

Existing  
Contractors  
Consultants  
New Contracts  
Contractors  
Operations

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** John Reilly [jireils@attglobal.net] - *wsdot consultant*  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 24, 2008 7:57 AM  
**To:** White, John  
**Cc:** Grotefendt, Amy; Paananen, Ron  
**Subject:** AWW, Governor, decision, SAC initiatives, Happy Holidays

John - good to talk to you last night about the AWW tunnel alternative and the Cascadia / SAC efforts.

I'll be interested in seeing the Richard Prust / Cascadia Center memo - please forward it when rec'd. Basically, from the communications I've seen, Cascadia and the SAC members are trying to get and understand (and then perhaps challenge - Note 1) the costs of the tunnel - relative to the WSDOT numbers - and in particular understand and challenge the add-ons and markups - the thought is that these are too high and then the markups compound leading to a much too high result (Note 2). They are also thinking about the NEPA requirements with the thought that the tunnel alternative is simpler with better performance, less impact and therefore less liable to be challenged by a lot of stakeholders.

I've heard that there is an idea (Governor, SAC?) to fund the other elements (transit, streets, I-5) separately. And, that the Governor has been talking to the stakeholders, has acknowledged support for the deep bore, would like more information but needs to make a decision now.

If Cascadia / Stakeholders were to call me (they have my contact info but none has called), I'd tell them:

Note 1 - I think that the PB/Ken Fiorentine [sp?] - Arup - HMM/Phelps tunnel cost numbers are all comparable and we could easily come to agreement (see Note 3)

Note 2 - this is also a concern of mine (that the add-on line items are high and they may compound unreasonably) but, see Note 3

Note 3 - as I stated at the Tuesday Dec 16 SAC evening presentation/questions, and informally after last Thursday's SAC final meeting, if we ran even a quick CEVP-type analysis on the tunnel we could have better construction cost numbers and the uncertainty could be quantified to give a reasonable "range of probable cost" - then WSDOT might determine a budget number less than the 90% range number as was done after the 2006 ERP. At this point, without that data and analysis, we have to use a "high" number (see Note 4) to account for the current uncertainties.

Note 4 - the high number could be reduced, as Mike R has already done internally, with some better analysis of the add-on costs and their uncertainty. this would not necessarily take a CEVP workshop - it could be done more simply with a small number of knowledgeable people (the usual characters we all know and love).

And, to be clear, the major uncertainty here is the political process (including the reliability of a preferred decision), the NEPA/Environmental process (impact, time) the appropriate "design allowance" and funding/cashflow.

Let me know how this evolves, have a great Christmas and happy holidays - talk to you soon (we have our office kid's party starting at noon, EST, but I'm available by email and cell phone).

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:** Renee Roline  
**To:** White, John ; Bruce Agnew ; Richard Prust ; Rita Brogan ; Bob Donegan  
**Cc:** Paananen, Ron ; Reilly, John  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 23, 2008 6:31 PM

**Subject:** Re: Meeting with tunneling experts

Thank you John for your follow up.

We have been working on this all day today and should have a memo in your hands by tomorrow morning. Richard at Arup, will be finishing up tonight.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide this to you.

Renée Roline  
Projects Coordinator  
Cascadia Center for Regional Development  
208 Columbia Street | Seattle, WA 98104  
Direct 206-292-0401 ext 120 | Fax 206-682-5320  
[reneer@discovery.org](mailto:reneer@discovery.org)

On 12/23/08 3:16 PM, "White, John" <[WhiteJH@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:WhiteJH@wsdot.wa.gov)> wrote:

Hi Bruce and Renée,

Hope all is well and you are both looking forward to some nice holiday relaxation time. That said, I did want to check in regarding the status of follow-up thoughts from Arup based on the SAC discussion last week. As time is getting very short ahead of a Gov's recommendation, and we are responding to the many bored tunnel questions being asked of us, the opportunity to chime in with any additional thoughts ahead of a decision is right now.

If Arup has formulated so thoughts based on the SAC discussion and cost information we provided, please forward them to us so that they can be factored into the work the agency is doing to support and inform the decision-making process. If a bored tunnel is to advance, there will be plenty of opportunity for Arup and others to further engage in the design process and potentially construction, but ahead of that we need to pull together the best tunnel thinking available related to thoughts on costs and construction options.

*quid pro quo*

Feel free to respond by e-mail or to give me a call on my cell, 206-310-4838.

