

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: Morrison, Mike (Consultant)
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2009 4:06 PM
To: White, John
Cc: Williamson, Alec; Jarnagan, Harry (Consultant); Smith, Brian (Consultant)
Subject: FW: FW: Final Hybrid Matrix
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

John,

I discussed the ramifications of a response to Jim Parson's request with Alec Williamson this afternoon. He agreed with me that I should discuss this matter with you before I respond to Jim Parsons.

The issue is whether or not I "fill in the blanks" with the comparison which we had in Dec. 2008, which was about \$200M less for the single bore tunnel than the twin-bore tunnel. Subsequent actions lowered the cost much more. Alec is of the opinion that we need to tell the complete story and get to the "current" estimate.

I know that you are on a field trip this afternoon. We can discuss this on Friday.

Thanks!

Best Regards,

Mike Morrison

Program Estimator

Alaskan Way Viaduct Program

AWV&SRP Office: 206-267-6535

Cell: 206-799-7798

VMC Office: 425-885-2185

VMC E-Mail valuemike@aol.com

From: James D. Parsons [mailto:JParsons@parametrix.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 3:15 PM
To: ValueMike@aol.com
Cc: Morrison, Mike (Consultant); Drake, Colin
Subject: RE: FW: Final Hybrid Matrix

Mike:

Please copy Colin when you are done. The text below is how your numbers will get used in the IPM report, so if you just want to plug them in go for it.

Scenario O: Bored Tunnel Hybrid

The SR 99 configuration in the Bored Tunnel Hybrid resembles that contained in Scenario F. Given the present level of concept development twin bore tunnels each containing two lanes form the basis of this hybrid. However, the IPM Team strongly recommends that consideration also be given to a single large (approximately 54-foot-diameter) structure, carrying two lanes of traffic on both an upper- and lower-level roadway. Should

the Tri Agency choose to pursue this hybrid as a preferred concept, further work is needed to determine if the larger tunnel can meet the design requirements, while being more economical and faster to build than the smaller twin bores.

The total costs of this scenario are estimated to be \$X.X billion in escalated year of expenditure dollars, of which \$X.X billion is associated with the central waterfront SR 99 elements. Initial work indicates that the large diameter single bore configuration might reduce these costs by as much as \$XXX million. The overall performance of this scenario on the other guiding principles is estimated to be similar to that for Scenario F

Jim

From: ValueMike@aol.com [mailto:ValueMike@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 2:45 PM
To: James D. Parsons
Cc: MorriMi@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Re: FW: Final Hybrid Matrix

Jim,

Thanks for the telephone call.

Yes I received your e-mail, and one from Colin. My other address is MorriMi@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov. I am finishing another "fire drill" for a response that WSDOT must give to the legislature. Then I will get yours done. You should have it tomorrow.

*Best regards,
Mike Morrison, President
VALUE MANAGEMENT CONSULTING, INC.
15330 Old Redmond Road
Redmond, WA 98052-6837
425-885-2185 (telephone with extensive voice messaging capability)
206-799-7798 (cellular telephone also with voice messaging capability)*

In a message dated 2/10/2009 5:19:13 P.M. Pacific Standard Time, JParsons@parametrix.com writes:

Mike:

Use the elements shown for Scenario L to produce your estimate for Scenario O: Bored Tunnel Hybrid. Your estimate for Scenario O should assume the old twin bore scheme with a surface boulevard not a couplet. Also, I need a separate estimate of the total if we were to use the single bore scheme now favored. Please confirm upon receipt and let me know when you can have these done. We need to get the next revision into layout by Friday.

Jim

The year's hottest artists on the red carpet at the Grammy Awards. [AOL Music takes you there.](#)