

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 12:05 PM
To: Williamson, Alec; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Conte, Rick (Consultant)
Cc: Preedy, Matt; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark; Reilly, John
Subject: RE: Ballard Spur Idea
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Alec,

Thanks, but I don't think we need a report on this one. Mark Bandy has already put substantial effort into the new and upcoming materials that describe the Elliott/Western users, their travel patterns today, and what their options in the future will be. I think that all we really need is a short summary from the civil team on the basic order of magnitude costs and challenges related to the proposed Mercer tunnel. We'll pair that up with the traffic work already done and basic messages regarding our budget and probably respond by e-mail.

John

From: Williamson, Alec
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 11:54 AM
To: White, John; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Conte, Rick (Consultant)
Cc: Preedy, Matt; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark; Reilly, John
Subject: RE: Ballard Spur Idea

John/Amy-

We will get a briefing paper put together for this for you to share with Bob and others.

The focus will be on a few key points:

1. Traffic demand in the Elliott/Western corridor vs. Mercer and how people will use the facilities
2. What the key travel routes will be for NW Seattle residents and businesses (using the city maps would be useful here)
3. How the Elliott/Western arterials will function as compared to today
4. How the Belltown neighborhood look and feel as compared to today with a focus on viaduct removal
5. Finally, a quick analysis on what the impacts and cost would be to implement a Mercer tunnel

Let me know if you would like to see other issues/topics covered. Let me know what your expectation for timing of a draft report would be.

Thanks,

Alec

From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 11:44 AM
To: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Conte, Rick (Consultant); Williamson, Alec
Cc: Preedy, Matt; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark; Reilly, John
Subject: RE: Ballard Spur Idea

We're on the same page, no way no how does it pencil out. As I said, that part of our response will be brief, the focus will be on educating Bob related to the anticipated traffic distribution of the Elliott/Western users.

Thanks,

John

From: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 11:34 AM
To: White, John; Conte, Rick (Consultant); Williamson, Alec
Cc: Preedy, Matt; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark; Reilly, John
Subject: RE: Ballard Spur Idea

John,

Below is a quick back of the envelope look I did yesterday. We'll confirm my quick math and get something very brief pulled together.

Very quick look. It looks like about 4,000 feet of tunnel. Assume 4 lanes: Compare to our bored tunnel at approximately 10,000 feet and a cost of \$2B (round numbers): $.4 \times \$2B = \$800M$ or about the same general range as the spur tunnel concept. Doesn't look like it pencils out or am I missing something?

Mike Rigsby
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
206-382-6352

From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 11:24 AM
To: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Conte, Rick (Consultant); Williamson, Alec
Cc: Preedy, Matt; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Bandy, Mark; Reilly, John
Subject: FW: Ballard Spur Idea

Hey guys,

Have another short fire drill for you. Please read Bob Donegan's below e-mail and the idea he puts forth for a tunnel to help get traffic to the SR 99 tunnel. We need to put together some basic thoughts on cost and issues related to the idea, but nothing extravagant. Our response will be structured around the financial limitations related to taking on new scope within our budget, combined with some info that better explains where the 35,000 Elliott/Western vehicles are coming from and going to (and shows that they all won't be on Mercer and bottle-necking at Mercer Place). We do need some content responding to his idea...any additional bored tunnels clearly does work within the budget, and one like this is probably not much less (if any) than the stub tunnel idea. By his statement of 'avoiding the 2-3 lane Mercer Place', I assume he is suggesting this tunnel be 4 lanes total...how you bring that into Mercer at the location described I do not know.

From: Amy Grotefendt [mailto:agrotefendt@enviroissues.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 11:05 AM
To: Reilly, John; White, John; bobd@keepclam.com
Subject: RE: Ballard Spur Idea

Bob,

Just to let you know that John Reilly forwarded this idea to John White who is having the project team put together

6/24/2009

some thoughts -- what it would take, range of costs, etc. We'll get something back to you as quickly as we can.

Thanks,
AJG

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

From: [Bob Donegan](#)

To: [John Reilly](#)

Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 10:31 AM

Subject: Ballard Spur Idea

The issue of 35,000 vehicles a day that enter the viaduct at Western or exit at Battery street is becoming a huge issue for the freight guys in Ballard and NW Seattle. We have talked about a tunnel spur off the main tunnel toward 15-Elliott as an option, which the project team prices at \$77M to \$1B. When I ask for details, they explain the cut and cover portion where the spur connects to the main tunnel will be expensive.

Here is an alternative. Can this work?

At 15th and Mercer Place on the west end, there is a public park cut into the rapidly rising slope of Queen Anne hill. How about boring a tunnel there to the ESE and bringing it out of the ground on Mercer between the Opera House, KCTS TV and the parking garage? Mercer is downward sloping to the east there--probably 3-4-5% slope.

This avoids having to do a cut and cover connection.

This avoids the narrow Mercer Place 2-3 lane street.

This avoids dumping 35,000 vehicles into a neighborhood.

Is this possible?
What would it cost?