Happy holidays,

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

**From:** Bruce Agnew [<mailto:bagnew@discovery.org>]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 15, 2008 9:42 AM  
**To:** Agnew, Bruce; White, John  
**Cc:** Renée Roline  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting with tunneling experts

John

7/13/2009

Lets go ahead with the phone call today at 11 to review how to proceed,  
Bruce

On 12/15/08 9:36 AM, "Bruce Agnew" <[bagnew@discovery.org](mailto:bagnew@discovery.org)> wrote:

John,

It looks as though our local tunnel experts will be out of town this week. I've asked if they are reachable by phone but as of now it doesn't appear so. Is there a way you could provide us with your detailed cost estimate report on the bored tunnel? They could then review and give feedback which may actually be a rather effective way to compare notes.

Thanks,

Renée Roline  
Projects Coordinator  
Cascadia Center for Regional Development  
208 Columbia Street | Seattle, WA 98104  
Direct 206-292-0401 ext 120 | Fax 206-682-5320  
[renee@discovery.org](mailto:renee@discovery.org)

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:32 AM  
**To:** 'Bob Rosain'  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec; Anderson, Ward  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Thanks, Bob. Much appreciated!

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:28 AM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

OK Tom.....I'll get with Jim Parsons on this latest thinking. I'm sure he'll be discussing this with Alec if he hasn't already, and confirm that we can wrap things up in the next 15 days.

Thanks for getting back to me,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:19 AM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec; Anderson, Ward; Smith, Brian (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

Bob, I was able to meet with Alec this morning regarding Amendment 7. We also talked about where Parametrix stands as far as funding through December 2008.

Given the Governor's decision this week to construct a bored tunnel, the STATE would like Parametrix and the IPM team to complete all necessary IPM-related work approved through Amendment 6 by January 30, 2009.

The STATE is currently evaluating Parametrix's role to support it during the upcoming 2009 legislative

6/24/2009

session, but it will most likely be at a reduced scope than that outlined in Amendment 7 previously submitted.

The STATE will advise Parametrix the sketch out this new scope as soon as possible so you can cost it out.

We are also interested in getting an idea if there will be any excess funds left over that might be used to finance Amendment 7. Currently, Task Order AJ ends in March 2009 so we have a little time to process the next amendment.

Please call if you have any questions regarding this email. And thanks for your persistence in checking on the status of Amendment 7.

Tom

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 14, 2009 6:01 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Michele Affronte; Parsons, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Tom:

Here's where we are: Although the January invoice (for December effort) seemed pretty sizable, four of our subs were not able to get us a December invoice, so what you saw did not include their charges for December (and I know that some had a significant effort in December). We are therefore in the process of getting at least a pretty firm estimate from these subs of their December charges this week. We are also getting projections for January from all of our subs as best they can forecast (I think January will be significantly lighter).

At this point, I think there MIGHT be some extra funds that some of our subs won't spend out of their total contract, but I can't be sure quite yet. Obviously, I'll pass the information along as soon as we compile it, hopefully by no later than Friday. Consequently, the \$367K AJ7 figure is still what I think we need as of today.

Thanks for understanding and stay tuned,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 2:36 PM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

6/24/2009

Bob: We got everything so thanks.

Regarding your question on AJ 7, it is still with Alec Williamson, the TO manager and I haven't seen him in his office today or yesterday to ask about its status.

I do have a question, however, regarding Parametrix's proposed cost for AJ 7.

According to our calculations, after January 9th invoice of \$480,526 is paid on Parametrix TO Y9631 AJ, the remaining balance is \$699,618.75 out of the approved \$3,614,335.00.

Parametrix's amendment for AJ 7 is \$367,190.

Are you anticipating that your January 2009 costs will pretty much each up the balance of the remaining \$699,618.75 such that Parametrix will still need \$367,190? Or will January expenditures be closer to \$500,000 [you state previously that December 2008 and January 2009 would be heavy months] such that there would be a balance of \$199,618 left?

I'd prefer not to amend AJ for an additional total of \$367 if there will still be monies left in the kitty so to speak.

Thx.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 1:30 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Macey, Laurie  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Tom:

I asked Connie Moore to forward e-copies of the invoices to you. The hard copy of the IPM (AJ) invoice went out yesterday addressed to Pam Martin in your office; the SR519 invoice (AI) went out Friday addressed to Allison Hanson at UCO (hopefully someone is opening and directing her mail to the right party).

Hope that helps; call me if you need anything else.

Also.....what's the current status on AJ7????

