
From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 7:35 AM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Project branding

Interesting...we'll set up a time to discuss further. And we may want to include an environmental person. Unfortunately, things are never as easy as we would like them to be...

From: White, John
Sent: Wed 4/29/2009 5:53 PM
To: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Paananen, Ron
Cc: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Project branding

This is funny...after our grueling 4 hour meeting with FHWA (just ended now), and getting a minor lecture from Kimberly, I am now not so sure about this. Related to the case we are making to FHWA that an SDEIS 2 is the way to go, which just extends the ongoing saga, there is great concern from the Environmental leads over changing the program name. We'll need to talk some more about this...also, after hitting send, I re-thought what I sent you and realized those ideas probably didn't cover the whole program well enough.

The biggest issue with FHWA right now is the program level elements where we proposed that FHWA provide 'conditional approval'. It appears that if we go that route, it locks those elements into NEPA processes, which we'd need to discuss with the City. FHWA was in some ways encouraging us to not have them take any federal action on those elements, but I don't think that will work for us.

More tomorrow...

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 5:29 PM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Project branding

I think we definitely need to move on re-branding the project, but I think it needs to be done in the context of clarity on agency roles and responsibilities (hopefully coming next week?) and with some involvement from Lloyd, et al. I'd bet you a drink that we will probably end up somewhere close to your suggestions, but we need to bring everyone else along with us.

My guess is probably not by Monday, but we will have the conversation quickly after we have everything ready for the first stakeholder meetings next week. We had talked to Lloyd about this awhile ago so he is ready to discuss.

From: White, John
Sent: Wed 4/29/2009 11:26 AM
To: Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: Project branding

With the legislation complete, and clarity in our goals, should we move on implementing a new and more appropriate program title? With the May 4th and 5th events, it seems like a great time to start moving away from

AWV and Seawall Replacement, the question is, what do we call ourselves?

SR 99 Bored Tunnel Program?

SR 99 Deep Bore Tunnel Program?

Other?

Just wanted to test the waters and see if there is common feeling that the time is right.

John