
From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 3:36 PM
To: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Ziegler, Jennifer; Paananen, Ron; White, John
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: RE: FAQs re Bored Tunnel

Amy - the cost risk discussion is still confusing, and I don't get the travel time examples for freight...can we clarify those...somehow the travel times are compared to surface streets...

-dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 2:04 PM
To: Ziegler, Jennifer; Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; White, John
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: RE: FAQs re Bored Tunnel

Here is an updated version that incorporates comments from John W and Jennifer. The only comment not incorporated yet is something about terrorism; am checking on that. I'm still waiting on technical review on a few things, but wanted you to be able to review the latest version -- we'll finalize by Friday.

I'm sure things are evolving quickly down there so let me know if there are other changes that need to be made. The goal is to keep it to two pages, but we're not doing very well on the length. Let me know if you think there are any questions or answers that aren't needed.

Thanks
AJG

-----Original Message-----

From: Ziegler, Jennifer (GOV) [mailto:Jennifer.Ziegler@gov.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 2:49 PM
To: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; White, John
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: RE: FAQs re Bored Tunnel

I keep trying to think about what would be most helpful to a legislator to just walk around with and I'm wondering if it would help to shift more to bullets, rather than paragraphs. So much of what staff prepares for them is in a bullet format--I think they are more accustomed to it and it may make it a handier reference sheet.

Based on our conversations, here are some other thoughts related to the specific questions:

1. Terrorist risk has come up in a couple of our conversations--whether a tunnel is a more inviting target. I've just referenced the emergency access and sufficient shoulders in response to that question, but it may be worth a specific reference.
2. On the Big Dig question, do we really want to say the Governor is the "project authority"? What exactly does that mean? Also, I wonder about moving the last sentence regarding delivery record down to question #3.
3. Could you depict the contingency and risk as a percentage? That seems to resonate with members. Also, does Arup have a one-page summary of their survey? We keep using Beacon Hill as an example of an on-schedule and on-budget project, but it sure would be nice to have some others. Volume is helpful on this one.
4. On the capacity question we've actually been saying the tunnel has room to grow because the 85,000 isn't full capacity. Is that worth mentioning?
9. As we talk with freight folks it would be great to be able to say it will save x amount of time on their trips or even the construction of the elevated would have added x amount of time and the surface would have added so much time to freight trips. Probably not possible, but it would be helpful to quantify travel time benefits for the agriculture folks.

10. When we talk with members about closure time, we tend to get more of a reaction when we mention a specific number of years, rather than saying "several years".

11. I think it would help to add the Port container movement number to this answer. Also, I wonder about a separate question regarding the economic impact of the surface and elevated construction?

I don't know if we want to do it, but more and more I keep mentioning to members that the elevated construction is not without risk. It's a little touchy because we don't want every kind of construction project to seem risky, but may be worth a question on what the risk assumptions were related to the elevated?

It probably also makes sense to add a question on why the state is responsible for cost overruns. We've been trying to make the point that this is a state highway and the state has responsibilities related to it--that we need to think about the precedent of making a city responsible for the overruns related to a state project.

Let me know if you have questions. Thanks for giving me a chance to comment.

-----Original Message-----

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
[mailto:GrotefA@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 11:16 AM
To: Ziegler, Jennifer (GOV); Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; White, John
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: RE: FAQs re Bored Tunnel

Attached is a draft of the FAQs about the bored tunnel; a few more questions have been added.

Please let me know if you have any other questions to include and if there are comments on the answers. This will be going through technical review in parallel so we can get this completed by the end of the week.

Thanks
AJG

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Mon 3/9/2009 3:01 PM
To: Ziegler, Jennifer; Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; White, John
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: FAQs re Bored Tunnel

We're putting together a one-pager (front and back) with FAQs about the bored tunnel that will hopefully be useful over the next several weeks.

Below are my thoughts on what the frequently asked questions are, but would appreciate any feedback since you're getting peppered with them as well.

1. Will the bored tunnel be safe?
2. Will the bored tunnel be another Big Dig?
3. Will there be cost overruns and who pays for them?
4. Does the four-lane tunnel provide enough capacity for the future?
5. How will drivers from Northwest Seattle access the bored tunnel?
6. Will there be restrictions on freight using the tunnel?
7. Can the tunnel work without the transit and city investments if they are not funded?
8. How does the tunnel work for freight?

Thanks
AJG