
From: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2008 5:01 PM
To: White, John; Williamson, Alec; Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); Mattern, Dave (Consultant); Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Morrison, Mike (Consultant)
Cc: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Subject: RE: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper

Here are some late-breaking edits as a result of our meeting with Dave Dye today. Dave asked that we develop a "Most Probable Range" around the \$2.130B that we published for the single bored tunnel at our workshop on Dec 16: \$1.987B - \$2.130B - \$2.426B. In addition, Alec asked that the ROW costs be increased in a range from \$60M - \$100M. Incorporating both of those changes, yields the matrix below:

Essential Elements	\$M	\$M	\$M
Construction Costs	896	961	1096
CM & Final Design	280	300	342
Contingency & Risk	510	547	623
Inflation	262	281	320
ROW	60	88	100
TOTAL	2008	2177	2481

This matrix should replace the one in the memo. Please let me know if you have comments or questions. Thanks.

Mike Rigsby
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
206-382-6352

From: White, John
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2008 4:54 PM
To: Williamson, Alec; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); Mattern, Dave (Consultant); Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Subject: FW: Draft Bored Tunnel Briefing Paper

Here is the version I just sent, along with the brief description. More to come tomorrow, thanks for all the great input to this memo.

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