
From: White, John
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 11:38 AM
To: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Everett, Susan; Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant)
Cc: Paananen, Ron; Greco, Theresa; Laird, Linea; Reilly, John (Consultant); harveyparker@compuserve.com; Bohlke, Brenda (Consultant); Grotfend, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: Tunnel cross section - communications and planning expectations
Importance: High

OK everyone,

After a number of off-the-cuff remarks in multiple meetings yesterday, and similar remarks in meetings prior, it's time to lay down some expectations over how we are going to communicate and coordinate through the effort we are about to embark on to validate the space allocation and cross-sectional diameter of our concept. The problem that I and others on the management team have is that we have fairly current cross-sections that show 54 and now 55 foot outer diameter tunnel sections on our walls, which include the basic geometric and vertical clearance expectations that had been initially set, yet way too frequently we sit in meetings where make off-hand remarks alluding to the potential that it might take a 58 to 60 foot outer diameter tunnel to accommodate what is shown currently within a 55 foot tunnel. When pressed on the rationale, it almost always involves judgmental or semi-speculatory statements made by different players where there is little to no design detail to back-up the statement.

This does not work, is unproductive, and leads to premature concerns. Yesterday's examples were during our tunnel systems meeting (where no one wanted to speak about systems), and during a meeting with our FHWA lead. As we embark on the design work required to make final determinations, we need to have an understanding that we are going to maintain speaking points focused on the latest version that has been presented to the management team and received concurrence, and then engage in meaningful and structured multi-disciplinary coordination on the emerging issues that need to be managed, with some focus on trade-offs and opportunities.

PLEASE stop the random statements about 58 and 60 foot diameter tunnels! We understand that there is a TBM tolerance issue that will drive the ultimate machine diameter, but the continual random statements that are being made without detailed design back-up are unproductive and problematic.

We will convene a short meeting next week to set more specific expectations around the Basis of Design Report efforts that are meant to produce a final proposal.

Thanks,

John

John H. White, P.E.
Director of Engineering and Administration
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
WSDOT Urban Corridors Office
Business: (206) 382 - 5270
Cell: (206) 450 - 2975