
From: James D. Parsons [JParsons@parametrix.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 9:46 AM
To: White, John; McCourt, Randy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark; Iboshi, Ralph (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper
Attachments: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper 122908jp.doc

Comments attached.

Jim

From: White, John [mailto:WhiteJH@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2009 6:07 PM
To: Parsons, Jim (Consultant); McCourt, Randy (Consultant); James D. Parsons; Mark Bandy
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 Please ignore the other portions, since the cost estimate and financing information has been superseded and is out of date now.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

*** eSafel scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***