
From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2009 12:51 PM
To: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: FW: imbedded private engineering firm PB , cable stayed bridges, Wes Ulhman pro Chopp...and one in favor...Coney e-mail crowd chimes in:

FYI

From: Frank Martin [mailto:fmartin@investco.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2009 8:32 AM
To: WES UHLMAN ASSOCIATES INC Owner; Keith Biever-transportation issues; djohnconey@aol.com
Cc: burke.d@portseattle.org; ua_stu@hotmail.com; annrpearce@aol.com; heather_hothouse@msn.com; francalhoun@cbbain.com; wcarr@eskimo.com; dace.campbell@gmail.com; michaeljerrett@msn.com; soconnell@morrisonhershfield.com; stoutlydia@yahoo.com; pingles@comcast.net; apanitch@hotmail.com; jpensund@juno.com; ntwelker@comcast.net; gary@friendsofseattle.org; drdelfs@msn.com; mhk@martinhenrykaplan.com; Matt Roewe; chanway@cads-inc.com; mcorsi@mka.com; dmcnuttt@nbbj.com; lesleyb@weinsteinau.com; cary@peopleswaterfront.org; larry.phillips@kingcounty.gov; Nick Licata; Tom Rasmussen; bruce harrell; lloyd.hara@portseattle.org; cpander@worldnet.att.net; dickerson.marylou@leg.wa.gov; kohl-welles.jeanne@leg.wa.gov; Richard Conlin; christa.dumpys@seattle.gov; vgray@olympus.net; jrowley@windermere.com
Subject: RE: Apparant Viaduct Central Waterfront Agreement today

Good points on both sides.

As a Boston native, I witnessed firsthand the Big Dig debacle and paid for it year after year. I lived in the north end for the last five years before moving to Seattle (2000-2005) and sat through noise, potholes, incessant construction, etc. I couldn't help but break out in laughter when I heard the viaduct was a candidate for a deep bore tunnel. I am glad that I do not live as close to the construction zone as I did in Boston!

As for how it was paid for - Massachusetts? No – Taxachusetts. As for corruption – man – part of the reason the project was so far over budget was due to massive mismanagement of funds and gross bid awarding techniques. For those same reasons, several contractors have closed their doors and are behind bars.

I guess the only point I will make is that despite all of the problems connected with this massive undertaking, it was the best thing that Boston could have ever done for the city. The removal of the road structure (I-93) freed up view corridors, reduced crime and shelter for the homeless, revitalized the waterfront businesses, provided green/park space in the urban core and finally connected the city of Boston to its most prized asset – its coastline. It will not be without pain or sacrifice for that matter, but ultimately it will be the best decision.

My two cents... for what it's worth.

FM
Frank Martin, CCIM
Project Manager
Investco
T: 206.264.1212

6/26/2009

D: 253.299.5826
F: 253.299.5827

From: WES UHLMAN ASSOCIATES INC Owner [mailto:wuhlman@msn.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2009 7:10 AM

To: Keith Biever-transportation issues; djohnconey@aol.com

Cc: burke.d@portseattle.org; ua_stu@hotmail.com; annrpearce@aol.com; heather_hothouse@msn.com; francalhoun@cbbain.com; wcarr@eskimo.com; dace.campbell@gmail.com; michaeljerrett@msn.com; soconnell@morrisonhershfield.com; stoutlydia@yahoo.com; pingles@comcast.net; apanitch@hotmail.com; jpensund@juno.com; Frank Martin; ntwelker@comcast.net; gary@friendsofseattle.org; drdelfs@msn.com; mhk@martinhenrykaplan.com; mroewe@via-architecture.com; chanway@cads-inc.com; mcorsi@mka.com; dmcnut@nbbj.com; lesleyb@weinsteinau.com; cary@peopleswaterfront.org; larry.phillips@kingcounty.gov; Nick Licata; Tom Rasmussen; bruce harrell; lloyd.hara@portseattle.org; cpander@worldnet.att.net; dickerson.marylou@leg.wa.gov; kohl-welles.jeanne@leg.wa.gov; Richard Conlin; christa.dumpys@seattle.gov; vgray@olympus.net; jrowley@windermere.com

Subject: RE: Apparant Viaduct Central Waterfront Agreement today

Good points made. Solutions, however, all evolve to one issue: Money.

A "consensus" to be announced today costing a billion more from sources that cannot be identified. A \$400 shortfall from identified state sources. A billion from the city of Seattle that is almost all from nebulous or nonexistent sources, i.e. a highly suspect taxing district or federal "stimulous" monies that have clearly been removed from consideration by the "shovel ready" requirements. And, King County's contribution: a government that is self admittedly broke without funds to carry out day to day needs? After facing the heavy public criticism over it's property tax policies, will the Port of Seattle step up with a huge property tax increase in these recessionary times?

As the late Senator Everett Dirkson famously said: A billion here and a billion there, and pretty soon, you're talking about real money.

Is it not, perhaps, time to inject into this debate a note of economic realism? Should we begin to discuss what we need (and can afford) as contraposed to what we would like? The basic need here is a transportation corridor to replace one that is dangerous. In an ideal world we would build what might cause our spirits to soar and meet all of our aesthetic desires, etc. But there is a constraint here: available resources... money.

Why not look seriously at the only serious solution that I have seen to date: the Chopp elevated transportation corridor? Time is now running out. It's time to arrive at a new consensus that is affordable and achievable.

