From: Visconty, Sasha (Consultant)

Sent: Thursday, January 08, 2009 10:05 AM

To: White, John; Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave

Cc: White, Megan

Subject: RE: AWV Environmental Approach

We are running down all NEPA options that can meet a 2010 DB goal and will be prepared to discuss them in the strategic meeting Ron referenced below (including Dave's suggestion).

If you have other ideas, let me know and we'll add them to the list!
Sasha

From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 2009 9:09 AM
To: Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave; Visconty, Sasha (Consultant)
Cc: White, Megan
Subject: RE: AWV Environmental Approach

This is certainly something we have discussed as an option, and is obviously attractive.

A few things to think about:

- It may be a bit tricky piecing together a cohesive story and approach, since the last year's public and agency scoping efforts constituted a 'new' document and approach in many people's eyes (including FHWA and resource agencies). Now that we have a conclusion that we can say is solidly a capacity solution (even with a couple less lanes, because it is just so much more efficient), it seems like the challenge is in explaining how the last year of work lead us back to where we previously were, just with a better overall alternative than those previously on the table (the Guiding Principles from the recent effort can certainly help tell that story).
- Assuming the above has been sorted out, we need to ensure that the previous purpose and need, along with the past year's work and conclusions, firmly supports a bored tunnel conclusion and does not leave room for other options to remain in the running. We all think we are there, as the Guiding Principles should rule help rule out other options, but we need to look from the outside in to determine vulnerability to challenges. Keep in mind we recommended two options for the short list that we now have determined to be inadequate, and we will need to explain that.
- South end and independent utility was mentioned...currently we are looking at a February FONSI for Holgate to King (affectionately known as H2K here), due to the DAHP delay and the current effort to gain tribal concurrence. As I have discussed with Ron, big changes will be required within H2K, especially in Phase 2, since the design does not correlate with a bored tunnel (everything north of Atlantic needs to be re-visited). Our challenge will be preserving independent utility while implementing the changes, which will almost surely include reducing the overall scope of H2K and putting some of it into the tunnel contract (or a later independent contract).

John

From: Paananen, Ron
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 2009 8:05 AM
To: Dye, Dave; Visconty, Sasha (Consultant)
Cc: White, Megan; White, John
Subject: RE: AWV Environmental Approach

I like the thought. We'll add this to the list of potential environmental strategies to discuss when we sit down with our environmental brian trust. Megan, we a shooting for a meeting on the 22nd or 23rd to land on an environmental approach that allows us to issue a DB contract in mid 2010, and a FONSI or ROD by December of that year. You should see a meeting request coming soon.

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Thu 1/8/2009 6:48 AM
To: Visconty, Sasha (Consultant); Paananen, Ron
Cc: White, Megan; White, John
Subject: AWV Environmental Approach

Hey all - Sitting here at EOC this morning and wonder (during a slow moment) out loud about approach to environmental for moving the viaduct forward...a couple of questions:

Given the extensive body of

  environmental and public outreach work to date (over the past eight years) - EIS, Supplemental EIS - is it possible to go straight to a final EIS with the bored tunnel where we document all the work done in the last time period since the supplemental, the SAC, the south end (independent utility) actions, and discuss the other related projects (city streets, I-5, bus, streetcar, seawall) that will all be covered under independent future actions...? If we could, how soon could we be ready to publish draft Final? Thoughts?

-dave