VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From:	John Reilly [jjreils@attglobal.net]
-------	-------------------------------------

Sent: Wednesday, December 24, 2008 7:57 AM

To: White, John

Cc: Grotefendt, Amy; Paananen, Ron

Subject: AWV, Governor, decision, SAC initiatives, Happy Holidays

John - good to talk to you last night about the AWV tunnel alternative and the Cascadia / SAC efforts.

I'll be interested in seeing the Richard Prust / Cascadia Center memo - please forward it when rec'd. Basically, from the communications I've seen, Cascadia and the SAC members are trying to get and understand (and then perhaps challenge - <u>Note 1</u>) the costs of the tunnel - relative to the WSDOT numbers - and in particular understand and challenge the add-ons and markups - the thought is that these are too high and then the markups compound leading to a much too high result (<u>Note 2</u>). They are also thinking about the NEPA requirements with the thought that the tunnel alternative is simpler with better performance, less impact and therefore less liable to be challenged by a lot of stakeholders.

I've heard that there is an idea (Governor, SAC?) to fund the other elements (transit, streets, I-5) separately. And, that the Governor has been talking to the stakeholders, has acknowledged support for the deep bore, would like more information but needs to make a decision now.

If Cascadia / Stakeholders were to call me (they have my contact infor but none has called), I'd tell them:

<u>Note 1</u> - I think that the PB/Ken Fiorentine [sp?] - Arup - HMM/Phelps tunnel cost numbers are all comparable and we could easily come to agreement (see Note 3)

<u>Note 2</u> - this is also a concern of mine (that the add-on line items are high and they may compound unreasonably) but, see Note 3

<u>Note 3</u> - as I stated at the Tuesday Dec 16 SAC evening presentation/questions, and informally after last Thursday's SAC final meeting, if we ran even a quick CEVP-type analysis on the tunnel we could have better construction cost numbers and the uncertainty could be quantified to give a reasonable "range of probable cost" - then WSDOT <u>might</u> determine a budget number less than the 90% range number as was done after the 2006 ERP. At this point, without that data and analysis, we have to use a "high" number (see Note 4) to account for the current uncertainties.

<u>Note 4</u> - the high number could be reduced, as Mike R has already done internally, with some better analysis of the add-on costs and their uncertainty. this would not necessarily take a CEVP workshop - it could be done more simply with a small number of knowledgeable people (the usual characters we all know and love).

And, to be clear, the major uncertainty here is the political process (including the reliability of a preferred decision), the NEPA/Environmental process (impact, time) the appropriate "design allowance" and funding/cashflow.

Let me know how this evolves, have a great Christmas and happy holidays - talk to you soon (we have our office kid's party starting at noon, EST, but I'm available by email and cell phone).

Regards, John Reilly Web: www.JohnReilly.us Email: JJReils@ATTGlobal.net Cell: +1-508-904-3434 ----- Original Message -----From: Renee Roline To: White, John ; Bruce Agnew ; Richard Prust ; Rita Brogan ; Bob Donegan Cc: Paananen, Ron ; Reilly, John Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2008 6:31 PM

Subject: Re: Meeting with tunneling experts

Thank you John for your follow up.

We have been working on this all day today and should have a memo in your hands by tomorrow morning. Richard at Arup, will be finishing up tonight.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide this to you.

Renée Roline Projects Coordinator Cascadia Center for Regional Development 208 Columbia Street | Seattle, WA 98104 Direct 206-292-0401 ext 120 | Fax 206-682-5320 reneer@discovery.org

On 12/23/08 3:16 PM, "White, John" <<u>WhiteJH@wsdot.wa.gov</u>> wrote:

Hi Bruce and Renée,

Hope all is well and you are both looking forward to some nice holiday relaxation time. That said, I did want to check in regarding the status of follow-up thoughts from Arup based on the SAC discussion last week. As time is getting very short ahead of a Gov's recommendation, and we are responding to the many bored tunnel questions being asked of us, the opportunity to chime in with any additional thoughts ahead of a decision is right now.

If Arup has formulated so thoughts based on the SAC discussion and cost information we provided, please forward them to us so that they can be factored into the work the agency is doing to support and inform the decision-making process. If a bored tunnel is to advance, there will be plenty of opportunity for Arup and others to further engage in the design process and potentially construction, but ahead of that we need to pull together the best tunnel thinking available related to thoughts on costs and construction options.

Feel free to respond by e-mail or to give me a call on my cell, 206-310-4838.

Happy holidays,

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

From: Bruce Agnew [mailto:bagnew@discovery.org]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2008 9:42 AM
To: Agnew, Bruce; White, John
Cc: Renée Roline
Subject: Re: Meeting with tunneling experts

John

Lets go ahead with the phone call today at 11 to review how to proceed. Bruce

On 12/15/08 9:36 AM, "Bruce Agnew" < <u>bagnew@discovery.org</u>> wrote:

John,

It looks as though our local tunnel experts will be out of town this week. I've asked if they are reachable by phone but as of now it doesn't appear so. Is there a way you could provide us with your detailed cost estimate report on the bored tunnel? They could then review and give feedback which may actually be a rather effective way to compare notes.

Thanks,

Renée Roline Projects Coordinator Cascadia Center for Regional Development 208 Columbia Street | Seattle, WA 98104 Direct 206-292-0401 ext 120 | Fax 206-682-5320 reneer@discovery.org