Washington State Department of Transportation

# SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct Release of Updated Cost Estimates Draft Communication Plan

## Introduction

This plan outlines the communication efforts regarding the updated cost estimates for the SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct programs.

The new SR 520 cost estimates are a result of a series of Cost Evaluation Validation Process (CEVP) workshops conducted by a team of in-house WSDOT experts as well as external industry professionals.

The new SR 520 CEVP cost estimates reflect the following:

- the accelerated schedule to open four lanes in 2014 and six lanes in 2016;
- changes to the floating bridge configuration;
- more than ten percent of the design for the floating bridge, the Eastside project and the pontoon construction site;
- less than ten percent design for the west side design options.

The three west side options are the product of a mediation process directed by the state legislature in the 2007 legislative session in Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6099. That bill also requires the completion of a project impact plan in January 2009, and states that "*the mediator shall strive to develop a project impact plan within the constraints of the range of estimated project costs as of May 1, 2007.*"

The updated cost estimates will be included in the project impact plan submitted to the governor and legislature in January 2009. In addition, an updated SR 520 Corridor Program Finance Plan to be submitted early in 2009 will include these cost estimates. During the 2009 legislative session, WSDOT will continue working collaboratively with the Governor's office and state legislature to identify funding options for the construction of the new SR 520 Bridge.

The Alaskan Way Viaduct cost estimates are a result of planning level estimates for eight scenarios being tested as potential options for the central section of the viaduct. These estimates are meant to be used for comparative purposes only. Many of the scenario building blocks are at conceptual-level planning only. Risks

and inflation assessments were prepared by staff from WSDOT, King County, and the City of Seattle.

The Alaskan Way Viaduct planning-level cost estimates reflect the following:

- more than 20 percent design for the independent elevated (Scenario D) and the cut-and-cover tunnel (Scenario G); and
- conceptual-level planning for all other scenarios, including the SR 99, transit, city street, I-5, and streetcar building blocks.

The eight scenarios are the result of a planning effort begun in December 2007 that took a new approach to the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall. This new approach is considering investments to the entire network of city streets, transit, I-5, and SR 99 from Elliott Bay to Lake Washington, and from N. 85th St. to Seattle's southern city limits.

The planning-level cost estimates will be used by WSDOT, King County, and the City of Seattle to assess the benefits and costs of each of the building blocks in order to create two to three new hybrid scenarios. This will take place in early December. A decision on the central waterfront section of the viaduct and seawall will be made by Governor Gregoire, King County Executive Sims, and Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels by the end of the year.

Consistent and clear messages will be combined with widespread notification and availability of the SR 520 CEVP cost estimates and Alaskan Way Viaduct planning-level cost estimates. This will ensure that WSDOT is effectively communicating the updated information to the public, the legislature, other local and regional elected officials, and other interested parties.

This plan outlines the communications goal, objectives, and strategies; roles and responsibilities; key messages; target audiences, significant public risks; and measures of success. Specifics, such as the key dates and schedule, can be found in Appendix A.

## Communications goal

- Members of the public, SR 520 mediation group, Alaskan Way Viaduct stakeholder advisory committee, and elected officials understand how the cost estimates were developed, why some costs increased, and the level of engineering and key assumptions in the estimates.

- Members of the public, SR 520 mediation group, Alaskan Way Viaduct stakeholder advisory committee, and elected officials are able to use the cost estimates to make decisions on the west side interchange of SR 520, SR 520 funding plan, and the central section of the Alaskan Way Viaduct.

DRAFT

## Communications objectives

- Provide information to the Alaskan Way Viaduct stakeholder advisory committee, SR 520 mediation group, governor's office, state legislators, local jurisdictions and public about the updated cost estimates.
- Increase public confidence by clearly and openly sharing updated data to the public as soon as it is available.
- Gain credibility as an agency by providing updated cost information in time for the 2009 legislative session.
- Set context for the 2009 legislative session during which the governor and legislature may recommend a westside interchange option, SR 520 funding plan, and central waterfront option for the Alaskan Way Viaduct.
- Respond quickly to questions and requests for additional information.

