

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: Paananen, Ron
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 5:11 PM
To: Dye, Dave; 'Fleckenstein, Mary'
Subject: RE: Tunnel traffic count

Dave has it right. Its important to note that we when we say 60% of the traffic is passing through downtown, "downtown" is defined as traffic that does not get off between Denny and Pioneer Square. The bored tunnel serves these trips well.

The viaduct does serve mostly Seattle residents. In addition 85% of the trips on the viaduct begin or end in the City.

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 12:54 PM
To: 'Fleckenstein, Mary'; Paananen, Ron
Subject: RE: Tunnel traffic count

Mary - it depends on how you define "regional" traffic...here are the rough breakouts and I encourage Ron to chime in...

About 40% of traffic on the viaduct are going downtown
About 60% of traffic on the viaduct is passing through downtown - but most of those trips originate or terminate within the city of Seattle limits
Trips beginning and ending outside the city limits (real "through trips, if you will) are about 10% of total trips...

This means that either Seattle residents or people working in Seattle will pay for the vast majority of the tolling. More work is being done on this, and Ron, please add what you know too...

Thanks!

-dave

From: Fleckenstein, Mary [mailto:Fleckenstein.Mary@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 12:37 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave
Subject: Tunnel traffic count

Ron or Dave -

Of the traffic estimated to use the viaduct replacement deep bored tunnel, what % is local traffic and what % is regional traffic? I remember something like 60% of current AWW traffic is regional. The question arises as to who would have to pay the toll if the tunnel were tolled.

Thanks.

From: Paananen, Ron [mailto:PaananR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 11:20 AM
To: Eddy, Rep. Deborah; Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig; Fleckenstein, Mary

Cc: Arnis, Amy; Ziegler, Jennifer; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Meredith, Julie

Subject: RE: The 520 Spreadsheet

Representative Eddy:

Unfortunately, the numbers on the spreadsheet don't sum up the way you are suggesting. The seismic safety estimates are for retrofitting vulnerable structures on the west end of the corridor. For the total segment cost of the westside options from I-5 to the west highrise (A at \$2.0 to \$2.3 billion, K at \$4.1 to \$4.2 billion, and L at \$2.6 billion), retrofitting or replacement of these structures across Portage Bay and Union Bay are included in those estimates. I have attached a power point slide that shows the corridor by segment and associated costs.

Ron Paananen
Deputy Urban Corridors Administrator
206-464-1221
206-276-0499 (cell)

From: Eddy, Rep. Deborah [mailto:Eddy.Deborah@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 9:26 AM
To: Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig; Fleckenstein, Mary
Cc: Arnis, Amy; Ziegler, Jennifer; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Meredith, Julie
Subject: RE: The 520 Spreadsheet

David ... and Amy: Clarify for me: There doesn't seem to be an individual item for the A, K, L costs. Thus, I'm assuming that the line C22 is a total C14:C21 PLUS THE INCREMENTAL COST of Option A? And, it would follow, that C23 is C14:C21 PLUS THE INCREMENTAL COST OF OPTION K? I'm multi-tasking in a hearing, so if I'm being really dense, just straighten me out ...

From: Dye, Dave [mailto:DyeD@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 8:43 AM
To: Eddy, Rep. Deborah; Stone, Craig; Fleckenstein, Mary
Cc: Arnis, Amy; Ziegler, Jennifer; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Meredith, Julie
Subject: The 520 Spreadsheet

Representative Eddy - Here is the latest version of the spreadsheet as promised. I will follow up with more information from the treasurer when we get it next week.

-dave

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 6:23 PM
To: 'Eddy, Rep. Deborah'; Stone, Craig; Fleckenstein, Mary
Cc: Arnis, Amy; Ziegler, Jennifer; Smith, Helena Kennedy
Subject: RE: We have a real problem w/some eastsiders.

Representative Eddy - I'm sorry I'm late in this response - I want to make sure I answer the question accurately and it's taking longer than I had hoped...here's an update:

1. The best information in hand right now for the finance plan remains the work developed in February - which was not really a complete finance plan but rather a spreadsheet that did demonstrate how different parts of the corridor could be funded with different mixes of funds...nickel, tpa, federal bridge and tolling...the big outstanding question on that sheet was a question about how much could we reasonably expect to get from tolling 520 only...I'm having that sheet updated and will get to you tomorrow...that sheet told us it seemed reasonable that the floating bridge could be replaced with necessary connections and that it would be close to generating enough to fund several combinations, like the floating bridge and seismic improvements or the floating bridge and east side improvements...it was pretty clear that we would fall short of funding option A and certainly fall short of K and L.

2. We also have asked the treasurer to develop a more detailed look at what we can fund by tolling 520 only to validate/inform our spreadsheet exercise...we expect to see that information next week and when we get it we will share it with you...

I also want to remind everyone that this finance plan not only has to deal with "what" we build, but "when" we build it...the state nickel and tpa and federal bridge cash flow in no way matches the delivery schedules established and was left as unfinished business until the TIC completed their toll outreach last year...now we are using those toll rate scenarios (option 7, I believe) as the basis for the treasurer's work effort to see how much tolling can "fill in" the cash flow gaps on the various build out scenarios...long way of saying lots in play here and we should have a better idea next week.

Thanks for your patience and please let me know if you need anything else...I'll get you another copy of the spreadsheet tomorrow...

-dave

From: Eddy, Rep. Deborah [mailto:Eddy.Deborah@leg.wa.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 9:29 AM

To: Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig; Fleckenstein, Mary

Subject: We have a real problem w/some eastsiders.

Especially Medina folks. Can you send me your best/latest information on the SR520 financing plan/expectation? Has it changed at all since the last powerpoint presentation to the transportation committee?

/d

Rep. Deb Eddy

132-D Legislative Bldg

PO Box 40600

Olympia WA 98504-0600

[Sign up for my E-Newsletter](#)

Committee Assignments:

Vice-Chair, Technology, Energy and Communications

Transportation

Ecology and Parks

For scheduling or questions,

please contact

Paula Rehwaldt at

rehwaldt.paula@leg.wa.gov or

phone 360 786 7848.