
- 5. More free special events

Household Income under 25K

- 1. Indoor recreation center
- 2. Parks in North Kirkland
- 3. Indoor aquatics center
- 4. New parks in my neighborhood
- 5. More free special events

Household Income 25-49K

- 1. Parks in North Kirkland
- More free special events
- 3. Indoor aquatics center
- 4. Splash pads
- 5. New parks in my neighborhood

Income isn't a significant factor

Household Income 50-75K

- Parks in North Kirkland
- 2. More free special events
- 3. Indoor aquatics center
- 4. Splash pads
- New parks in my neighborhood

Importance of parks and programs by large ethnic group

Overall

- 1. Indoor aquatics center
- 2. Parks in North Kirkland
- 3. Indoor recreation center
- New parks in my Neighborhood
- 5. More free special events

Asian

- 1. Indoor recreation center
- 2. New parks in my neighborhood
- 3. Indoor aquatics center
- 4. Parks in North Kirkland
- 5. More free special events

Hispanic

- 1. Indoor recreation center
- 2. Parks in North Kirkland
- 3. More free special events
- 4. Cultural events
- 5. Indoor aquatics Center


"I feel welcome in my park or recreation facility"

Overall – 4.3, Asian 4.1, Hispanic, 4.2 (scale 1-5) Ethnicity isn't a significant factor


Communication




Effectiveness of Communication



Preferred Methods of Communication



Communication Effectiveness by Ethnic Background




Financial Choices/Fees




Support for Funding Sources

Rating Category	Average Rating	Average Rating Registered Voters	Probably or Definitely Support
Bond referendum for specific projects	3.6	3.6	60%
Bond referendum for indoor aquatic facility	3.5	3.5	60%
Bond referendum for indoor recreation center	3.5	3.5	57%
Increased user fees	3.4	3.5	56%
New tax body such as a metropolitan park district	2.5	2.5	28%
Increased property tax	2.4	2.6	26%
New dedicated sales tax	2.3	2.3	24%

Result of Fee Increases



Knowledge of Scholarship Opportunities




ADA Evaluation




Household Need for ADA-Accessibility

Q: Does your household have a need for ADA-accessible facilities and services?




Q: Have there been challenges to anyone in your household in accessing parks or programs due to physical or sensory limitations? by "ADA Needs"



Households with individuals who have a disability have challenges accessing parks and programs

Neighborhood By ADA Needs





Inventory Summary

Property Classification	Park / Property	Aquatics, Lap Pool	Basketball Court	Basketball, Practice	Bike Course Concessions	Diamond Field	Diamond Field, Complex	Diamond Field, Practice	Dog Park	Educational Experience	Event Space	Game Court	Garden, Community	Garden, Display	Horseshoe Court	Loop Walk	Natural Area	Open Turf	Passive Node	Pickleball Court	Picific Ground	Playground, Destination	Public Art	Rectangular Field, Large	Rectangular Field, Overlay	Rectangular Field, Small	Shelter, Large	Shelter, Small Skate Park	Tennis Court	Track, Athletic	Trail Access Point	Volleyball Court	Water Access, Developed	Water Access, General	Water Feature Water, Open	Total Components in Park	Component Diversity	Reported Acres
	2nd Avenue South Dock																																1	<u> </u>	1	2	100%	1.06
	David E Brink Park																	1	1				1										1	<u> </u>	1	5	100%	0.87
	Doris Cooper Houghton Beach Park				1											1		1				1	. 1									1	2	1	1	10	90%	3.80
	Forbes Lake Park																1																	<u> </u>	1	2	100%	8.81
¥	Juanita Beach Park				1	2				1	1				4		1	1		1	1	1	. 1				2		2			2	1	1	1	23	70%	21.94
Waterfront Park	Kiwanis Park																1																	1	1	3	100%	2.57
ıfro	Lake Ave W Street End Park																																	1	1	2	100%	0.25
Vate	Marina Park				1											1		1					1				1						1	1	1 1	9	100%	3.59
_	Marsh Park														-			1	1		_		1									_	1	1	1	6	100%	4.18
	O O Denny Park																1	1		1	1	1					1					L		1	1	8	100%	45.72
	Settlers Landing																		1														1	<u> </u>	1	3	100%	0.10
	Street End Park																	<u> </u>	1															<u> </u>	1	2	100%	0.10
	Waverly Beach Park																	1				1	. 1				1						2	1	1	8	88%	2.76
	132nd Square Park					2												1	1			1			1			1				_		↓		7	86%	9.75
¥	Crestwoods Park		1			3		1			1						1	<u> </u>		1	1	1		1										<u> </u>		10	80%	26.63
ty Pa	Edith Moulton Park								1	1						1	1	1				1	ı				2				1			<u> </u>	1	10	90%	26.72
nuni	Everest Park		1		1	4	1										1	1		3 1	1	1					1	1			1			↓		17	71%	23.17
Comn	Heritage Park									1	1			1				1	2			1							2					<u> </u>		9	78%	10.12
U	McAuliffe Park									1			1					1				1												<u> </u>	2	6	83%	12.46
	Peter Kirk Park		1		1	1												1				1	. 1					1	2					<u> </u>		9	89%	12.48