6/24/2009

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 7:39 AM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Macey, Laurie  
**Subject:** Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Hi Bob, what is the status for submitting the December invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

I would like to process AI so we can close out.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

6/24/2009

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 20, 2009 7:48 PM  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Stone, Craig  
**Cc:** Reilly, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Re: Update items

Oh yeah, so as you know, the 'want to build a bored tunnel' crowd are coming out of the woodwork, with briefings starting this week. Would like to limit who engages the interested industry parties at the front end to ensure consistency in message prior to having a more evolved plan that has some executive concurrence.

Herrenknecht, who potentially could be the only firm playing in the 50+ TBM game, want to visit next Thurs the 29th as they swing through town. Please let me know if you would like to attend, this is strictly an initial introduction that they requested. My hope is to establish basic communication lines while at the Underground Construction Association conference next week, where many key players will be present.

John

---

**From:** White, John  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Stone, Craig  
**Cc:** Reilly, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 20 19:32:52 2009  
**Subject:** Update items

Just wanted to provide a status report on various activities. First, attached are a couple summary documents capturing initial thoughts on oversight and advisory structure. There is an accompanying list of candidates for roles on the technical and strategic advisory committees, we hope to have that to you tomorrow (John R is doing some final vetting).

We are working on a new boiler plate PPT, including some slides specific to leg hearing needs. I will call to discuss expectations to make sure we are aligned, so far we are keeping it lean and focused on messages from the folio along with some additional cost info and key points from the tunnel one pagers we are working on.

Speaking of those, the tunnel ones and most others are in motion, but needing more work still. Transportation performance remains a challenge, as we did not model a scenario that matches the current proposal, which begs getting modeling going at the front end of this effort, once we figure out the northend configuration.

Speaking of the northend, and other areas of City interest, we had an enlightening meeting with Chandler and Brown where they decribed their view of what is 'in' the EIS, and needless to say we aren't exactly on the same page. This should be item number 1 for next Monday's enviro strategy meeting.

Speaking of that meeting, we will have draft materials to you by COB Thurs, along with some key points from the City discussion. Well attended brown bag today, Linea and Bob made it and are now engaged in the 'what it will take' discussion. AGO discussion tomorrow.

John

---

**From:** Greco, Theresa  
**To:** White, John; Preedy, Matt  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 20 17:42:43 2009  
**Subject:** Description of the Bored Tunnel Advisory Teams 1-20-09.doc

P R Info  
Mistake  
Process Enviro  
contractor

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 20, 2009 7:48 PM  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Stone, Craig  
**Cc:** Reilly, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Re: Update items

Oh yeah, so as you know, the 'want to build a bored tunnel' crowd are coming out of the woodwork, with briefings starting this week. Would like to limit who engages the interested industry parties at the front end to ensure consistency in message prior to having a more evolved plan that has some executive concurrence.

Herrenknecht, who potentially could be the only firm playing in the 50+ TBM game, want to visit next Thurs the 29th as they swing through town. Please let me know if you would like to attend, this is strictly an initial introduction that they requested. My hope is to establish basic communication lines while at the Underground Construction Association conference next week, where many key players will be present.

PDR

John

**From:** White, John  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Stone, Craig  
**Cc:** Reilly, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 20 19:32:52 2009  
**Subject:** Update items

Just wanted to provide a status report on various activities. First, attached are a couple summary documents capturing initial thoughts on oversight and advisory structure. There is an accompanying list of candidates for roles on the technical and strategic advisory committees, we hope to have that to you tomorrow (John R is doing some final vetting).

We are working on a new boiler plate PPT, including some slides specific to leg hearing needs. I will call to discuss expectations to make sure we are aligned, so far we are keeping it lean and focused on messages from the folio along with some additional cost info and key points from the tunnel one pagers we are working on.

PDR

Speaking of those, the tunnel ones and most others are in motion, but needing more work still. Transportation performance remains a challenge, as we did not model a scenario that matches the current proposal, which begs getting modeling going at the front end of this effort, once we figure out the northend configuration.

Making unsubstantiated claims

Speaking of the northend, and other areas of City interest, we had an enlightening meeting with Chandler and Brown where they decribed their view of what is 'in' the EIS, and needless to say we aren't exactly on the same page. This should be item number 1 for next Monday's enviro strategy meeting.

PDR

Speaking of that meeting, we will have draft materials to you by COB Thurs, along with some key points from the City discussion. Well attended brown bag today, Linea and Bob made it and are now engaged in the 'what it will take' discussion. AGO discussion tomorrow.

