
From: White, John
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2008 3:33 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig
Cc: Greco, Theresa; Preedy, Matt; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark
Subject: FW: Updated Summary
Attachments: Base Cost Summary rev 7 BACKUP.pdf; Scenario_Summary_v_14 without color coding.pdf

Hi everyone,

Attached are the latest version of the base cost estimates (no risk or escalation) for the AWV scenarios and their respective building blocks, along with the summary of the general elements included in each scenario. Please understand that these base cost estimates are still being reviewed and validated, and will change further. The table also does not differentiate what portions are funded (i.e. where might the remaining state funds be applied, and which City projects are funded or partially funded). Our belief is that right now we are likely in the +/- 5 - 10% range on these. Also be aware that as fun as it is to look at the bottom line by scenario, the process we are going through to develop the best hybrids for the short list will change the cumulative costs, so it may be better to look at the building block level and compare across scenarios.

Yesterday we held the first of three hybrid workshops aimed at mixing and matching specific elements in order to try and identify the optimal short list of scenarios. The basic approach right now is to identify the best surface configuration, then pair with it the best through-put options and make any additional adjustments necessary. Currently we have the draft results from the demand model, which like the cost estimates continue to be reviewed and refined. We do not have the ever-critical intersection performance data, so we don't know which intersections have problems with the projected demand, nor can we accurately predict the travel times. All that said, here are a few key points from the discussion:

General:

- No significant difference between daily person through trips amongst all scenarios, with some showing a decrease due to the influence of TDM measures and transit changes.
- The bored tunnel (scenario F) is the only scenario to draw traffic from I-5.
- All scenarios show reduction in BST volumes (with reduction under the bored tunnel being significant).

Surface scenarios:

- Potential issues related to transitioning and traffic distribution going from 70 - 80K ADT south of King/Yesler to 40 - 50K along Central Waterfront.
- While the 40 - 50K ADT along Alaskan Way in scenarios A & B could be managed, it would require left turn lanes and increased parking restrictions. All thoughts expressed from the City indicate that this does meet pedestrian and bike objectives.
- Clear indications that scenario C (the Alaskan Way and Western couplet) is the preferred surface configuration, given that it splits the projected 40 - 50K ADT Central Waterfront traffic across the two arterials. That said, it triples or almost triples the current traffic on Western and has over double the current Alaskan Way traffic.

I-5:

- A 10 - 15% increase in I-5 demand is projected, though there was much discussion of the fact that I-5 during peak periods is maxed out and cannot handle additional demand. We mentioned the concern over I-5 degradation under any scenario, specifically large increases in through City travel times and spreading of the peak periods.

Throughput scenarios:

- All scenarios appear able to carry 75 - 90% of current traffic (operational efficiencies are gained by eliminating the central downtown ramps and eliminating sub-standard lane and shoulder widths).
- There remain questions related to Elliott and Western ramp operations on those scenarios that retain the ramps similar to today.

- The lidded trench (scenario H) needs to be coupled with the Elliott/Western ramps, and not signalized intersections at both as shown currently. The current configuration of the signalized intersections north of BST will need to be re-evaluated for this scenario as well, in order to maximize performance.
- Concerns expressed for the bored tunnel (scenario F) over the ability for the north and south arterial systems ability to efficiently feed traffic into the tunnel (Mercer/Roy at the north, SR 519 and Royal Brougham in the south).

Mark Bandy might want to add to or clarify my statements on the issues raised from the demand modeling. There was also a punch line statement at the end from the City appearing to advocate for scenario C (surface couplet) over the throughput options.

John

From: Morrison, Mike (Consultant)
Sent: Thursday, October 09, 2008 9:21 AM
To: White, John; Greco, Theresa; Williamson, Alec
Cc: Jarnagan, Harry (Consultant); Smith, Brian (Consultant)
Subject: Updated Summary

John, Theresa, and Alec,

The first result from asking the partners to check the totals has occurred. Karl Otterstrom from King County Metro discovered an error in posting the transit totals to the summary.

Version 7 is attached and replaces version 6. The largest change occurs in Scenario A, which is reduced substantially from Version 6.

Best Regards,
Mike Morrison
Program Estimator
Alaskan Way Viaduct Program
AWV&SRP Office: 206-267-6535
Cell: 206-799-7798
VMC Office: 425-885-2185
VMC E-Mail valuemike@aol.com