
From: Randy McCourt [rsm@dkspdx.com]
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2009 7:51 PM
To: White, John
Subject: RE: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper

Second bullet on page 2 – you may want to mention that part of why the future is faster is the removal of the Elliott/Western ramps and the removal of the 1st Ave/Seneca weave which slow peak traffic today.

Page 3 – 2030 crops up a few times – I am sure you all used resources from other works for this.

Page 3 - . Therefore if those investments are not made there is expected to be little effect on the transportation performance of the bored tunnel.

I think you need to be careful here – the TDM investments do help reduce travel and the I-5 helps operation – which would make the bored tunnel even more productive – but the way this is worded sounds like they don't do anything.

Page 4 – top paragraph – be careful with your language for NEPA (dropping). Remember there are also the prior EIS options of 6 lane tunnels and others scenarios which were not part of the scenarios (to avoid redundant analysis) but are not necessarily being pursued either.

Page 5 – I know the costs are being work – just remember that tunnel risks are such that someone will likely need to be willing to accept the cost risk of uncertainty and that should not be lost in the decision to proceed process. Don't need folks saying they did not know.

Page 5 – last paragraph – a real estate transfer fee/tax should be considered for properties in the waterfront that would benefit from the removal of AWV – this would work as follows. Current assessed value - \$5M, AWV goes away, property owner sells property for \$10M in five years. At 5% property value increase per year (not recently!) in five years the value should have increased about 28% or to about \$6.4 M. The increment between the sale value and the normal annual increase in property value ($10 - 6.4 = 3.6M$) would be taxed at 20/30/40% on presumption that the public investment generated the private property value gain and the public should be proportionally reimbursed for its share of the value gain. The 5% and the 20/30/40% would be subject to research to determine the appropriate values in reality. But in the end – a one time transfer fee would be paid if the rate of property value gain was disproportionate to the rest of the market. In that case the public would recover its share of the cost to improve the waterfront.

Page 6 – NEPA SEPA – seems like an important decision to make given its schedule and cost implications.

Randy

Ransford S. McCourt, PE, PTOE
DKS Associates
1400 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97201
503/243-3500
FAX 503/243-1934
rsm@dksassociates.com

From: White, John [mailto:WhiteJH@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2009 6:07 PM
To: Parsons, Jim (Consultant); McCourt, Randy (Consultant); Parsons, Jim; Bandy, Mark
Subject: FW: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper

Jim, Randy, Mark,

Attached is a draft bored tunnel briefing paper we had been working on last week. We would like your thoughts related to the transportation performance piece of this, which we pieced together from existing materials with some additional opinion added from Chris Wellander. Please ignore the other portions, since the cost estimate and financing information has been superseded and is out of date now. We want to make sure we capture all relevant thoughts related to bored tunnel transportation performance, with key focal points being how it works for through-city and regional trips, along with the travel time differences for those making the Ballard/Interbay/Magnolia to SODO (and other places SW) trips.

There is going to be a Gov's briefing paper that captures some of this that is due on Wed, so quick response is appreciated.

John

From: White, John
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2008 4:51 PM
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John; Stone, Craig; Greco, Theresa; Preedy, Matt
Subject: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper

Dave & Ron,

Here is a draft paper that we hope addresses the request to provide thoughts on a mostly stand-alone bored tunnel option, based on the transportation benefits achieved by the bored tunnel. As I am sure you will understand, much of what is presented is based on the opinions of the project team, and will require further assessment in order to confirm and validate those opinions.

There are a couple of things to mention in particular:

- The cost estimate numbers and ranges are a bit generalized, and assume that with further assessment, we will find consensus in making reductions to some of the mark-ups that have come into question. I believe we may be discussing an early January workshop to address these questions. That said, the numbers here are solely based on professional opinion within the team, so care should be taken in how they are used. As stated before, the upper end of the range is our previously presented 'probable' cost, with the lower end of the range being the team opinion part.
- There is a variety of opinion and debate regarding how the environmental planning process would proceed, though it is clear that based on the work we have done to date, there is very strong opinion (within UCO, AGO and FHWA) as to the need to retain multiple options within the next draft or supplemental draft EIS. Based on continued analysis, one or more of the other options may not be warranted to continue on beyond the next draft document for reasons stated in the paper.
- We have presented some professional opinion related to 2030 transportation operation that will take further work to validate.

Hope this is along the lines of what you were hoping for. Some sections may have more detail than is desired at this point, please inform if there are any areas you think a more summarized or generalized discussion is appropriate. See you tomorrow.

John

John H. White, P.E.
Program Director
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
WSDOT Urban Corridors Office
Business: (206) 382 - 5270
Cell: (206) 450 - 2975