John

? Chandler - Bob Chandler SPOC

Lisa Brown Senate Majority Leader ?

**From:** Greco, Theresa  
**To:** White, John; Preedy, Matt  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 20 17:42:43 2009  
**Subject:** Description of the Bored Tunnel Advisory Teams 1-20-09.doc

PDR

Attached is the last revision of the Bored Tunnel Advisory Teams for your review and distribution to Ron, Craig and Dave

Take care.

Theresa

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Monday, January 26, 2009 3:00 PM  
**To:** 'Bob Rosain'  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec; Parsons, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Hi Bob. I had a chance to talk with Alec this morning regarding his meeting with Jim Parsons and based on that meeting, this is how the STATE would like Parametrix to proceed with TO Y9762 AJ – AWVSRP SR 99 Central Waterfront Collaboration Independent Project Manager & Implementation Team.

Please complete all necessary work under Task Order Y9631 AJ 6 by February 2009 so that we can close it out by March 31, 2009, the original Task Order End Date. It is my understanding that Parametrix is producing a summary draft report by the end of January and final report by mid- February 2009 as requested by Ron Paananen; this is pretty much what is left to complete on TO AJ as far as deliverables go.

The STATE further requests that CONSULTANT Parametrix revise its previously submitted December 15, 2008 draft scope document for TO AJ Amendment 7 to include the necessary administrative support Parametrix will provide to the STATE and the 2009 legislative from say February 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009 as a separate Task Order. I see that Y9631 AM has been assigned so as soon as we get a draft scope document, I can reserve the next Task Order number.

If you have any questions regarding this email, please feel welcome to contact me or Alec Williamson.

Thanks.

Tom

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:28 AM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

OK Tom.....I'll get with Jim Parsons on this latest thinking. I'm sure he'll be discussing this with Alec if he hasn't

6/24/2009

already, and confirm that we can wrap things up in the next 15 days.

Thanks for getting back to me,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:19 AM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec; Anderson, Ward; Smith, Brian (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

Bob, I was able to meet with Alec this morning regarding Amendment 7. We also talked about where Parametrix stands as far as funding through December 2008.

Given the Governor's decision this week to construct a bored tunnel, the STATE would like Parametrix and the IPM team to complete all necessary IPM-related work approved through Amendment 6 by January 30, 2009.

The STATE is currently evaluating Parametrix's role to support it during the upcoming 2009 legislative session, but it will most likely be at a reduced scope than that outlined in Amendment 7 previously submitted.

The STATE will advise Parametrix the sketch out this new scope as soon as possible so you can cost it out.

We are also interested in getting an idea if there will be any excess funds left over that might be used to finance Amendment 7. Currently, Task Order AJ ends in March 2009 so we have a little time to process the next amendment.

Please call if you have any questions regarding this email. And thanks for your persistence in checking on the status of Amendment 7.

Tom

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 14, 2009 6:01 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Michele Affronte; Parsons, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

6/24/2009

Tom:

Here's where we are: Although the January invoice (for December effort) seemed pretty sizable, four of our subs were not able to get us a December invoice, so what you saw did not include their charges for December (and I know that some had a significant effort in December). We are therefore in the process of getting at least a pretty firm estimate from these subs of their December charges this week. We are also getting projections for January from all of our subs as best they can forecast (I think January will be significantly lighter).

At this point, I think there MIGHT be some extra funds that some of our subs won't spend out of their total contract, but I can't be sure quite yet. Obviously, I'll pass the information along as soon as we compile it, hopefully by no later than Friday. Consequently, the \$367K AJ7 figure is still what I think we need as of today.

Thanks for understanding and stay tuned,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 2:36 PM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Bob: We got everything so thanks.

Regarding your question on AJ 7, it is still with Alec Williamson, the TO manager and I haven't seen him in his office today or yesterday to ask about its status.

I do have a question, however, regarding Parametrix's proposed cost for AJ 7.

According to our calculations, after January 9th invoice of \$480,526 is paid on Parametrix TO Y9631 AJ, the remaining balance is \$699,618.75 out of the approved \$3,614,335.00.

Parametrix's amendment for AJ 7 is \$367,190.

Are you anticipating that your January 2009 costs will pretty much each up the balance of the remaining \$699,618.75 such that Parametrix will still need \$367,190? Or will January expenditures be closer to \$500,000 [you state previously that December 2008 and January 2009 would be heavy months] such that there would be a balance of \$199,618 left?

