
From: Grotefeldt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 1:57 PM
To: Paananen, Ron
Cc: Schuster, Chad (Consultant); Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Subject: FW: Magazine questions
Attachments: Access_Maps.pdf

Dave had many questions for your 2:30 call with him, most of which we are able to handle by sending him information and materials. Chad has talked to him about it and he knows that it is on the way. Some of our proposed responses are below in case he brings any of it up. Knowing that we are sending him info, he wants to focus on the three questions at the end of his email (copied right below for ease of reading on a blackberry). Some thoughts on potential responses are below.

I've also attached the access maps in case you don't have them in your briefcase. He is having a hard time visualizing the railroad crossing so may want you to walk him through that on the phone. We're asking Gordon if he has visuals, but we don't have any yet.

I think you have everything you need, but call if you don't...

- **Disruption during construction.** The Dec, 2007 MIG report regarding stakeholder interviews recommended addressing construction disruption "promptly and rigorously" but the 2008 stakeholders did not get the consultant's disruption report until December 2008, at the very end of the process. I would like to better understand the reasons for the delay. It seemed to be there was a real gulf between the private and public sectors on the disruption issue, and it's highly relevant now because many of us support the deep bore option because it minimizes disruption. **Economic analysis was dependent on traffic modeling, which was provided to the SAC at the beginning of November. Economic report came a month later -- this was a very quick turnaround for the depth of analysis completed by ECONorthwest. We agree that construction disruptions were a major concern and are more easily handled with the bored tunnel.**
- **Local versus regional.** We very much disagreed with the EconNorthwest conclusion that local disruptions would be significant, and regional ones not. In our experience, many of our "local" companies and facilities, like T46, are regional and when they are disrupted, the impact is regional. Is that an unfair or wrongheaded way to look at it? **The local economy is part of the regional economy so yes, local impacts can impact the regional economy. What EcoNorthwest was trying to say that when the regional economy was looked at across the four-county region that the impacts on some of the business that rely on the viaduct corridor would not dramatically affect the regional economy. The regional economy is very diverse so a change to one sector does not dramatically undermine it.**
- **Limits of traffic modeling.** As I understand it, it is hard to factor in the kind of prospective delays that might be caused by accidents in a transportation corridor. Am I getting that right? This is important because I think layman like myself judged (and maybe misjudged) the viaduct modeling based on our experiences with the types of horrendous traffic jams that occasionally take place in the corridor, coloring our view of the traffic modeling data that might be more accurate in describing normal conditions. **Correct.**

From: Dave [mailto:dgmic@qwestoffice.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 4:15 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant); Schuster, Chad (Consultant)
Subject: Magazine questions

Hi Ron. I hope this is the complete list of questions that we'd like to answer as we put together the special issue of

our magazine, Seattle Industry, that will be devoted to the deep bore tunnel option and related issues. KaDeena and Chad have been very helpful in the past on requests like this so I'm ccing them here. I've got some questions that would also be better addressed through a conversation so maybe we can schedule a time to chat soon (?) It wouldn't take long.

I'm learning how to use the WSDOT annual report for traffic volumes and collisions and am probably just knowledgeable enough to be dangerous.
Here goes.

- 1) I usually hear the SR 99 traffic count is 100,000+ vehicles per day, The annual report references a recording station R101 that shows 84,925 cars on the viaduct near T46. Why the difference? **Blue and green arrow charts on the board in Kristy's office**
- 2) If 100,000-plus SR 99 trips is correct, it would look like the SR 99-I5 corridor in Seattle accounts for something like 320,000-plus trips per weekday. I can't find another corridor in the state that comes close for traffic volume. I-90 in Spokane looks like 110,000; Vancouver I-5 looks like 117,000 and Tacoma I5 is about 185,000. Does that seem right to you? I don't know the other areas very well and maybe I'm missing major roads like SR 99 that run near the freeway. **I-5 near University St carries about 257,000 vehicles each weekday. At the same location on the viaduct, which is north of the two downtown ramps, there are about 90,000 vehicles each weekday. Total them together and it is just shy of 350,000 vehicles. There isn't a comparable corridor in the state.**
- 3) It looks like there has been no real change in I-5 Seattle traffic volumes for the past 10 years or so. Is that because the freeway is maxed out? **Correct.**
- 4) Any idea of the historic traffic counts on SR 99? Up? Down? **SR 99 viaduct volumes have grown a little bit over the past decade, going from about 102,000 in 1996 to 110,000 in 2006. Over the last several years the volumes have remained essentially constant. This measurement is at the point just south of the downtown Seneca/Columbia ramps which is why the numbers are higher than what is listed above.**
- 5) For the magazine, can we get some visuals that would illustrate some of the planned changes, like the grade separation for the new Alaskan Way surface road? Or, am I getting that wrong? **Only have maps at this point -- tracking this down with Gordon.**
- 6) Can we get the most up to date version of the charts where you evaluated each of the viaduct replacement options for traffic, construction timelines, etc. I saw some good ones but was not a viaduct stakeholder and my info was pretty sketchy.

Summary by scenario: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/9D5254B3-4C32-46AF-9ECA-F633E631F37E/0/AWV_SAC_SummaryofFindings_121108.pdf

Traffic information: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/8DE75ACA-24B0-4871-B689-7C112CF032E5/0/AWV_SAC_Nov13_Model_Analysis_Handout_lowres.pdf

Construction information: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/CA82701D-0870-4ABF-8E1E-41CABA6D5CEE/0/AWV_ConstructionOverview_Handout_112008.pdf

Cost information: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/CF145801-E99D-4367-8780-BCAA32E59A61/0/AWV_CostEstimate_Handout_112008.pdf

- 7) How many meetings did the stakeholders hold? Does anyone have hard copies of all the materials they received? I now possess the notebooks of Bob Donegan and John Odland and Bob's is only half the size of Odland's. We'd like to take a picture of the stack of written materials that were distributed to the stakeholders. **We have notebooks somewhere around the office – either Kristy or Emily C probably have them. We pulled together the number of meetings the SAC had – check with Emily Claus.**
- 8) Can I get a copy of the TDM work performed by Bonnie Nigard – at least I think that's the author. It was the consultant from San Francisco.

Presentation on TDM to SAC: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/16AEDA25-6F27-4FFC-9AF1-68BE08F9AF0F/0/Policies_and_Management_Presentation.pdf

9) Questions I'd like to talk about:

- **Disruption during construction.** The Dec, 2007 MIG report regarding stakeholder interviews recommended addressing construction disruption "promptly and rigorously" but the 2008 stakeholders did not get the consultant's disruption report until December 2008, at the very end of the process. I would like to better understand the reasons for the delay. It seemed to be there was a real gulf between the private and public sectors on the disruption issue, and it's highly relevant now because many of us support the deep bore option because it minimizes disruption.
- **Local versus regional.** We very much disagreed with the EconNorthwest conclusion that local disruptions would be significant, and regional ones not. In our experience, many of our "local" companies and facilities, like T46, are regional and when they are disrupted, the impact is regional. Is that an unfair or wrongheaded way to look at it?
- **Limits of traffic modeling.** As I understand it, it is hard to factor in the kind of prospective delays that might be caused by accidents in a transportation corridor. Am I getting that right? This is important because I think layman like myself judged (and maybe misjudged) the viaduct modeling based on our experiences with the types of horrendous traffic jams that occasionally take place in the corridor, coloring our view of the traffic modeling data that might be more accurate in describing normal conditions.

Thanks!

Dave Gering
Manufacturing Industrial Council
206-762-2470