## Communications strategies

- **No surprises and manage up:** Keep executives informed through calls, briefings, and materials. (Governor's Office, Paula Hammond)
- **No surprises for key elected officials.** Conduct phone calls with elected officials during 11/18 through 11/19. Hold a briefing with legislators on 11/19. Send follow-up e-mail once data is available on program Web sites.
- **Coordinate with media to provide information to the general public.** Hold a media briefing on 11/20 to review the cost and traffic data and answer questions prior to the mediation session. Have spokespeople available for follow-up questions.
- **Engage the SR 520 mediation and Alaskan Way Viaduct stakeholder advisory committee participants.** Provide clear information at the 11/20 mediation and committee sessions. Be able to confirm what next steps are
- **Lead with the Web.** Update the Web sites the afternoon of 11/20. Use the program Web sites and email announcements to alert public of new information.
- **Manage down:** Inform all members of the SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct program teams as content on the updated cost estimates becomes available on the program Web sites.

## Roles and Responsibilities

- WSDOT – Headquarters (Paula Hammond, Dave Dye, Lloyd Brown). Provide strategic advice, review key messages, coordinate communication activities with the Governor's Office, and serve as spokespeople.
- WSDOT – Urban Corridors Office (Ron Paananen, David Hopkins, Victoria Tobin, Joy Carpine). Provide strategic advice, review updated data, review media materials, assist with the media briefing, and assist with communication to the governor, legislators, and stakeholders.
- SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct program teams. Prepare cost estimates and supporting materials for the public.

DRAFT

- City of Seattle (Grace Crunican, Robert Powers, Richard Sheridan). Present preliminary estimates for Alaskan Way Viaduct jointly with WSDOT, focusing on city streets and streetcar investments.
- King County (Harold Taniguchi, Ron Posthuma, Rocky Ogershok). Present preliminary estimates for Alaskan Way Viaduct jointly with WSDOT, focusing on transit investments.

## Target audiences

Both Programs

- WSDOT executives
- Governor's Office
- Legislators and staff
- FHWA
- Media – print, broadcast, Internet

SR 520

- SR 520 Mediation Executive Committee
- Elected officials and jurisdictional staff from Seattle, Medina, Hunts Point, Yarrow Point, Clyde Hill, Bellevue, Kirkland, and Redmond (secondary contacts with Bothell, Kenmore, and Lake Forest Park)
- Mediation group
- Sound Transit
- King County METRO
- SR 520 corridor users and neighbors
- SR 520 email distribution list

Alaskan Way Viaduct

- Alaskan Way Viaduct Stakeholder Advisory Committee
- Alaskan Way Viaduct Project Oversight Committee
- Alaskan Way Viaduct Program email distribution list

## Significant public relations risks

- Unclear results or next steps for executives and legislators
- Public confusion about the three westside interchange options and eight central waterfront scenarios
- Negative reaction by public regarding increased cost estimates
- Perception that increased cost estimates may delay the schedule of replacing the SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct in light of the state's financial deficit
- Proponents of options attempt to use this opportunity to advance their alternative and/or negate the mediation or central waterfront process
- Proponents of options don't trust the data and launch other public debate about the cost estimates and decision-making process

DRAFT

## Measures of success and opportunities

The success of the communications efforts can be measured, at least in part, in the following ways:

- Elected officials, jurisdictional staff, mediation group, stakeholder advisory committee and general public understand the information.
- Elected officials are able to speak knowledgeably about the west side alternatives and the updated costs.
- Minimal questions are received regarding the approach or methods used to update the data.
- High number of visits to the program Web sites.
- Constituent comments reflect that the information was clearly presented.
- Media coverage is timely and accurate.

