
From: White, John
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2009 6:06 PM
To: Paananen, Ron
Subject: FW: The Stranger & other PB things

FYI, not sure if Amy forwarded this to you. Yesterday walked Margie at DJC through the very basics of the approach to structuring the H2K Stage 2 plan around the tunnel plan, i.e. a temporary connection to the existing viaduct. Margie's story was a bit confusing, since she didn't clearly enough differentiate between the permanent structures and the interim structure connection. KIRO picked up on it a bit, though nothing huge thus far, and then there is the below Stranger commentary. We are getting the key messages assembled in order to be ready to speak to and describe the basics of the plan.

Also wanted to mention that me and Theresa met with Jared and Mike today, mostly over space/lease issues. Jared floated the idea that they could possibly negotiate terms that allow PB to assign a portion of the space to us after a year or two, thus we get the economy of scale deal but have terms that allow us to transition to a lease under our name in the near future. Not sure of that would work internally or not, though we can make a case around our contractual commitment with PB through the end of this year (which will have to be extended through next year at some point). Also continued talk about their ongoing role, reinforcing what I have told Mike where WSDOT and our reps will own and deliver the technical requirements and contract terms, PB would be lead on the reference docs and associated analysis and constructability related assessment work (the docs that describe and reflect the concept). I did tell Jared and Mike that we expect the PB tunnel lead (who we expect to have a solid tunneling resume comparable to our other tunnel experts) to be located here full time, given the work efforts required over the next year and a half. What I didn't mention, and wanted to float by you, was that I really think we need to ask Jared that that experienced tunnel manager be our day to day lead. We are headed towards a discussion over the PB management structure for the next phase, and it is clear that between having a experienced tunnel lead, Mike, Gordon and Rick, things are top heavy. Initial thought is that Mike could report to the PB tunnel lead, and that there is a place for Gordon on the technical side, which leaves Rick as the odd man out once H2K stage 2 is designed.

Anyways, wanted to share those thoughts, and see if you concurred and supported some follow up with Jared on the subject. Bringing in a PB tunnel manager/expert, only to have them report to Mike who does not have that relevant background, potentially leads to all kinds of awkward communications and chain of command issues. Right now there is some preliminary indication that their lead for the Port of Miami tunnel planning and RFP might be an option, he'll be here for our south portal workshop next week, along with a couple other senior PB tunnel guys.

Hope today went well, we'll be in Portland meeting with the CSO team and reachable by cell or e-mail...

John

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2009 5:21 PM
To: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: The Stranger

[City WSDOT Gets It Backwards](#)

Posted by [Erica C. Barnett](#) on Wed, Apr 8, 2009 at 4:57 PM

The Washington State Department of Transportation—getting it, as usual, exactly backwards—plans to build a temporary elevated structure to accommodate traffic along the waterfront while a bored tunnel is being dug to replace the viaduct. Once the tunnel's finished, the state will take down the temporary viaduct, and only then will it

turn its attention to the downtown street grid and the waterfront.

The new structure, which will be on the south end of the current viaduct, will connect waterfront traffic to a new section of the viaduct WSDOT plans to build in SoDo. Somewhat astonishingly, this new quasi-viaduct will actually have more lanes than the existing stacked viaduct (six instead of four), all on a single level. According to the [Daily Journal of Commerce](#) (sorry, subscription only) the structure will be part of a \$300 million contract to replace the south end of the viaduct.

For years now, surface/transit supporters have been advocating the opposite approach (no matter what the city and state ultimately decide to do about the viaduct). Fix the waterfront first, they've argued, *then* tear down the viaduct, and only *then* think about replacing it. As we saw during the 2001 earthquake, people are adaptable; they have the ability to change in response to changing circumstances. (When traffic gets bad on Road X, some people take Road Y, ride public transit, rearrange their schedules, etc.—and traffic gets better). Tear down the viaduct, reconnect the street grid downtown and in South Lake Union, and people will figure out new ways to get through and around downtown—something we'll have to do anyway if the city and state can't come up with enough money to pay for the tunnel. Build a new, wider temporary viaduct, and people will never learn to adapt. By putting off waterfront improvements until the very end of planning, WSDOT is setting downtown surface streets up for failure—and ensuring that Seattle will continue to be car-dependent and cut off from its waterfront for decades to come.