Property Classification	Park / Property	Aquatics, Lap Pool	Basketball Court Basketball, Practice	Bike Course	Concessions	Diamond Field Diamond Field, Complex	Diamond Field, Practice	Dog Park	Educational Experience Event Space	Fitness Area	Game Court	Garden, Community	Garden, Display	Loop Walk	Natural Area	Open Turf	Passive Node	Pickleball Court		Playground, Destination Playground, Local	Public Art	Rectangular Field, Large	Rectangular Field, Overlay	Rectangular Field, Small	Shelter, Large	Shefter, Small Skate Park	Tennis Court	Track, Athletic	Trail Access Point	Trailhead	Volleyball Court	Water Access, Developed	Water Access, General	Water Feature	Water, Open	Total Components in Park	Component Diversity	Reported Acres
	Brookhaven Park								1							1																	$\bot \bot$	\bot	1	3	100%	0.95
	Bud Homan Park														1	1																				2	100%	2.20
	Carillon Woods								1						1					1	1								1							5	100%	8.71
	Cedar View Park																			1																1	100%	0.20
	Forbes Creek Park		1													1				1							2									5	80%	2.02
	Hazen Hills Park															1											1								\top	1	100%	1.25
	Highlands Park		1				1									1				1				1								\neg	\dashv	\dashv	+	5	100%	2.73
			1				1									1								1								\dashv	\dashv	\dashv	+			
	Josten Park									1					+-	1		_	+	1	+						+	-	1			\dashv	\dashv	+	+	2	100%	0.85
	Juanita Heights Park									1					1				-								-		1			\rightarrow	\dashv	\dashv	+	2	100%	10.74
Park	Kingsgate Park									-					1												-		1			\rightarrow	\dashv	\dashv	+	2	100%	6.91
Neighborhood Park	Mark Twain Park		1							-					1	1				1													\longrightarrow	\perp	\rightarrow	4	100%	6.60
orhc	North Kirkland Com Ctr and Park		1													1				1													$\bot \downarrow$		\bot	3	100%	5.49
ghb	North Rose Hill Woodlands Park								1						1	1		:	1	1 1					1				4							11	73%	20.96
	Ohde Avenue Pea Patch											1																					\bot		\perp	1	100%	0.89
	Phyllis A. Needy Houghton Neighborhood Park		1							-						1	1			1							-					\rightarrow	\dashv	\dashv	+	4	100%	0.50
	Reservoir Park Rose Hill Meadows									1		-			1	1	1			1					1		-						 -	-+	-	2 5	100% 100%	0.62 4.10
	Snyders Corner Park									1					1	1	1			1					1							\dashv	\dashv	+	+	1	100%	4.10
	South Norway Hill Park			1						1					1	1											1		2			\dashv	\dashv	+	+	4	75%	9.80
	South Rose Hill Park		1												1					1																3	100%	2.19
	Spinney Homestead Park						2									1				1																4	75%	6.54
	Terrace Park		1				1									1				1													\bot		\perp	4	100%	1.81
	Tot Lot Park									-		1			-	-				1									ļ.,				\dashv		\dashv	2	100%	0.52
	Totem Lake Park Van Aalst Park		1							-						1	1	1		1 1									1					-+		3	100% 100%	17.18 1.59
	Windsor Vista Park									1		1			1	1		1		1							+					\dashv	+	+	1	4	100%	4.76
Je .	Peter Kirk Pool	1													_					<u> </u>												\neg	\dashv	\dashv	十	1	100%	0.57
Other	Kirkland Cemetery	_													1		1						-				-					\dashv	\dashv	1	+	2	100%	6.82
	Cotton Hill Park								1	1					1		1															\dashv	\dashv	-+	+	2	100%	2.16
ž	Heronfield Wetlands				1		1	1		1					1												1					一	$\neg \dagger$	$\neg \dagger$	\top	2	100%	28.12
Natural Park	Juanita Bay Park								1						1						1								2	1		3			1	10	70%	110.83
atur.	Neal Landguth Wetland Park														1																		\Box	\bot	\perp	1	100%	1.29
ž	Watershed Park				1		1			1 -					1			_	_								-		3			\rightarrow	\dashv	\dashv	+	4	50%	75.53
	Yarrow Bay Wetlands				1		1		1	1		\vdash			1	-			-		1						+		2			\rightarrow	\dashv	\dashv	+	4	75%	74.19
	Totals:	1	6 5	1	5	12 1	5	2	10 2	1	0	4	1 4	3	23	29	11	4 5	5	3 27	9	1	1	1	10	2 1	8	0	19	2	3	13	8	4	17			641.20