## Key messages

**SR 520 Program CEVP Cost Estimates**

- **Replacing SR 520 is a critical safety project.** The current bridges are vulnerable to windstorms and earthquakes.
- **A funding plan is needed to open a new bridge to drivers in 2014.** This will enable WSDOT to begin pontoon construction next year and work on the east side of the corridor in 2010.
- **The most likely cost estimate for the project is $4.6 billion.** This is an increase of 10 percent from 2006 and reflects a more detailed level of design, input from communities on mitigation and enhancements, and increases in global construction costs. If decision-makers select one of the other two options being considered in the west side mediation process, the most likely costs range from $5,066 billion (Option L) to $6.672 billion (Option K).

**Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Planning-Level Cost Estimates**

- TBD

DRAFT

## Calendar of Events

*(Items in italics are activities not related to cost estimate release, but are included for coordination purposes)*

| Date | Event/Activity | Logistics Info | Responsibility |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mon., Nov. 17 | Brief Governor's Senior Staff on SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct cost estimates | Afternoon, Olympia | Paula Hammond, Dave Dye |
| *Tues., Nov. 18* | *Update 520 mediation executive committee with traffic results for Westside mediation* | *Send 11/18 PowerPoint presentation via email* | *Jennifer Ziegler* |
| *Tues., Nov. 18* | *Update 520 Tolling Implementation Committee members with traffic results for Westside mediation* | *Send 11/18 PowerPoint presentation via email* | *David Hopkins* |
| *Tues., Nov. 18* | *Update cities of Lake Forest Park, Bothell, and Kenmore with traffic results for westside mediation* | *Send 11/18 PowerPoint presentation via email* | *David Hopkins* |
| *Tues., Nov. 18* | *SR 520 mediation panel meeting* | *1 to 7 p.m. MOHAI* | *Ron Judd, Jennifer Ziegler, Dave Dye, Ron Paananen, Julie Meredith* |
| *Tues., Nov. 18* | *Update SR 520 program Web site with materials presented at mediation panel meeting* | *Afternoon* | *SR 520 communication team* |
| *Weds., Nov. 19* | *Presentation to Transportation Commission on Alaskan Way Viaduct* | *9 a.m., Olympia* | *Ron Paananen, John White* |
| Weds., Nov. 19 | Legislative briefing on Alaskan Way Viaduct costs | 10 to 11 a.m., Olympia | Jennifer Ziegler, Dave Dye, Ron Paananen, John White |
| Weds., Nov. 19 | Legislative briefing on SR 520 costs | 11 a.m. to 12 p.m., Olympia | Jennifer Ziegler, Dave Dye, Ron Paananen, Julie Meredith |
| Weds., Nov. 19 | Update SR 520 mediation executive committee members (other than leg.)<br>• Seattle Mayor Nickels<br>• Seattle CM Conlin<br>• KC Executive Sims<br>• UW President Emmert<br>• ST CEO Earl<br>• FHWA Division Director | Phone calls after leg. briefing | Ron Judd, Jennifer Ziegler<br>Ron Paananen |

DRAFT

| Date | Event/Activity | Logistics Info | Responsibility |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Mathis | | |
| Weds., Nov. 19 | Issue media advisory for SR 520 roundtable | 1:00 p.m. | SR 520 communication team |
| Weds., Nov. 19 | Issue media advisory for Alaskan Way Viaduct roundtable | 1:00 p.m. | Alaskan Way Viaduct communication team |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Update stakeholders on SR 520 costs<br>• Paige Miller<br>• Ted Lane<br>• Maurice Cooper<br>• Jonathan Dubman | Morning | Ron Judd, Jennifer Ziegler |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Send Alaskan Way Viaduct and SR 520 cost estimates and news release to legislators | 10 a.m. | Willy Leiste, Elissa Hicks |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Hold Alaskan Way Viaduct media roundtable on information to be presented to SAC | 10 to 11 a.m., Urban Corridors Office (tentative) | Ron Paananen, Ron Posthuma, Bob Powers |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Issue news release about Alaskan Way Viaduct costs | 10:30 a.m. | Alaskan Way Viaduct communication team |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Issue news release about SR 520 costs | 11 a.m. | SR 520 communication team |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Hold SR 520 media roundtable | 11 a.m. to 12 p.m., Urban Corridors Office (tentative) | Paula Hammond (to be confirmed), Dave Dye, Julie Meredith |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | SR 520 mediation panel meeting | 1 to 5 p.m. Seattle Center Northwest Rooms | Dave Dye, Ron Paananen, Julie Meredith |
| Thurs., Nov. 20 | Alaskan Way Viaduct Stakeholder Advisory Committee | 4 to 7:30 p.m., Plymouth Congregational Church | Dave Dye, Ron Paananen, John White |
| Fri., Nov. 21 | Brief Gov. Gregoire on SR 520 and Alaskan Way Viaduct programs | Olympia | Paula Hammond, Dave Dye, Ron Paananen |