I'd prefer not to amend AJ for an additional total of \$367 if there will still be monies left in the kitty so to speak.

Thx.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

6/24/2009

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 1:30 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Macey, Laurie  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Tom:

I asked Connie Moore to forward e-copies of the invoices to you. The hard copy of the IPM (AJ) invoice went out yesterday addressed to Pam Martin in your office; the SR519 invoice (AI) went out Friday addressed to Allison Hanson at UCO (hopefully someone is opening and directing her mail to the right party).

Hope that helps; call me if you need anything else.

Also.....what's the current status on AJ7????

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 7:39 AM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Macey, Laurie  
**Subject:** Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Hi Bob, what is the status for submitting the December invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

I would like to process AI so we can close out.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

6/24/2009

consultants -  
contracts transition Through  
all events no new bids  
change in participants  
one ongoing gravy train

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 29, 2009 1:43 PM  
**To:** Williamson, Alec  
**Subject:** FW: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

FYI.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 29, 2009 1:41 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Parsons, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

Tom:

We've been discussing your proposal below for the last couple of days, and making sure all our subs are finished with all their work and the Tri-Agency leads are OK with this plan. At this point, it all looks good with the exception of being able to "stop work" on Task AJ by 6 February. Considering our promise to get Draft report comments completed by "Mid-February", stopping work on 6 Feb. is a little too soon. I would say it'll be more like 28 Feb, which will still allow us to close out AJ by 31 March as planned.

We will revise our previously submitted AJ7 as a new Task Order to support the Tri-Agency team through June 30th as you propose. However, the extent of that support is still being worked out with the Tri-Agency leads, but we hope to get their final direction next week. We'll shoot to get you a revised scope and budget soon after that.

Thanks,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 26, 2009 3:00 PM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec; James D. Parsons  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

Hi Bob. I had a chance to talk with Alec this morning regarding his meeting with Jim Parsons and based on that meeting, this is how the STATE would like Parametrix to proceed with TO Y9762 AJ – AWVSRP SR 99 Central Waterfront Collaboration Independent Project Manager & Implementation Team.

Please complete all necessary work under Task Order Y9631 AJ 6 by February 2009 so that we can close it out by March 31, 2009, the original Task Order End Date. It is my understanding that Parametrix is producing a summary draft report by the end of January and final report by mid- February 2009 as requested by Ron Paananen; this is pretty much what is left to complete on TO AJ as far as deliverables go.

The STATE further requests that CONSULTANT Parametrix revise its previously submitted December 15, 2008 draft scope document for TO AJ Amendment 7 to include the necessary administrative support Parametrix will provide to the STATE and the 2009 legislative from say February 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009 as a separate Task Order. I see that Y9631 AM has been assigned so as soon as we get a draft scope document, I can reserve the next Task Order number

If you have any questions regarding this email, please feel welcome to contact me or Alec Williamson.

Thanks.

Tom

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:28 AM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Subject:** RE: Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

OK Tom.....I'll get with Jim Parsons on this latest thinking. I'm sure he'll be discussing this with Alec if he hasn't already, and confirm that we can wrap things up in the next 15 days.

Thanks for getting back to me,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2009 10:19 AM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec; Anderson, Ward; Smith, Brian (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Status Update on TO Y9631 AJ Amendment 7

6/24/2009

Bob, I was able to meet with Alec this morning regarding Amendment 7. We also talked about where Parametrix stands as far as funding through December 2008.

Given the Governor's decision this week to construct a bored tunnel, the STATE would like Parametrix and the IPM team to complete all necessary IPM-related work approved through Amendment 6 by January 30, 2009.

The STATE is currently evaluating Parametrix's role to support it during the upcoming 2009 legislative session, but it will most likely be at a reduced scope than that outlined in Amendment 7 previously submitted.

The STATE will advise Parametrix the sketch out this new scope as soon as possible so you can cost it out.

We are also interested in getting an idea if there will be any excess funds left over that might be used to finance Amendment 7. Currently, Task Order AJ ends in March 2009 so we have a little time to process the next amendment.

Please call if you have any questions regarding this email. And thanks for your persistence in checking on the status of Amendment 7.

Tom

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 14, 2009 6:01 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Michele Affronte; Parsons, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Tom:

Here's where we are: Although the January invoice (for December effort) seemed pretty sizable, four of our subs were not able to get us a December invoice, so what you saw did not include their charges for December (and I know that some had a significant effort in December). We are therefore in the process of getting at least a pretty firm estimate from these subs of their December charges this week. We are also getting projections for January from all of our subs as best they can forecast (I think January will be significantly lighter).