					Crestwoods Park
Initial Inventory Date:		7/9/2021			00.00
45.6 Total Neighborhood	48	Total Community	Approximate Pa	rk Acreage:	26.63
GRASP® Score		GRASP® Score	Owner		COK
Drinking Fountains	2	Shade		1	-
Seating	2	Trail Con	naatian	2	Design and Ambiance
BBQ Grills	0	Park Acc		2	2
Dog Pick-Up Station	2	Parking		2	
Security Lighting	0	Seasona	l Plantings	0	
Bike Parking	0	Ornamer	ital Plantings	2	
		Picnic Ta	LILL .	2	
Restrooms	2	PICITIC LA	ibles	-	

Athletic park with multiple components. Good grass

Components with	1 Score	•
-----------------	---------	---

MAPID	Component	Quantity	Lights	Neighborhood Score	Community Score	Comments
L047	PARCEL	1		2	2	
C314	Diamond Field	1		2	2	Outfield fencing, powder coated, nice turf, covered dugouts
C028	Natural Area	1		2	2	Woodlands and nature trails
C027	Diamond Field, Practice	1		2	2	
C026	Basketball Court	1		1	1	No paint.
C025	Picnic Ground	1		2	2	
C024	Diamond Field	2		1	1	No outfield fencing
C023	Rectangular Field, Large	1		3	3	Good turf
C022	Playground, Local	1		2	2	
C021	Fitness Area	1		2	2	

Mapping Location and Quality of Components



Inventory
Site Visits

- Overall parks are in good condition and well maintained
- Good examples of recent progress to update
 - Totem Lake Park
 - 132nd Square Park Fields
- Turf conditions vary and may have been associated with the 2021 heat wave
- Undeveloped or underdeveloped properties limit level of service in some areas
- Some access and ADA issues
- Limits to walkable access across the system



The Kirkland System



Sort for things such as picnic shelters








				GRASP®
Map ID	Park/Location	Component	Quantity	Score
C038	Edith Moulton Park	Shelter, Large	2	2
C045	Everest Park	Shelter, Large	1	2
C099	Juanita Beach Park	Shelter, Large	2	3
C113	Marina Park	Shelter, Large	1	2
C148	North Rose Hill Woodlands Park	Shelter, Large	1	2
C170	Rose Hill Meadows	Shelter, Large	1	2
C207	Waverly Beach Park	Shelter, Large	1	2
C345	O O Denny Park	Shelter, Large	1	2
C008	132nd Square Park	Shelter, Small	1	2
C049	Everest Park	Shelter, Small	1	2