## Key Contacts

### WSDOT Headquarters

Paula Hammond, Secretary, WSDOT
360-705-7054, hammonp@wsdot.wa.gov

Dave Dye, Deputy Secretary, WSDOT

DRAFT

360-705-7773, dyed@wsdot.wa

Lloyd Brown, WSDOT Communications Director
360-705-7076, brownl@wsdot.wa.gov

### Urban Corridor Office

Ron Paananen, UCO Deputy Director
206-770-3565, paananr@wsdot.wa.gov

David Hopkins, UCO, Director, Government Relations and Communications
206-464-1194, hopkida@wsdot.wa.gov

Victoria Tobin, UCO Communications Manager
206- 440-4613, tobinv@wsdot.wa.gov

Joy Carpine-Cazzanti, UCO, Government and Community Relations Manager
206- 491-6974, carpinej@wsdot.wa.gov

### SR 520 Program Office

Julie Meredith, SR 520 Project Director
206-770-3568, meredjl@wsdot.wa.gov

Amy Grotefendt, SR 520 Communications Strategic Advisor
206-295-9846, grotefa@wsdot.wa.gov

Suanne Pelley, SR 520 Communications Manager
206-770-3578, pelleys@wsdot.wa.gov

Elizabeth Faulkner, SR 520 Deputy Communications Manager
206-770-3633, faulkne@wsdot.wa.gov

### Alaskan Way Viaduct Program Office

John White, Alaskan Way Viaduct Program Director
206-770-3568, meredjl@wsdot.wa.gov

Amy Grotefendt, Alaskan Way Viaduct Communications Strategic Advisor
206-295-9846, grotefa@wsdot.wa.gov

Kristy Van Ness, Alaskan Way Viaduct Communications Manager
206-382-6361, vannesk@wsdot.wa.gov

Emily Fishkin, Alaskan Way Viaduct Communications Lead
206-267-6321, fishkie@wsdot.wa.gov

DRAFT

## SR 520 Media Roundtable

**Spokespeople**

Paula Hammond, WSDOT Secretary (tentative)
Dave Dye, WSDOT Deputy Secretary
Julie Meredith, SR 520 Program Director

**Technical Resources**

Larry Kyle
Rick Singer
Greg Wornell
Daniel Babuca

**Communication Staff**

Lloyd Brown, HQ (tentative)
Victoria Tobin, UCO
Amy Grotefendt, SR 520 Communications
Suanne Pelley, SR 520 Communications

**Format**

Spokespeople sitting at table with reporters. Display materials around room. Media packets available with information identified below.

See agenda below

**Display**

2006 and 2008 Cost Comparison Summary
Detailed Option A Estimate: I-5 to Floating Bridge
Detailed Option K Estimate: I-5 to Floating Bridge
Detailed Option L Estimate: I-5 to Floating Bridge

**Media Kit**

News release

Cost Estimates (available in hardcopy and CD)

- 2006 and 2008 Cost Comparison Summary
- Detailed Option A Estimate: I-5 to Floating Bridge
- Detailed Option K Estimate: I-5 to Floating Bridge
- Detailed Option L Estimate: I-5 to Floating Bridge

Background Information (available in CD)

- Cost Estimate for SR 520 Corridor With Option A
- Cost Estimate for SR 520 Corridor With Option K
- Cost Estimate for SR 520 Corridor With Option L

