

---

**From:** Dave [dgmic@qwestoffice.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 11, 2009 3:37 PM  
**To:** Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Schuster, Chad (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Last questions

Thanks for all your help. The stories turned out well for our magazine and we hope they will help move the ball down the field a little bit. Amy, any word on a visual showing the Western-Elliott scenario? Our designer starts work next week and we can leave a hole if we know something is on the way.

I have two last groups of questions. I'll be back in the office tomorrow if you would like to explain on the phone.

The disruption issue is such a big deal. I'm trying to understand the relative nature of disruption among the options, according to the color coded chart given to the stakeholders in November. I'm trying to grasp the real meaning of what the different colors are trying to convey in terms people will understand.

Is the following paragraph accurate?

**“The process would not be painless. The deep bore tunnel may require about 12 months of significant traffic detours as street connections are built that will allow SR 99 traffic to move from the viaduct to the tunnel. But any other viaduct replacement option would cause more pain for longer periods of time.**

**“A new elevated structure would cause worse disruption for three to five years. The earlier cut-and-cover tunnel would have shut down SR 99 completely for up to four years and shut down the Seattle waterfront and fouled up Interstate 5 for the better part of a decade – even 117 months by one estimate.”**

**“The surface option of removing the viaduct and replacing it with road and transit improvements would not cause disruption so much as strangulation. Permanently shrinking regional and local north-south traffic capacity while clogging Interstate 5, Seattle surface streets and the central waterfront with tens of thousands of cars, trucks and buses.”**

Also, regarding bored tunnel cost estimates, I'm trying to better understand apples and apples comparisons between the present range of \$1.2 to \$2.2 billion, and the original estimate by the viaduct staff team. I believe the Governor released a letter in 2006 ruling out the bored tunnel partly because of a cost estimate of \$8 billion to \$12 billion (?) If that's right, was that just for the tunnel, or the whole project? Or, could we compare per mile costs between the present and the past? As I recall from the added on stakeholder meeting with the tunnelers, there was also quite a difference between the lengths of the estimated construction schedules – what is it now, what was it before?

Thanks. I'm not trying to beat a dead horse. The difference in cost estimates was a big factor.

Dave Gering  
Manufacturing Industrial Council  
206-762-2470