	1	1	ı	ı	I	I	I	ı	
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Repla	cement								
Estimate of Engineering									
	•	•	•	•	•	•			
SR99 Tunnel: Seismic Design Criteria	White Paper								
Summary Structural Hours Prioritized	by Need.								
	Í								
Summary By Need Vs Discipline									
Tag	Name	Description							
1	Required	Needed for CE – In Scope							
II	Needed	Needed for CE – Not in Current Scope							
III	Useful	Good for CE – May be Postponed							
IV	Good	Good for Clarity of Presentation							
V	Project	Project Overh	ead Including R	eviews & Meetir	ngs				
Discipline		Required	Needed	Useful	Good	Project	Sum	Total	
Start Insert Rows Below									
Engineering (Senior; QA/QC)	EngSr	69	0	0	0	0	69	69	
Engineering	Eng	165	0	0	0	0	165	165	
Drafting (Senior; QA/QC)	DrfSr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Drafting	Drf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Word Pro/Admin	Adm	15	0	0	0	0	15	15	
End Insert Rows Above									
Total	249	249	0	0	0	0	249	249	

		1						
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement								
Estimate of Engineering								
SR99 Tunnel: Seismic Design Criteria White Paper								
orteo rumien colomic beorgii orteoria vinte ruper								
Running Total Raw	36.0	164.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	214.0		
Running Total Final	68.8	165.4	0.0	0.0	14.7	248.9		
								1
	Hours (Raw)		Hours (Raw)				1
	Engineer	Hours (Raw)	Drafting	Hours (Raw)	Hours (Raw)	Total (Final)		1
Item Description Analysis	(Senior)	Engineer	(Senior)	Drafting	Admin	Hours	Remarks	Need
Start Insert Rows Below	i							i
General						0		,
Calculations:						0		1
							Assume BST Ground distortions applicable to Bore Tunnel. Use SB Undercross data	
							developed for 108, 1000, and 2500 year events as applicable to South Portal. Mononobe-	1
Coordinate w/ Geotechnical	2.0	4.0				7	Okabe applicable to North Portal	1
							Perform Hand Calculations Ovaling Analysis. Use BST Ground Distortion Curves. Apply J	
Bore Tunnel Ovaling – Classical Analysis	2.0	8.0				12	Wang close form solutions.	1
·							As part of CE work FLAC models will be run. Compare Hand Calculation to Numerical	
Bore Tunnel Ovaling – Evaluation	2.0	4.0				7	Analysis.	1
-							Assume Construction case developed as part of CE. Calculations to verify when slabs & deck	
Evaluate Deep Cut and Cover Section	2.0	6.0				9	are in place Seismic Does Not Control.	1
South Portal Retaining Walls – Loads	4.0	16.0				23	Evaluate w/ RISA3D Model for 108, 1000, 2500 year Loads for SB.	1
							Develop Applicable Criteria. Conflicting codes ATC-49 for 108, 2500 Year forced based; 1000-	
							year AASHTO T3 deflection based. 108-year Elastic; 1000, 2500 year Plastic. Develop	1
South Portal Retaining Walls – Capacities	4.0	24.0				33	Consistent Approach.	1
							Develop Mononobe-Okabe Loading. Evaluate w/ RISA3D Model for 108, 1000, 2500 year	
North Portal Retaining Walls – Loads	4.0	16.0					loads. Exterior Walls Secant Piles. Interior Walls MSE.	1
North Portal Retaining Walls – Capacities	2.0	16.0				21	Evaluate Capacities. Use procedures developed for S. Portal	1
Develop Costs						0		1
							Develop the difference in quantities for controlling Seismic event, 108, vs 1000, 2500. Assume	1
Quantities.	2.0	8.0				12	is mostly a difference in reinforcement ratio.	/
							Develop cost: Assume use Unit cost already available. Develop appropriate raw cost	1
Cost	4.0	4.0			0.0	9	multipliers for project cost.	
Write Report						0		1
Outline:		2.0			1.0	4	Write Outline and QPL	1
						_	Discusses need for dual criteria and 2500 year upper level event. Draft version already largely	1.
Introduction: Dual Criteria & Risk		4.0			1.0	6	done in draft technical memorandum.	- '
Other built distinct Colores Contacts	1						Survey other jurisdictions seismic criteria. Need to be based on recent codes and	1 ,
Other Jurisdictions Seismic Criteria	2.0	8.0			1.0		understanding of seismic demands on tunnels.	- '-
Analysis Procedure		8.0		1	1.0		Briefly discusses the analysis performed and limitation.	- '-
Findings		8.0		-	1.0	11	Layout findings for Bored Tunnels, Cut and Cover, Retained Cuts Summarize the cost differences. Present as percentage of tunnel construction cost and project	1
Cost Comparison		4.0			0.5	_	Summarize the cost differences. Present as percentage of tunnel construction cost and project cost.	1 ,
Cost Companson Conclusion		4.0			0.5	3	Summary and Recommendations	
Technical Editing	2.0	4.0		1	0.5		One round of technical edits and pick-ups.	1
Final Version	2.0				4.0		Incorporate Lead Agency Comments. Submit	
Reviews for Report	2.0	4.0			4.0	- 1	поогрогате сеаи луетсу Соптиента. Зарти	 ',
Discipline/IDCR		8.0			2.0	12	2 4 reviewers @ 2Hr Ea	 ',
Lead Agency	2.0				2.0	9	Comment Resolution and Meeting	
End Insert Rows Above	2.0	7.0			2.0			
Totals	36	164	0	0	14	249	<u> </u>	
	30	104	<u> </u>	1 0	14	249		
Note: "Final Hours" Include QC and Coordination.			l					