DRAFT

Contact Information

**Draft Agenda (for internal purposes only)**

| Time | Agenda | Who |
|---|---|---|
| 10:00 a.m. | Welcome and Introductions | Paula Hammond |
| 10:05 a.m. | Overview<br>• What to Expect Today<br>• 2006 vs. 2008 Cost Estimates | Paula Hammond<br>Dave Dye |
| 10:10 a.m. | Review Updated Cost Estimates<br>• Eastside<br>• Floating Bridge and Pontoon Construction Site<br><br>Question and Answers | Dave Dye<br>Julie Meredith |
| 10:30 a.m. | Review West Side Design Alternatives Cost Estimates<br><br>Questions and Answers | Dave Dye<br>Julie Meredith |
| 11:00 a.m. | Adjourn | |

**Talking Points**

Welcome and Introductions (Paula Hammond)

- Thank you for joining us today to learn about the most recent update to the SR 520 program costs.
- With me today are Dave Dye, WSDOT Deputy Secretary, and Julie Meredith, the director of the SR 520 Program

Overview (Paula Hammond)

- This morning we will be walking through the cost estimates for the program, beginning on the east side of the corridor and working our way across the lake to I-5.
- We'll spend the first 30 minutes talking about the east side of the corridor and the lake crossing.
- We'd like to reserve the last 30 minutes to discuss the west side interchange options, which have come out of the work of the mediation panel. As these are new options and new cost estimates, we think they will take 30 minutes to walk through and discuss with you.

DRAFT

- As most of you know, the SR 520 corridor program is working toward replacing the floating bridge and approaches, which are at risk due to earthquakes and windstorms, and the Portage Bay viaduct, which is at risk due to earthquakes.
- A quick reminder of where we've been…
- The governor and legislature have agreed that the SR 520 corridor should be rebuilt with four general purpose lanes and two HOV lanes. This will improve public safety and mobility in the corridor. In fact, with the addition of two HOV lanes, XX percent more people will move in the corridor with only a three percent increase in vehicles.
- In 2006 the governor's expert review panel recommended that the costs for SR 520 incorporate a higher rate of inflation based on the rapid growth of worldwide construction costs.
- This cost re-evaluation resulted in a new cost estimate for the project: $3.9 billion most likely cost for the six-lane Montlake interchange option and $4.38 billion most likely cost for the six-lane Pacific interchange option.
- In 2008, the governor announced an accelerated schedule for the project and changes to the pontoon configuration across the lake. These two items resulted in a potential cost saving of $500 to $700 million, reducing the project costs to $3.7 to $3.9 billion.
- Key decisions have been made on the project since 2006, which have allowed us to develop more detailed project designs:
  - A preferred site for constructing pontoons was selected in Grays Harbor.
  - A design for the east side was agreed to with the local jurisdictions.
  - Other decisions?
- Why are we updating costs now? Two key decisions lie ahead for us on the SR 520 program:
  - We need to select a design for the west side interchange option. The legislature set up a mediation process, which has provided us with three options. We need agreement on these in the next legislative session in order to move forward with project design and meeting the accelerated schedule.
  - We need to fund the new SR 520. The legislature also set up a tolling implementation committee last year, of which I am a member, to evaluate options for partly funding SR 520 through tolls. The committee is due to reports on those options in January.

DRAFT

- WSDOT will take some of the tolling options evaluated by the committee, current state funding committed to the program, and develop an updated finance plan for the legislature to consider next session.
- We are hopeful that the legislature will use these two documents to help us agree on a funding plan that will allow us to move forward on the accelerated schedule set by the governor.
- The accelerated schedule will not only improve public safety, but also improve mobility across Lake Washington.