Wes Uhlman

CC: burke.d@portseattle.org; ua_stu@hotmail.com; annrpearce@aol.com; heather_hothouse@msn.com; francalhoun@cbbain.com; wcarr@eskimo.com; dace.campbell@gmail.com; michaeljerrett@msn.com; soconnell@morrisonhershfield.com; stoutlydia@yahoo.com; pingles@comcast.net; apanitch@hotmail.com; jpensund@juno.com; fmartin@investco.com; ntwelker@comcast.net; gary@friendsofseattle.org; drdelfs@msn.com; mhk@martinhenrykaplan.com; mroewe@via-architecture.com; chanway@cads-inc.com; mcorsi@mka.com; dmcnut@nbbj.com; lesleyb@weinsteinau.com; cary@peopleswaterfront.org; Larry.Phillips@kingcounty.gov; nick.licata@seattle.gov; tom.rasmussen@seattle.gov; bruce.harrell@seattle.gov; lloyd.hara@portseattle.org; cpander@worldnet.att.net; dickerson.marylou@leg.wa.gov; kohl-welles.jeanne@leg.wa.gov; richard.conlin@seattle.gov; Christa.Dumpys@seattle.gov; vgray@olympus.net; jrowley@windermere.com; wuhlman@msn.com
From: biever36@comcast.net

6/26/2009

Subject: Re: Apparant Viaduct Central Waterfront Agreement today
 Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2009 23:25:14 -0800
 To: djohnconey@aol.com

To all,

The new location for the tunnel is manifold better than the Mayor's earlier tunnel plan which was voted down. This plan should reduce the grade problem for trucks in the tunnel, while saving the waterfront businesses and the through traffic by leaving the present viaduct during the several years of construction.

In terms of cost to we taxpayers, this however is yet another sad example of how our State lets politicians design our transportation infrastructure (using an imbedded private engineering firm PB, formerly known as Parsons Brinckerhoff) --- a firm which was also involved with the Boston Big Dig) rather than use international design competitions like most of the world now does to reduce the cost of large transportation projects. A design competition would likely have resulted in a signature cable stayed bridge at about half the cost of the now proposed bored tunnel and constructed it also without removing the present viaduct or disrupting the waterfront businesses.

I'm not an engineer but I've done extensive research, so please share my vision for a moment by imagining a vehicle and light rail bridge starting on the north from the Battery street tunnel going over the Aquarium to a pylon, in shallow water, above the ferry terminal where a light rail station would connect to an elevator down to the ferry terminal, then terminating on the south just west of Quest Field. Of course my light rail vision takes the train on to West Seattle, after it originated some place north of Ballard and linked to the Northgate area. Also imagine a restaurant on top of the station above the ferry terminal! Maybe a revolving restaurant to mirror our iconic Space Needle. The PB firm was involved with the design and construction of the Boston Bunker Hill bridge over the Charles River where the the design of the cable stayed pylons mirror the Bunker Hill Monument.

PB has used elsewhere the latest Figg cable stayed design technology which greatly reduces bridge costs, so why not in Washington State? Is it because they have a monopoly and do not have to bid in our State?

John, Your "Strange Bedfellows" is so appropriate, but I might amend it to add --- and office mates.

And to all, please take a field trip downtown to the Wells Fargo Building to see for yourself that the Private firm PB shares at least one entire floor with our city SDOT, our State WSDOT and our Federal USDOT. How can 150 plus people, both public and private people working in the same office give us competitive, cost effective designs? If any of you would like to see or discuss the several volumes of my recent transportation research please reply to this email or call me.

Most sincerely,

Keith Biever
 206-283-9047
 Cell 425-501-9769

On Jan 12, 2009, at 11:40 AM, djohnconey@aol.com wrote:

Strange Bedfellows

Sources: Viaduct to be replaced with tunnel
 By CHRIS McGANN
 P-I reporter

OLYMPIA – After years of immobilizing conflict between the City of Seattle, King County and the state, elected leaders have agreed on a replacement for the earthquake-damaged Alaskan Way Viaduct – a deep bore tunnel under downtown Seattle.

Sources close to the negotiations confirm that all three parties have agreed to go forward with a plan that would involve major funding from the state bolstered, with investment from the county, city and a yet-to-be created local investment district.

The tunnel would be paid for with roughly \$2.8 billion that the state set aside for the project. The surface street elements, including a waterfront park would be paid for by the city. The capital and operating investments in transit would be covered by King County.

Seattle Deputy Mayor Tim Ceis confirmed that a consensus had been reached.

"It's an agreement all three parties embracing and moving forward with and we'll announce it (Tuesday) morning," he said.

Gov. Chris Gregoire's spokesman Pearse Edwards said the impasse had been broken.

"We believe we have a solution that serves all parties and is fiscally responsible."

The deep-bore tunnel idea is similar to the plan Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels had previously pushed. State leaders rejected it as too expensive at the time – and Seattle voters showed no support for it in a curiously designed ballot measure that also ask if an elevated structure should be build.

The idea seems to have come full circle in the past two years, with a different tunnel but similar concept.

The new plan gained momentum this year in part because the deep-bore technology allows much less disruptive construction than the cut-and-cover tunnel that Nickels had originally advocated.

It will likely cost more money than 2007's doomed plan.

The last time the Alaskan Way Viaduct battle came to a head, Speaker of the House Frank Chopp, D-Seattle, vigorously opposed anything but an above ground replacement. He is credited in large part for killing the tunnel plan.

Since that time, he has invested energy designing and promoting an above-the-ground replacement that would have included a throughway and a shopping center – all capped with waterfront park.

Though he has been trying to build support for his idea, most stakeholders remained skeptical. And where Chopp could previously take advantage of the divisions among local leaders, he would now face unified front if he decides to dig in his heels. In addition, the Legislature is faced with finding a way to balance a \$6 billion budget shortfall. Starting a war with his fellow Democrats at the onset could prove counter productive.