

Notes from Eastside Rail Corridor discussion
Transportation Commission June 15, 2010

1. Economic
 - 1.1. Costs/ridership (on commuters)
 - 1.2. Financial viability
 - 1.3. City monetary contributions
2. Value of other alternatives, i.e. investments in BRT on I-405
3. Security and Safety
 - 3.1. Grade crossings
 - 3.2. Pedestrians – school children
 - 3.3. Dual use
 - 3.4. Conflicts with trail
 - 3.5. Neighborhood division
4. Operational concept
 - 4.1. No freight no excursions
 - 4.2. Service
 - 4.2.1. Speed Frequency Span
 - 4.2.2. Vehicle type
 - 4.3. Stations
 - 4.3.1. Locations
 - 4.3.2. Amenities
 - 4.3.3. Parking
 - 4.3.4. Platform
 - 4.3.5. Fare Collection
 - 4.4. Connections to regional rail and bus
5. Provision of a trail
 - 5.1. Time
 - 5.2. Space
 - 5.3. Type
 - 5.4. Track crossings
6. Environmental (do a review to disclose impacts)
 - 6.1. Noise
 - 6.2. Air quality
 - 6.3. Surface water
 - 6.4. Sensitive areas
7. Traffic impacts
 - 7.1. Delays/queuing
 - 7.2. Signal pre-emption
8. Adequacy of existing infrastructure
 - 8.1. Financial viability
 - 8.2. Safety
9. Ridership
 - 9.1. Type of trips
 - 9.2. Origin and Destination of trips

9.3. Number of trips that begin or end in Kirkland

10. Land Use

10.1. Station location

10.2. Right-of-way

11. Economic Development Impacts

11.1. Community livability