

Graves, Natalie (Consultant)

From: Arany, Sally (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 4:36 PM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Bandy, Mark
Subject: FW: hall items needing follow up

[Mark needs an answer today/tonight. Ron, can you respond since John is at an early evening briefing? Thanks.](#)

From: Bandy, Mark
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 3:24 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; White, John
Subject: hall items needing follow up

Hi guys,

Since I was only able to catch for 10 seconds, here is a follow up e-mail on the items I was mentioning:

1. TSMC - I know you have committed to funding the next phase of design development and we're looking forward to getting started on that. The questions for you (Ron) is: what steps do we need to take to finalize decision to move forward with this on our way funding construction in the 11-13 biennium? Do we simply need freshen up our brief writeup to reflect that our tunnel operations strategy will be based upon operating out of the TSMC, couple that with a funding plan (from AWV and 520 I presume), and get endorsement from ? (Lenzi or Dye or Paula?)
2. Tolling of AWV - as I've mentioned to you both, I'm concerned that a rough approach has not been put forth before you (that I'm aware of) because we need to start the modeling process. It appears that there is a strategic meeting this Friday morning, but that Ron nor Dave will be there. It appears that Craig will be there so if that is sufficient check-in/exec buy-in, we can try to target that. Please advise. If we don't use Friday, then we need a special meeting.
3. O & M - McCormick and I are ready to share our proposal. Similar to the tolling subject, the question is who needs to be there? I suspect at least Ron should be there and perhaps Dave, so we may need to do a special subject meeting if the Friday strategy sessions continue to be hit and miss.
4. AWV Program Planning - I mentioned the north portal and 6th through the Gates Foundation. Tweit gave me a heads up that WSDOT involvement was being sought. Not having heard anything is why I brought it up. I'm foreseeing a departmental and program need to support some of these type of activities, which are not directly tied to the delivery of the bored tunnel. It's kind of like a planning and strategic advising role, and one that I think I can help out with. Central waterfront, two-way Mercer west, etc. are other activities that may fall into the same category. Anyway, something to think about.
5. Transit - an fyi that I spoke with Chris O'Claire at the county about my concern with showing one of three lanes being restricted to transit/HOV and that a transit shoulder on 99 was a more viable option which our design had been accommodating. I also asked her about their expectations for reflecting the tunnel hybrid transit components within the SDEIS. We need to make an assumption about what to put in our modeling is the first reason I asked, but we also will need to know how they will want them written up. She was going to talk internally a bit and get back to me.

Give me a call to discuss as needed or shoot me an e-mail.
Mark