
From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2009 2:47 PM
To: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); White, John; Paananen, Ron; Reilly, John (Consultant)
Cc: Larsen, Chad; McLemore, Susanne
Subject: RE: Followup to Our February 6 Meeting

We're getting closer -- I'm still not completely there with the way we are communicating risk because it still looks like the tunnel is more risky...how about something like this...

Do we have earlier estimates/CEVP's when we were at comparable levels of design between surface, elevated and now our tunnel...and what did the comparable risk registers look like at that time? Since level of engineering effort has lots to do with this, and as the other designs have progressed, my strong guess is that we have retired "risk" and transferred it to the base...hence the base went up, the risk down and presumably the cost stayed in the chart...we know that will happen with the tunnel...

is there a graphic that can show the total staying the same (roughly) as design progresses and risk transferring to base cost? How would that look if we did it for each of the alternatives? Food for thought and all help welcome...

-dave

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2009 1:47 PM
To: White, John; Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Larsen, Chad; McLemore, Susanne
Subject: RE: Followup to Our February 6 Meeting

FINALLY....attached is the risk one-pager. My apologies for the very very very and very delayed response.

Hopefully this is what you wanted - please let me know if any further changes are needed.

From: White, John
Sent: Tue 2/24/2009 9:20 AM
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Larsen, Chad; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Followup to Our February 6 Meeting

Yes, we are working on the risk comparison one-pager (surface/l-5 vs. elevated vs. bored tunnel are the options to be included, correct?). We have a meeting tomorrow to review the draft work, hopefully we'll be able to get the draft to you soon after that.

John

From: McLemore, Susanne **On Behalf Of** Dye, Dave
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 8:41 AM
To: Paananen, Ron; White, John
Cc: Larsen, Chad
Subject: FW: Followup to Our February 6 Meeting

Hi! Here is the followup email I sent to Senator McDermott on Dave's behalf. Is the one-pager

referenced in the first paragraph near completion?

Thanks in advance for your help -- Have a great morning!

Susie :)

From: McLemore, Susanne **On Behalf Of** Dye, Dave
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 5:21 PM
To: 'McDermott Sen. Joe (mcdermott.joe@leg.wa.gov)'
Subject: Followup to Our February 6 Meeting

Dear Senator McDermott:

I would like to provide you with information to answer questions you asked during our February 6 meeting. Work is also underway on a one-page document comparing risk related to the tunnel versus other options for the Alaskan Way Viaduct. I will send it to you next week.

How long will the 34-car boat service last and what other options are available?

The Hiyu will run until the end of February. The Rhododendron is in dry dock for service and the required annual U.S. Coast Guard inspection. There is no other backup ferry.

Summary information for the Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Plan

I have attached the presentation David Moseley made to Senate Transportation Committee on February 4. It is a brief overview of the elements of the revised plan.

Ramps on SR 518

The City of Burien and the Port of Seattle want to construct a new ramp onto westbound SR 518 at Des Moines Memorial Drive. Currently the Des Moines Memorial Drive interchange only has ramps to and from the east. The new ramp would serve the freight and air transit developments planned for the Port's property north of SR 518. This property is referred to as the "L-shaped property."

The City and WSDOT entered into an agreement to study adding the westbound onramp. WSDOT has not agreed to the ramp because the study is not complete. The biggest issue to resolve is determining if a collector distributor is needed between Des Moines Memorial Drive and the SR 518/SR 509 interchange, or if an auxiliary lane would meet the traffic and safety needs. We also need to ensure improvements are compatible with the future SR 509 Southbound to SR 518 Westbound Flyover Project.

Spokane Street Widening

The project begins at the east end of the West Seattle Bridge and ends at 6th Avenue South, at a total cost of \$168 million. The added lane on Spokane Street is General Purpose (GP). The loop ramp to 4th Avenue South will have HOV and GP lanes. The loop ramp to 4th Ave South is under construction (\$25 million - all from AWW).

Of the remaining \$143 million of project cost, the City is about \$30 million short of being fully funded. The City reflected the \$30 million as stimulus funding in the AWW. The City needs \$30 million to complete Spokane Street and \$50 million for Mercer.

Delridge Rapid Ride

King County is looking for pathways to make transit service reliable with competitive travel times. The

County has requested that WSDOT designate one of the three lanes on SR 99 from Spokane Street as HOV. They suggest the additional HOV lane, combined with the existing "bus only" lane on the West Seattle Bridge and the new HOV lane on the widened Spokane Street Viaduct, will result in the route achieving the goals of rapid ride.

Thank you for your continued support. If you have any questions, please call me at 360-705-7773.

Sincerely,

David L. Dye

Deputy Secretary of Transportation

<< File: WSF Draft LRP - STC.pdf >>