
From: Schuster, Chad (Consultant)
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 1:33 PM
To: Paananen, Ron
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: FW: Magazine questions

Dave Gering would like to meet with you this week to do an interview for the MIC's magazine. It should take about 30 minutes. Would Wednesday at 4 p.m. work? I see an opening at that time on your calendar, but want to make sure it's okay with you before I schedule this. I could have him come to our office if that's easier for you. Thanks.

Chad

From: Dave Gering [mailto:dgmic@qwestoffice.net]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 1:04 PM
To: Schuster, Chad (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Magazine questions

We have to begin sending copy to the editor by Friday (Feb. 27), so Wednesday afternoon would be perfect. The magazine is coming out the first week or so in April which means all edited copy and artwork have to be submitted to our designer by March 6. We can still gather info the week of March 2-6, but there's declining wiggle room.

I am really struggling to understand the grade separation that would cross the railroad tracks to get to the new Alaskan Way surface route (is that right?) Any help with that issue and related visuals would be greatly appreciated. I'm also trying to get my hands on the last packet of option info that went to the stakeholders. I'm also trying to get a count for the number of stakeholder meetings, and the number of presenters that the stakeholders heard from.

Thanks.

From: Schuster, Chad (Consultant) [mailto:SchustC@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 12:45 PM
To: Dave; Paananen, Ron; Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Magazine questions

Dave,

I can schedule a meeting between you and Ron to discuss these and other questions you might have. Would you please suggest a few times that would work for you? Ron's week is mostly booked, although he may have some time available on Wednesday afternoon. When is your deadline?

Chad Schuster
Communications and Public Involvement
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
(206) 267-3830
schustc@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov

From: Dave [mailto:dgmic@qwestoffice.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 4:15 PM

6/25/2009

To: Paananen, Ron; Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant); Schuster, Chad (Consultant)

Subject: Magazine questions

Hi Ron. I hope this is the complete list of questions that we'd like to answer as we put together the special issue of our magazine, Seattle Industry, that will be devoted to the deep bore tunnel option and related issues. KaDeena and Chad have been very helpful in the past on requests like this so I'm ccing them here. I've got some questions that would also be better addressed through a conversation so maybe we can schedule a time to chat soon (?) It wouldn't take long.

I'm learning how to use the WSDOT annual report for traffic volumes and collisions and am probably just knowledgeable enough to be dangerous.

Here goes.

- 1) I usually hear the SR 99 traffic count is 100,000+ vehicles per day, The annual report references a recording station R101 that shows 84,925 cars on the viaduct near T46. Why the difference?
- 2) If 100,000-plus SR 99 trips is correct, it would look like the SR 99-I5 corridor in Seattle accounts for something like 320,000-plus trips per weekday. I can't find another corridor in the state that comes close for traffic volume. I-90 in Spokane looks like 110,000; Vancouver I-5 looks like 117,000 and Tacoma I5 is about 185,000. Does that seem right to you? I don't know the other areas very well and maybe I'm missing major roads like SR 99 that run near the freeway.
- 3) It looks like there has been no real change in I-5 Seattle traffic volumes for the past 10 years or so. Is that because the freeway is maxed out?
- 4) Any idea of the historic traffic counts on SR 99? Up? Down?
- 5) For the magazine, can we get some visuals that would illustrate some of the planned changes, like the grade separation for the new Alaskan Way surface road? Or, am I getting that wrong?
- 6) Can we get the most up to date version of the charts where you evaluated each of the viaduct replacement options for traffic, construction timelines, etc. I saw some good ones but was not a viaduct stakeholder and my info was pretty sketchy.
- 7) How many meetings did the stakeholders hold? Does anyone have hard copies of all the materials they received? I now possess the notebooks of Bob Donegan and John Odland and Bob's is only half the size of Odland's. We'd like to take a picture of the stack of written materials that were distributed to the stakeholders.
- 8) Can I get a copy of the TDM work performed by Bonnie Nigard – at least I think that's the author. It was the consultant from San Francisco.
- 9) Questions I'd like to talk about:
 - **Disruption during construction.** The Dec, 2007 MIG report regarding stakeholder interviews recommended addressing construction disruption "promptly and rigorously" but the 2008 stakeholders did not get the consultant's disruption report until December 2008, at the very end of the process. I would like to better understand the reasons for the delay. It seemed to be there was a real gulf between the private and public sectors on the disruption issue, and it's highly relevant now because many of us support the deep bore option because it minimizes disruption.
 - **Local versus regional.** We very much disagreed with the EconNorthwest conclusion that local disruptions would be significant, and regional ones not. In our experience, many of our "local" companies and facilities, like T46, are regional and when they are disrupted, the impact is regional. Is that an unfair or wrongheaded way to look at it?
 - **Limits of traffic modeling.** As I understand it, it is hard to factor in the kind of prospective delays that might be caused by accidents in a transportation corridor. Am I getting that right? This is important because I think layman like myself judged (and maybe misjudged) the viaduct modeling based on our experiences with the types of horrendous traffic jams that occasionally

take place in the corridor, coloring our view of the traffic modeling data that might be more accurate in describing normal conditions.

Thanks!

Dave Gering
Manufacturing Industrial Council
206-762-2470