2008 Cost Estimates (Dave Dye)

- As most of you probably know, WSDOT uses the Cost Estimation Validation Process (CEVP) as an estimating tool that considers cost, schedule, risks, opportunities and uncertainties. A few factors that influence cost estimates include:
  - Contractor bid price adjustments related to contract packaging, delivery method and competition.
  - Uncertainty about the pontoon fabrication and assembly of the flanker pontoons and pontoon assembly.
  - Refinements to the floating bridge design following the most recent wind/wave analysis.
  - Possible schedule delays
  - Accommodation for future high-capacity transit.
  - New regulations and scope changes.
  - Extended overhead costs resulting from preconstruction delay.
- A decision on the west side interchange will be informed by the completion of a project impact plan in December. Three potential options remain, two of which are significantly different from those evaluated in the Draft EIS. This means that the costs for Option K and L are based on conceptual level designs.
- This year we have completed a full CEVP for the entire program. This included almost five weeks of time with independent experts who reviewed the base costs and identified risks to scope and schedule.
- While some of the costs are reflective of advances in engineering, we still have not yet reached 30 percent design nor received environmental approval. We expect that these costs will continue to be refined as we move forward.
- We also updated the inflation rate to better reflect changes to the national and global economy.
  - More detail here

DRAFT

- We'll now walk through the updates that were made to the project's cost estimates.
  - More detail here

Eastside Transit and HOV Project (Dave Dye, Julie Meredith)

- The most likely cost for SR 520 from Evergreen Point Road to I-405 is $776 million. In 2006, we estimated the cost for this segment to be $680 million.
- The increased cost is a result of:
  - Unit price increases of $106 million. This includes materials such as….
  - Quantity increases of $43 million. Design on the east side has reached 10 percent; this means that we are better able to estimate the quantity of items, such as noise walls, and reflect a more accurate estimate of the costs. The amount of wetland mitigation acreage increased 146 percent.
  - Scope changes of $18 million. Input from regulatory agencies and local jurisdictions, as well as new regulations, have led to scope changes. For example, new stormwater requirements have added costs for wetland mitigation and treatment options.
- We are exploring options for reducing the costs, including changing the structure types, pavement type, and traffic detours during construction.

Floating Bridge Pontoon Construction Site (Dave Dye, Julie Meredith)

- The most likely cost for the pontoon construction site and 22 pontoons is $358 million.
- The most likely cost for constructing the remaining pontoons and building the new floating bridge is $1.37 billion.
- The total cost for these two items is $1.728 billion
- In 2006, we estimated the costs for these two project elements to be $1.488 billion
- The increased cost is a result of:
  - Meeting seismic standards. We believe a site in Grays Harbor is most likely the only place in Washington that can be permitted as a pontoon construction site. However, the geology of the area requires a more expensive design to meet seismic standards.
  - Others?

DRAFT

- We are exploring options for reducing the costs, including pontoon salvage which presents an opportunity to reduce demolition costs, construction engineering and drainage.

<u>West side design options</u>

- All of the options on the west side of the corridor include:
  - Quieter pavement
  - Narrower footprint
  - Elimination of the Montlake flyer stop and new direct connections to the Montlake Multimodal Center.
  - Lid over I-5 at Roanoke
- The most likely cost for the west side of the corridor is $2.022 to $2.298 billion, assuming Option A that has been developed in the mediation process. In 2006, we estimated the cost for this segment to be $1.892 billion (assuming the Montlake interchange option).
- The increased cost is a result of community input through the mediation process, including:
  - The addition of quieter pavement
  - Changing the aesthetic design of the Portage Bay bridge
  - Adding a lid over I-5 at Roanoke

  The cost will be at the lower end of the range if the land bridge over Foster Island, the ramps at Lake Washington Boulevard, and the eastbound HOV direct access ramps are not included.
- If decision-makers select Option K, the most likely cost is $4.070 to $4.168 billion. For comparison purposes, in 2006 we estimated the cost for this segment to be $2.202 billion (assuming the Pacific St. interchange option). The scope items that make up the biggest percentage of the cost are:
  - Designing the Portage Bay viaduct to include a false arch ($242 million).
  - Constructing a tunnel under the Montlake Cut ($704 million). This is for a sequential excavation tunneling method. If a less expensive tunneling approach were selected up to $X million could be saved, however, regulatory agencies have raised significant concerns about the impacts to fish from the alternate approach.
  - Building a single-point urban interchange east of the existing one ($775 million).
- If Option L is selected, the most likely cost is $2.562 to $2.642 billion. For comparison purposes, in 2006 we estimated the cost for this