At this point, I think there MIGHT be some extra funds that some of our subs won't spend out of their total contract, but I can't be sure quite yet. Obviously, I'll pass the information along as soon as we compile it, hopefully by no later than Friday. Consequently, the \$367K AJ7 figure is still what I think we need as of today.

6/24/2009

Thanks for understanding and stay tuned,

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 2:36 PM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Bob: We got everything so thanks.

Regarding your question on AJ 7, it is still with Alec Williamson, the TO manager and I haven't seen him in his office today or yesterday to ask about its status.

I do have a question, however, regarding Parametrix's proposed cost for AJ 7.

According to our calculations, after January 9th invoice of \$480,526 is paid on Parametrix TO Y9631 AJ, the remaining balance is \$699,618.75 out of the approved \$3,614,335.00.

Parametrix's amendment for AJ 7 is \$367,190.

Are you anticipating that your January 2009 costs will pretty much each up the balance of the remaining \$699,618.75 such that Parametrix will still need \$367,190? Or will January expenditures be closer to \$500,000 [you state previously that December 2008 and January 2009 would be heavy months] such that there would be a balance of \$199,618 left?

I'd prefer not to amend AJ for an additional total of \$367 if there will still be monies left in the kitty so to speak.

Thx.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Bob Rosain [mailto:RMRosain@parametrix.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 1:30 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Macey, Laurie  
**Subject:** RE: Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Tom:

6/24/2009

I asked Connie Moore to forward e-copies of the invoices to you. The hard copy of the IPM (AJ) invoice went out yesterday addressed to Pam Martin in your office; the SR519 invoice (AI) went out Friday addressed to Allison Hanson at UCO (hopefully someone is opening and directing her mail to the right party).

Hope that helps; call me if you need anything else.

Also.....what's the current status on AJ7????

Bob

**From:** Tobin, Thomas [mailto:TobinTh@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 7:39 AM  
**To:** Bob Rosain  
**Cc:** Macey, Laurie  
**Subject:** Status of December 2008 Invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

Hi Bob, what is the status for submitting the December invoices for TOs Y9631 AI (and AJ)?

I would like to process AI so we can close out.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** John Reilly [jireils@attglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 02, 2009 5:45 PM  
**To:** White, John; Paananen, Ron; Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa  
**Subject:** Re: Kiewit meeting

John - Unfortunately I'll be in Washington DC that week.

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:** [Paananen, Ron](#) ; [Preedy, Matt](#) ; [Greco, Theresa](#) ; [Reilly, John](#)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 02, 2009 5:36 PM  
**Subject:** Kiewit meeting

Kiewit would like to meet and discuss bored tunnels. It would be their WA management as well as Mark Ramsey, who is their national underground lead (from Omaha if I remember right).

Looking at the 17th lunch or afternoon, or the 18th in the AM.

Am guessing that Ron (and possibly others) might want to be there. Please work with Sally to confirm availability and others' attendance (such as Linea or Bob D).

Thanks.

John

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 03, 2009 5:08 PM  
**To:** Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa; Reilly, John  
**Subject:** FW: Alaska Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program - Possible Introductory Meeting  
**Attachments:** Transportation Package 8.4.08.pdf

FYI. I'll respond and find some time to sit down for introductions, probably will put it off until late this month or next month.

**From:** Glenn Cheek [mailto:glenn.cheek@traunerconsulting.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 03, 2009 3:52 PM  
**To:** White, John  
**Subject:** Alaska Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program - Possible Introductory Meeting

Dear John;

Based upon the recent announcement regarding adoption of the bored tunnel option, it sounds like the pace of work on your program will only be accelerating.

Because of your role in guiding this program, I wanted to introduce you to our firm and discuss possible ways in which we might be a resource.

Trauner Consulting Services, Inc. has extensive expertise in transportation related consulting, including schedule analysis, claims avoidance, project controls, contract document development, alternative delivery methods, related training and other transportation construction support services.

Trauner has two agreements in place with the Urban Corridors Office. These include Agreement Y-9599 "On Call Engineering Specialty Services for UCO – Projects over \$1 Billion", and Agreement Y-9625 "Urban Corridors Office Engineering Management On-Call Services" (Cost Risk Assessment, Tunnels, and General Engineering Management).

Under Y-9625, we provided scheduling analysis and reporting services to WSDOT during the late stages of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge project working with Jeff Carpenter and Rick Singer. I believe they both felt Trauner performed well on that assignment.

