

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2009 9:54 AM
To: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant); Morrison, Mike (Consultant)
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW: Draft presentation for Senate/House Transportation Committees

A few further comments, which I just reviewed with Kristy and will leave with KaDeena:

- On the tunneling technology slide, it might be a good idea to show our proposed tunnel on the graphic showing the increasing diameter of bored tunnels around the world.
- On the cost, risk and contingency slide we may want to consider having it focus only on the bored tunnel with the \$1.9B number, and avoid the add-ons since they are on a separate funding responsibility sheet.
- On the bored vs cut and cover tunnel sheet, the \$4.24B bored tunnel program cost and \$4.6B cut and cover cost are apples and oranges in a big way. I'd suggest leaving it out, and if it stays, we need to get down to a \$1.9B vs \$_____ comparable number for the cut and cover tunnel (which has the seawall integral to it as well as Alaskan Way relocation).
- Might want to consider a more detailed comparable tunnel sheet ahead of the Big Dig sheet, though the tunneling technology sheet covers the basics. If desired we have some details we can provide quickly on the Madrid, Hamburg and Canadian tunnels.
- Need to revise the Big Dig sheet per comments on the one-pager. This should be coordinated with Theresa. Initial observations are making it crystal clear that we are talking very different tunnel types and construction conditions; might want to add to the first bullet that significant scope was also added along the way; might want to note the \$ spent on some of the mitigation efforts such as the temporary structures.

From: White, John
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2009 5:42 PM
To: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant); Morrison, Mike (Consultant)
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW: Draft presentation for Senate/House Transportation Committees

The Cost, Risk and Contingency sheet needs to be updated with our revised estimate numbers, the one in here is the old version from the SAC briefing. We need the \$1.9B tunnel version, see Mike Morrison for help. Also need to check all the other program numbers on the slide so we add up to \$2.8B.

From: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2009 3:42 PM
To: Dye, Dave; White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Lenz, KaDeena (Consultant)
Subject: FOR REVIEW: Draft presentation for Senate/House Transportation Committees

Attached is the draft presentation for the Senate Transportation Committee meeting on 1/26. I need to confirm information on the Big Dig comparison slide, and I'm not sure if the last bullet on page 9 is correct.

King County has asked that we include a slide of MVET (currently slide #11) since they need legislative authority.

We have not finished the talking points or divided out slides to the different agencies yet, but wanted to get your input on the current content. Should we add a slide on I-5? Other things that are missing?

Please send me your comments as soon as possible. I was going to send this to the City and County for a quick look tomorrow morning, and then need to send the final to Willy by noon tomorrow.

Thank you,
Kristy

Kristy Van Ness (Laing)
Communications Manager
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
206.382.6361
cell: 206.300.4312
email: VanNesK@wsdot.wa.gov

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2009 8:49 AM
To: Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); White, John; Paananen, Ron; Stone, Craig
Subject: Fw: AWW work session

We're on next week (not this week) as tri-agency in the senate - so far we're on only as wsdot in the house same week but are working on that - need a powerpoint that is based on the folio and the 1-pagers - note it's due in oly thursday...let's discuss tomorrow - thanks all

-dave

From: Reinmuth, Steve
To: Auyoung, Dillon; Leiste, Willy; Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig; Ziegler, Jennifer; Hammond, Paula; Aldridge, Jo; Healy, Linda; Brown, Lloyd
Sent: Mon Jan 19 08:23:05 2009
Subject: Fw: AWW work session

City and County are in at the Senate. Dave and Craig, please get names of presenters and PowerPoint materials to Dillon before Thursday of this week.

From: Simpson, Kelly
To: Reinmuth, Steve; Auyoung, Dillon; Healy, Linda; Aldridge, Jo
Cc: Ziegler, Jennifer
Sent: Mon Jan 19 08:11:03 2009
Subject: RE: AWW work session

Yes, we would like city/county participation please. What about ports?

From: Reinmuth, Steve [<mailto:ReinmuS@wsdot.wa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2009 7:36 AM
To: Simpson, Kelly; Auyoung, Dillon; Healy, Linda; Aldridge, Jo
Cc: Ziegler, Jennifer
Subject: Re: AWW work session

It's a go. Please let Dillon know details on date in week 3. Dave Dye is hoping that city and county can be a part of the presentation. Will that work?

7/14/2009

From: Simpson, Kelly
To: Reinmuth, Steve; Auyoung, Dillon
Cc: Ziegler, Jennifer
Sent: Fri Jan 16 15:22:11 2009
Subject: AWV work session

Jennifer & I were briefly discussing the possibility of an AWV briefing to the committee. I was originally intending to include AWV on the 29th along with SR520, but that work session was primarily focused on project cost increases. Given this week's announcement on the AWV, I think it would be good to have a separate briefing on AWV, including WSDOT, King County, & Seattle perspectives (maybe Port??). So, any chance we could put together a work session on AWV early in week 3, Jan 26 or 27? If so, I would remove AWV from the presentation on the 29th.

Please advise, thanks.