

---

**From:** Williamson, Alec  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 23, 2008 10:40 AM  
**To:** Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)  
**Cc:** White, John  
**Subject:** FW: Bored tunnel

Mike- A couple of thoughts following our phone conference this morning-

We have a limited opportunity to influence this process. Let's give ourselves the best possible chance to make it successful. Let's recommend a single alternative in the environmental process for this SR 99 replacement action. It will make the analysis and public process more streamlined (not to mention cheaper and more achievable). There are many more independent actions to follow but let's let them run on their own track (Alaskan Way, Armory Way, Seawall, Utilities, etc...). If we don't separate it this way, we will run the risk of falling back into the same type of pitfalls and process gridlock that we've encountered in the past.

We should recommend that this first action focus exclusively and specifically on the new SR 99 alignment. This initial process is a SR 99 replacement project only. The tear down of the viaduct and reconnection to Belltown should be a separate environmental process because there are a lot of choices and a lot of voices out there. Let's keep it simple to increase our chances of success and quick implementation. Yes, that means access to Belltown and NW Seattle will change in the interim, but I think we can explain and get through those issues.

I am hopeful that you can help to keep the team focused on how to achieve success.

Thanks,  
Alec

---

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Tue 12/23/2008 7:12 AM  
**To:** Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Williamson, Alec  
**Cc:** Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Paananen, Ron  
**Subject:** Fw: Bored tunnel

OK everyone, top priority holiday assignment, we all know these are the best since there is no one around to do the work.

Need some 'Gov. friendly' bored tunnel materials per Ron's below e-mail. Breakout of costs is an easy one once we decide which base tunnel assumption we are using, aggressive schedule as well. Not sure how to answer all the 'how we pay for it' part, but for now what we need to do is determine the gap between minimum cost tunnel (without the other systems projects per below) and what we have in hand. Based on our environmental approach and assumed schedule, we can answer as to when additional funds would be required.

More later, but this is enough to get started. I will follow up with Cascadia/Arup today.

John

---

**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.