
From: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2009 11:50 AM
To: 'Andrew Garber'
Subject: RE: two more questions

Andrew --

Answers to your questions are below.

-Kristy

From: Andrew Garber [mailto:agarber@seattletimes.com]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2009 10:12 AM
To: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Subject: two more questions

-- Many people I've talked to have characterized the tunnel option as being cheaper than expected because of improvements in technology. My question is: cheaper than what? What is the cost being compared to?

The single bored tunnel is cheaper than the twin bored tunnel that the team was analyzing earlier this year (as seen in the scenarios) .

-- In 2007 Seattle voters rejected a proposal to replace the viaduct with a four lane, \$3.4 billion tunnel. Why would it be wrong to compare the costs between that proposal and the current one?

The bored tunnel addresses three major issues we had with the old waterfront cut-and-cover tunnel. Those are: impacts to the waterfront during construction, the amount of time that SR 99 was closed, and cost.

Also, the tunnel on the ballot in March 2007 was a cut-and-cover tunnel that included improvement solely on the SR 99 corridor. Today's bored tunnel hybrid alternative includes major, long-term transit investments, and improvements on city streets.

My deadline is 2 p.m. today. I'm leaving shortly after that and the story is running tomorrow.

Thanks -- Andrew