

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: Greco, Theresa
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 11:50 AM
To: Preedy, Matt
Subject: FW: Bored vs Cut and Cover

Attachments: AWV_Bored_vs_CutCover_fs_Feb09.pdf



AWV_Bored_vs_Cu
tCover_fs_Feb09...

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

From: Balliet, Eric (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 11:44 AM
To: 'Harvey W. Parker'; Williamson, Alec; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)
Cc: White, John; Greco, Theresa; Reilly, John; Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Bored vs Cut and Cover

Attached is an updated version of the fact sheet. I used Harvey's suggestions below to replace the specific construction durations with more general language.

Please review and send any further edits as soon as possible.

Eric

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

From: Harvey W. Parker [mailto:harveyparker@compuserve.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 9:57 AM
To: Williamson, Alec
Cc: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Harvey W. Parker; Balliet, Eric (Consultant); Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); White, John; Greco, Theresa; Reilly, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Bored vs Cut and Cover

Mike and Alec, the durations did not come from the SDEIS but came from the latest one-page overall schedules and were intended to reflect just the tunnel structure construction itself. For cut and cover, that must include utility construction and any demolishing of the viaduct prior to cut-and-cover construction. It might be better to leave out the reference to years of construction and just say:

"Because of utility relocation and early removal of the viaduct, construction activities of the cut-and-cover tunnel itself would take about twice as long as deep bore tunnel construction."

That way, we are not tied to any time frame, not even a range. Alec's comments on traffic are covered in the next section but could be strengthened by adding a sentence to the end saying:

"Overall, the bored tunnel will result in significantly less traffic disruption both in length of time and intensity."

Best regards,
Harvey

At 08:37 AM 2/4/2009 -0800, Williamson, Alec wrote:

>
>I agree with Mike however I would state it slightly differently- I

>would downplay the overall delta in construction duration, because by
>the time you get the surface AW street, the seawall, armory way, etc.
>done the durations will probably be about the same.

>
>I would play up the reduction in traffic disruption to and through
>downtown, because that is a clear cut advantage.

>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)
>Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 7:41 AM
>To: 'Harvey W. Parker'; Balliet, Eric (Consultant)
>Cc: Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); Williamson, Alec; White, John;
>Greco, Theresa; Reilly, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
>Subject: RE: Bored vs Cut and Cover
>
>Thanks, Eric. I have pasted my edits to Harvey's. I am confused by the
>paragraph on construction disruption. According to the SDEIS, the
>cut-and-cover tunnel would take between 7-10 years to construct
>depending on the approach. Where did the 6 come from? For the bored
>tunnel, the material I have seen shows the start of major construction
>in early 2011 and open to traffic in late 2015. That seems like 5
>years to me and not 3. After that, you still have to tear down the
>viaduct and put in the surface street. There is probably still some
>time savings in overall construction duration in an apples-to-apples
>comparison, the real benefit of the bored tunnel is the avoidance of
>most of the construction duration.

>
>Mike Rigsby
>Parsons Brinckerhoff
>Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
>206-382-6352

>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Harvey W. Parker [mailto:harveyparker@compuserve.com]
>Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2009 5:14 PM
>To: Balliet, Eric (Consultant)
>Cc: Harvey W. Parker; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Clark, Gordon T.
>(Consultant); Williamson, Alec; White, John; Greco, Theresa; Reilly,
>John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
>Subject: RE: Bored vs Cut and Cover

>
>Here are my edits.

>
>Best regards,
>Harvey

>-----
>At 01:54 PM 2/3/2009 -0800, Balliet, Eric (Consultant) wrote:
> >
> >Thank you for your help, Harvey.
> >
> >Everyone - Attached is the fact sheet in layout form. Please review
> >and
> >
> >let me know by the end of today if you see any information that needs
> >to be corrected. John White will need this for a meeting with Craig
> >Stone tomorrow.

> >
> >Eric Balliet
> >Communications and Public Involvement Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall
> >Replacement Program
> >(206) 267-6017
> >BallieE@wsdot.wa.gov

> >
> >
> >-----Original Message-----
> >From: Harvey W. Parker [mailto:harveyparker@compuserve.com]

> >Sent: Friday, January 30, 2009 2:41 PM
> >To: Greco, Theresa; Balliet, Eric (Consultant)
> >Cc: rigsby@pbworld.com; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Gordon Clark;
> >Reilly, John
> >Subject: Bored vs Cut and Cover
> >
> >Here is a draft of a one-pager in almost bullet format to define the
> >differences between the deep bored and the Cut and Cover concepts.
> >Rather than just concentrate on the method of construction, I have
> >elected to also involve more aspects including time of construction
> >soils, environment, and disruption to the public.
> >
> >Gordon, are the depths of excavation etc. correct?
> >
> >Best regards,
> >Harvey
> >
>
>*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
>*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***