

## VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

---

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Friday, December 12, 2008 3:04 PM  
**To:** Reilly, John; Harvey W. Parker  
**Cc:** Don Phelps; Langrock, Gary M.; Paananen, Ron; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Grotefendt, Amy; Williamson, Alec  
**Subject:** RE: Tunnel Issues  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

I have contacted Bruce Agnew and reviewed both proposed meetings with him. He is contacting the letter signatories to determine availability in person or by phone. I told him that we are hoping he can arrange for a couple of them to be part of the panel discussion, and that we will provide agenda time for them to speak to their thoughts on the bored tunnel option. He should be getting back to me later today to confirm attendees and availability.

John

---

**From:** John Reilly [mailto:jjreils@attglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 12, 2008 1:48 PM  
**To:** White, John; Harvey W. Parker  
**Cc:** Don Phelps; Langrock, Gary M.; Paananen, Ron; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Grotefendt, Amy; Williamson, Alec  
**Subject:** Re: Tunnel Issues

John - thanks, I'll look forward to the materials - what ever can be sent/linked electronically today would be appreciated.

I can confirm availability for the Tuesday 5:30 pm meeting at PSRC  
I can be available, with some adjustments, for a Monday meeting with Cascadia between 11 am & 1:30 pm (then I'm clear until 3:30 pm), let me know the final time.

See also my recent email to you on this subject regarding the Tunneling 101 presentation.

Regards, John Reilly  
Web: [www.JohnReilly.us](http://www.JohnReilly.us)  
Email: [JJReils@ATTGlobal.net](mailto:JJReils@ATTGlobal.net)  
Cell: +1-508-904-3434

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [White, John](#)  
**To:** [Harvey W. Parker](#)  
**Cc:** [Reilly, John](#) ; [Don Phelps](#) ; [Langrock, Gary M.](#) ; [Paananen, Ron](#) ; [Rigsby, Mike \(Consultant\)](#) ; [Grotefendt, Amy](#) ; [Williamson, Alec](#)  
**Sent:** Friday, December 12, 2008 1:33 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Tunnel Issues

Harvey,

Thanks for the prompt follow up, I was actually about the e-mail you, John and Don with where we are at currently. Forgot to mention it last night, but I started my engineering career in the late 80's at S&W in Seattle working under Ralph Boirum (small world).

Right now we are looking at a SAC briefing meeting on Tuesday the 16th at 5:30pm, PSRC Boardroom. We are also hoping to schedule a meeting with Cascadia reps and available signatories to the industry letter on Monday the 15th, somewhere between 11am and 1:30pm. Outside of all that, we need to try and align everyone here with our planning to date and key assumptions. I am hoping/asking that between the PB team and Alec Williamson, we have some readily available information that we get out promptly (either by e-mail or for ftp download). This would include basic twin and single bore layouts and cross-sections as well as the estimate summaries and a summary of the assumptions and back-up to our soft costs.

You are right in that we need to better align ourselves before we engage in a group discussion, and we have almost no time available to do so. I agree that we need to be ready for the procurement discussion, as we know it is coming, and all other areas where opportunities to save time and cost have been identified. Gordon Clarke from our design team has been working on a response to points brought up within the Cascadia letter, hopefully he has a working document that we can forward.

Bottom line that you can expect for the Tuesday meeting is that the funds WSDOT has in-hand or that have been committed are all that is available to the project at this period in time, and that the prevailing opinion is that there is no way to finance a bored tunnel at this point in time. We expect people to lobby to cut other committed scope and add tolling and propose other things to fund the tunnel, but these are not things we think are viable at this point in time (though may be in the future).

I am hoping that you, John and Don can confirm your availability for the Tuesday SAC meeting, and am hoping that some of you may be available for the proposed Monday meeting/conference call. I am going to contact Cascadia today and try to line them and some of their resources up for next week.

John

John H. White, P.E.  
Program Director  
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program  
WSDOT Urban Corridors Office  
Business: (206) 382 - 5270  
Cell: (206) 450 - 2975

-----Original Message-----

From: Harvey W. Parker [mailto:harveyparker@compuserve.com]  
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2008 12:47 PM  
To: White, John

6/25/2009

Cc: Reilly, John; Don Phelps; Langrock, Gary M.  
Subject: Tunnel Issues

John, it was good to see you again last night. As Dave Dye mentioned last night, we should meet next week. As for who should be invited, we all discussed it last night but I would like to assist you in developing the strategy for the meeting(s) and the list of participants.

We should exercise caution to have the right people there and to structure our discussions/actions to make sure we get the best outcome for all parties, especially WSDOT who ultimately has to make this all work no matter what is decided.

It seems to me that we need to address many things quickly. The main issue seems to be cost so, to start with, we need to all learn and understand what the reported costs include. I have not been personally involved so I do not even know what is involved in the \$3.5 B. These are issues that can, and have been, questioned.

As important as getting the best cost estimate is finding ways to reduce the cost of any tunnel concept, not just the construction cost but the overall design. There are many ways to address this.

Perhaps this is the time to re-evaluate the pros and cons of alternative procurement, PPP etc. We should be thinking practically but with the future in mind.

An added potential of our discussions is the clarification and, hopefully, the identification of life-cycle costs and benefits. As you may or may not know, John Reilly and I have written several papers on life cycle costs and risks etc. As good as the life cycle concepts may seem to support tunnel options, our papers have suggested that there is no good way for life cycle costs to be considered by decision makers at least by the numbers. There has to be a change in attitudes to allow consideration of life-cycle costs. Our industry does have procurements by "Best Value" in construction bids. Maybe this or similar concepts can be applied to selection of alternates.

As we discussed last night, I worked with John to look at bored tunnels and other concepts for WSDOT along all of the avenues back in 2001 before the EIS process started.

To reacquaint you with some of my background, tunnel and geotechnical engineering are my specialties. I served as President of the International Tunnelling and Underground Space Association (ITA) for 3 years and I am now serving as Past President. A brief one-page resume is attached for your information.

John, I have contacted Gary Langrock to see if I can get another WSDOT/UCO task order initiated for me for some of this work. I have 4 On-call contracts with UCO and 2 with the State and Gary has been

involved in all of my task orders. Please let me know if I need to contact anyone else.

Best regards,  
Harvey

\*\*\* eSafe1 scanned this email for malicious content \*\*\*

\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*