Both Rick Smith and Kevin Dayton are familiar with Trauner through their work with us on association committees, panels and related transportation activities. I believe they will also have positive comments on Trauner.

The attached material will provide you with more information on our transportation experience and personnel. Our website below provides additional information.

We would very much appreciate it if we could arrange a meeting with you at your convenience. This would be a great opportunity to discuss the challenges you see ahead and ways in which we might serve as a resource. I will contact you regarding your availability for a brief introductory meeting.

---

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 10, 2009 9:06 AM  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** Reilly, John  
**Subject:** RE: Seattle - Alaskan Way Viaduct Project - Bored Tunnel Option

Agreed. John R has dropped a line to Caspar trying to verify that they were not coming over exclusively for a 90 minute meeting with me and Ron. Arup is coming in to meet with us in 2 weeks, Kiewit (including their US underground district lead) is coming in next week, CH2M is scheduling follow up, etc. We are going to proactively contact the other TBM manufacturers and bring them into the dialogue as well. At Brightwater this week we are meeting with the CM who was involved with the Paris A86 double deck tunnel that is a common comparison point for our project, and we have discussed a visit with the Portland CSO project management team.

John

---

**From:** Dye, Dave  
**Sent:** Monday, February 09, 2009 5:09 PM  
**To:** White, John; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** Reilly, John  
**Subject:** RE: Seattle - Alaskan Way Viaduct Project - Bored Tunnel Option

I like the idea of accepting any and all free advice before we get too formal a process started to inform our design of the formal process...my understanding is they were in the neighborhood anyway - certainly didn't think they were coming from Denmark just for this 90 minutes...we should chat with ARUP and any others you wish right now as well because at some point not too far in the future we'll form our process and the formality will increase exponentially...food for thought...

-dave

---

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Monday, February 09, 2009 1:07 PM  
**To:** Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** Dye, Dave; Reilly, John  
**Subject:** Re: Seattle - Alaskan Way Viaduct Project - Bored Tunnel Option

Ron,

Was talking to JR about this proposed meeting you and I would have with COWI. Am a bit concerned that it is worth their while to make this trip specifically for a 90 min mtg with us.

Seems like it might be more appropriate after we have our thoughts/proposal better defined regarding the advisory committee structure and short list of candidates.

This trip evolved from Dave's e-mail to Caspar, John R offered to talk to Caspar and explain that it might be better to wait a bit until we start more formal outreach based on a plan we are ready to discuss.

Thoughts?

John

---

**From:** Casper Paludan-Müller

**To:** Arany, Sally (Consultant)

**Cc:** Dye, Dave; McLemore, Susanne; Paananen, Ron; White, John; Søren Degn Eskesen ; Christoffer Brodback

**Sent:** Mon Feb 09 07:02:47 2009

**Subject:** Seattle - Alaskan Way Viaduct Project - Bored Tunnel Option

Hi Sally,

I confirm that we can have the meeting Wednesday 18. Feb. 8:30-10:00 (will get direct flight from Copenhagen Tuesday afternoon and leave Thursday afternoon)

We will be Søren Degn Eskesen and myself from COWI Copenhagen office and Christoffer Brodback from the Seattle office of our US company Ben C. Gerwick.

Will there be any specific agenda? and pls could you confirm address of meeting!

Best regards  
Casper

**From:** Dye, Dave  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 17, 2009 5:08 PM  
**To:** Greco, Theresa; Stone, Craig; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** White, John; Preedy, Matt; Smith, Helena Kennedy  
**Subject:** RE: SUBS-Active at 021209 under PB contract Y-9715

Thanks Theresa, note also that the vendor payments over 100K on the CRC included payments to others, like the MPO (for modeling I assume) and other partners for whatever work they have been doing - I suspect we need to broaden beyond just the subs and prime and bring those in too...do you want to have Jodie try and run something similar here to help? If yes, direct contact is the best...thanks again.

-dave

**From:** Greco, Theresa  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 17, 2009 5:05 PM  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** White, John; Preedy, Matt  
**Subject:** RE: SUBS-Active at 021209 under PB contract Y-9715

Thanks, Dave. This is the initial list of contractors you wanted in relation to potential conflict of interest. I will have the total amounts for PB, other contracts and expenditures per your email on the PDR by 9:00 tomorrow morning.

Theresa

**From:** Dye, Dave  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 17, 2009 5:00 PM  
**To:** Greco, Theresa; Stone, Craig; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** White, John; Preedy, Matt  
**Subject:** RE: SUBS-Active at 021209 under PB contract Y-9715

Theresa - are these the total agreement amounts authorized or amounts actually spent to date? What is the PB number?