DRAFT

segment to be $2.202 billion (assuming the Pacific St. interchange option). The scope items that make up the biggest percentages of the cost are:

- Designing the Portage Bay viaduct to include a false arch ($242 million)
- Constructing a new bascule bridge over the Montlake Cut ($208 million).
- Building a single-point urban interchange east of the existing one ($179 million).

DRAFT

## Alaskan Way Viaduct Media Roundtable

**Spokespeople**

Ron Paananen, UCO Deputy Administrator
Ron Posthuma, King County DOT Deputy Director
Bob Powers, Seattle DOT Deputy Director

**Technical Resources**

Jim Parsons, Independent Project Manager

**Communication Staff**

Lloyd Brown, HQ (tentative)
Victoria Tobin, UCO
Amy Grotefendt, Alaskan Way Viaduct
Emily Fishkin, Alaskan Way Viaduct
Rocky Ogershok, King County DOT
Rick Sheridan, Seattle DOT

**Format**

Spokespeople sitting at table with reporters. Display materials around room. Media packets available with information identified below.

Presentation of costs will take 15 to 20 minutes. Remaining time reserved for question and answer.

**Display**

TBD

**Media Kit**

News release

TBD

Contact Information

**Draft Agenda**

TBD

DRAFT

## General Common Questions

1. **How are a slowing economy and fewer construction jobs on the horizon being factored into the cost estimates?**

## SR 520 Common Questions

2. **What caused the project costs to increase from $3.98 to $4.6 billion in less than a year?**
   The updated cost estimates reflects a combination of factors including; more detailed level of design, input from communities on both sides of the lake on mitigation and enhancements, increases in global construction costs, new regulations, and scope changes. [NEED TO ADD A COUPLE KEY FACTS HERE.] The estimates also take into consideration potential schedule delays, risks, opportunities and uncertainties. This is all part of the Cost Estimation Validation Process that WSDOT uses on a regular basis to provide the public with more realistic projections of the probable cost and schedule for a project.

3. **What mitigation is assumed for the west side neighborhoods and University of Washington?**
   A project impact plan will be delivered to the governor and state legislature by the end of this year. It will outline the west side interchange options and their effect on neighborhoods, quality of life, traffic, the environment, parks, the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington. Mitigation elements common to all of the options include lids, noise abatement, use of active traffic management, a new Bus Rapid Transit service plan, best practices for stormwater, use of transportation demand management.

4. **The west side Option A seems the most financially reasonable. Are either of the other two options affordable?**
   We are updating the 2008 finance plan and will make it available to the governor and legislature in early 2009. The Tolling Implementation Committee will be making recommendations to the legislature on the results of various tolling scenarios across the lake. We are here to present the cost updates. It will be up the governor and legislature to decide on which option is most affordable, based on all the information.

5. **Does this mean tolling I-90 is inevitable? Will tolling on both bridges begin in 2010?**
   The state legislature will need to decide on the implementation of tolling across the lake on both SR 520 and I-90.

6. **How confident are you in these higher costs? Will we see higher costs in two years?**
   These cost estimates reflect our best estimates at this point in time. We will continue to conduct cost estimates throughout the life of the project using CEVP. This process takes into consideration cost, schedule, risks, opportunities and uncertainties. We know that schedule delays increase costs due to the increasing costs of materials such as steel and concrete. We also know that our national financial crisis is having a ripple effect to local state and municipalities in terms of borrowing and bonding services.

DRAFT

7. **Why did the costs for building the pontoon construction site in Grays Harbor increase so dramatically? Should other sites be considered?**

## Alaskan Way Viaduct Common Questions

8. **TBD**

DRAFT