

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: White, John
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2008 7:57 AM
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: Re: Bored tunnel

Thanks Dave. PB has been looking at revised mark-ups, we will update the costs as appropriate and get them out to you, Ron and John Reilly for a reality check.

I assume we stick with the single bore for now (at least at the low end), assuming we can make the cross-section work without significant upsizing?

John

From: Dye, Dave
To: Paananen, Ron; White, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Tue Dec 23 07:39:16 2008
Subject: Re: Bored tunnel

John - please check with mike r and gordon because they were getting vibes from new york the estimate was too conservative - I suggest whatever lower number is developed become the lower end of the range with current estimate the high end...thanks.

-dave

From: Paananen, Ron
To: White, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Cc: Dye, Dave
Sent: Tue Dec 23 06:51:26 2008
Subject: Bored tunnel

The Governor asked a few questions about the bored tunnel. We need some material that clearly shows how much the tunnel will cost, what is included in the basic cost, and how it would be funded. We need to tell the story about what it does for capacity (compared to the existing viaduct) and what are the disruptions associated with building a bored tunnel. A good schedule should be assembled to show when the tunnel would be open to traffic. John, the team should put together the most aggressive schedule they can conceive, like doing an EA for environmental, purchasing the machine in advance, using design-build - all the usual stuff.

The project would be the SR 99 components only. Minimal work on the waterfront: no seawall. Tear down and basic connection back to Battery Street Tunnel.

Has anyone heard back from Cascadia? We need their feedback to help in reconsideration of the risk and contingency numbers.

Dave may want to add a few comments.