Trails Summary: Parks and Rec + Public Works



Park Score

		Park
		GRASP®
Classification	Park / Location	Score
	Juanita Beach Park	130
	Doris Cooper Houghton Beach Park	5 8
	Marina Park	52
	O O Denny Park	47
.	Waverly Beach Park	43
Waterfront	Marsh Park	34
erf	David E Brink Park	29
Wat	Kiwanis Park	18
	Settlers Landing	18
	2nd Avenue South Dock	15
	Lake Ave W Street End Park	13
	Street End Park	13
	Forbes Lake Park	7

		Park
		GRASP®
Classification	Park / Location	Score
	Everest Park	94
>	Edith Moulton Park	53
laiţi	Crestwoods Park	4 8
Community	Heritage Park	4 8
) mo	132nd Square Park	4 3
	Peter Kirk Park	4 3
	McAuliffe Park	34

		I	Park
		GF	RASP®
Classification	Park / Location	S	core
	North Rose Hill Woodlands Park		55
	Totem Lake Park		32
	Rose Hill Meadows		2 9
	Carillon Woods		2 6
	Forbes Creek Park		2 6
	Highlands Park		2 6
	Windsor Vista Park		24
	Mark Twain Park		24
	Spinney Homestead Park		24
	South Norway Hill Park		22
Neighborhood	Van Aalst Park		22
	Terrace Park		22
	North Kirkland Com Ctr and Park		19
	Phyllis A. Needy Houghton Neighborhood Park		19
	South Rose Hill Park		19
	Reservoir Park		13
	Brookhaven Park		9
	Ohde Avenue Pea Patch		9
	Tot Lot Park		7
	Bud Homan Park		7
	Juanita Heights Park		7
	Kingsgate Park		7
	Josten Park		6
	Hazen Hills Park		4
	Cedar View Park		3
	Snyders Corner Park		3

Top 200 of all park scores



Components, Agencies, Parks

Top 10% of all park scores

Comparisons (National Dataset)

GRASP® Benchmarking


(With Comparable Population)











Kirkland tends towards top in total parks, parks per capita but falls below the median in components per capita, components per location and average score per location

NRPA 2021 Park Metrics

(With comparable population)

2021 NRPA Agency Performance Review: Park and Recreation Agency Performance Benchmarks Outdoor Park and Recreation Facilities

Outdoor Facility	Agencies Offering this Facility	Median Number of Residents per Facility	Kirkland Residents per Facility	Kirkland Current Quantity	Need to add to meet current median	Need to add with population growth
Residents Per Park	NA	2,387	1,739	53		
Acres of Park Land per 1,000 Residents	NA	7.9	6.9	634 acres	94	
Basketball courts	87.4%	8,790	15,361	6	4	5
Community gardens	48.3%	51,197	23,041	4	-2	-2
Dog park	64.9%	58,926	46,083	2	0	0
Playgrounds	94.4%	3,672	2,106	30	-5	-3
Skate park	39.3%	66,672	92,165	1	0	1
Tennis courts (outdoor only)	81.4%	5,726	11,521	8	8	10

Comparison based on median for 50,000 to 99,999 population comparison


Surplus

Possible Deficit


Pedestrian Zones




GRASP® Walkable Target



GRASP® Walkable Access



% of Population with Walkable Access to Outdoor Recreation





Next Steps

- Visioning Workshop
- ADA Transition Plan & Engagement/Comment Opportunity
- Athletic Fields Demand Study Completion
- Draft Plan with Recommendations and Cost Estimates
- RCO Review
- Final Master Plan

Thank You For Your Time

Jeff Milkes, MS, CPRP
Project Manager
Direct (mobile): 720-788-3558

Jeffm@greenplayllc.com

Tom Diehl Principal-in-Charge Direct (mobile): 804-833-6994

Tdiehl@greenplayllc.com











https://www.kirklandwa.gov/PlayItForward