

---

**From:** Dye, Dave  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 14, 2009 2:58 PM  
**To:** White, John; Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)  
**Cc:** Aldridge, Jo; McLemore, Susanne  
**Subject:** FW: Third Viaduct Option

Fyi - no reply necessary...

-dave

---

**From:** Aldridge, Jo **On Behalf Of** Hammond, Paula  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 14, 2009 2:17 PM  
**To:** Dye, Dave  
**Cc:** McLemore, Susanne  
**Subject:** FW: Third Viaduct Option

This is Jo. . . Here's another Viaduct e-mail.

---

**From:** Dave Petrie [mailto:DavePetrie@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 20, 2008 8:48 PM  
**To:** Bob Donegan; Frank Chopp; Ron Sims; Judy Clibborn; Grace Crunican; Jennifer Ziegler; Tim Burgess; Hammond, Paula  
**Cc:** Bruce Chapman; Paananen, Ron; Bob Petrie; Tom Boatman; Paul Dorpat  
**Subject:** Third Viaduct Option

Click <http://blog.seattletimes.nwsources.com/northwestvoices/index.html#35476> Scroll down to fourth Letter.

Look familiar?

The Viaduct Study people steadfastly refuse to look at the Surface Tunnel: The option that provides the most desirable features for the least down-time/cost. And we know why.

It's High Time we send them to the showers. They have wasted 6-years and \$50M. We could have it fixed by now!

The PI OP-ED page (May 11, 2006) labeled it *A Perfect Solution to the Viaduct*. Are they crazy, or what?

The Deep-Bore Tunnel (Scenario F) deserves a more thorough evaluation, in a Trade Study against the ALID (Surface Tunnel)- which is essentially Scenario E, but with the stilts cut off, placing the tunnel directly on the ground.

But the current study team is incapable of an honest, competent evaluation.