-dave

**From:** Greco, Theresa  
**Sent:** Friday, February 13, 2009 9:23 AM  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Stone, Craig; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** White, John; Preedy, Matt  
**Subject:** FW: SUBS-Active at 021209 under PB contract Y-9715

Per your request, attached is a list of the largest subcontractors under the PB contract.

Theresa

**From:** Greengard, Mark J. [mailto:Greengard@pbworld.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2009 12:07 PM  
**To:** Greco, Theresa  
**Subject:** SUBS-Active at 021209 under PB contract Y-9715

Theresa,

The attached uses bold text to indicate the subs included in Task Orders CC (Environmental); CE (Engineering) or CG (Transportation) for the Bored Tunnel.

As I mentioned, the Scope for EI mentions the CWF but doesn't say 'Bored Tunnel'. I also noted that Bored Tunnel work for S&W is not included in PB's contract, but we're not certain whether S&W has Bored Tunnel under some other contract.

Mark

Mark Greengard  
 Project Administrator  
 Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement Program  
 Parsons Brinckerhoff  
 Phone 206-382-6363 // Cell 206-293-4321  
 Fax 206-382-5222

\*\*\* eSafe? scanned this email for malicious content \*\*\*  
 \*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*

7/2/2009

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

AWWSRP Agreements: Active Subs as of 02/12/09

JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP INC.	14,416,425.31
ROSEWATER ENGINEERING, Now GHD Inc, dba Rosewater GHD	6,350,171.01
PARAMETRIX, INC	5,654,280.59
POWER ENGINEERS, INC	5,339,597.21
HDR ENGINEERING, INC.	5,131,660.03
ENTECH NORTHWEST, INC.	2,332,411.40
DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.	2,051,578.92
ENVIROISSUES, INC.	1,823,148.32
SO-DEEP INC.	1,596,281.96
SHANNON & WILSON, INC.	1,311,588.49
ROMA DESIGN GROUP	1,037,746.77
BOLIMA DRAFTING & DESIGN, INC.	542,820.29
TELVENT FARRADYNE, INC.	531,406.64
WILLIAM P. OTT	528,078.41
BERGER/ABAM ENGINEERS INC	479,055.72
ICx TRANSPORTATION GROUP, INC.	164,928.00
EARTH TECH, INC	140,022.49
MIMI SHERIDAN, AICP	51,764.89
HOUGH BECK & BAIRD, INC.	41,229.31
ARTHUR BENDELIUS, reactivated Feb 2009	32,034.26
FREDERICK SKAER (Not billed yet)	10,021.00
TETRA TECH, INC	8,813.28

<p><b>Bold:</b> Included in Task Orders CC (Environmental), CE (Engineering), or CG (Transportation) for the Bored Tunnel.</p>
--

**Inactive:** BLACK & VEATCH CORPORATION  
 COSMOPOLITAN ENGINEERING  
 HIRSCHMUGL, HEINE & ASSOCIATES  
 JOHN F. MACDONALD  
 KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS  
 LIN & ASSOCIATES  
 NELSON NYGAARD CONSULTING ASSOC, INC  
 PETER HASSELMAN  
 PETERSON DESIGN (KEVIN PETERSON)  
 SEQUANA ENVIRONMENTAL (TOM MUELLER)  
 SWIFT & COMPANY  
 TAYLOR ASSOCIATES

02/12/09 mjg/JMR

RE D-B Firewall policy.txt

RE: D-B Firewall policy  
From: Nancy Beshaler [nancy.beshaler@I405.wsdot.wa.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2007 4:17 PM  
To: Valerie Ikehara  
Cc: Dilley, Doyle; Langrock, Gary M.; Nduta Mbutia  
Subject: RE: D-B Firewall policy

Attachments: I-405 -\_COI\_Resp\_ltr\_rev5.doc; RE: Y-9431AB, CH2MHill Traffic Analysis; RE: Y-9431AB, CH2MHill Traffic Analysis

Valerie - the discussion with CH about this task not precluding them from participating on a DB team was based on the type of work CH was performing. We took the position that the traffic work CH was doing was very specific and did not provide an unfair advantage. The question came up later, by another DB team, about the situation of CH being co-located on the floor here. This was a separate issue that had not previously been considered completely. In order to avoid the perception of an unfair advantage situation HQ Executives made the decision to not have any members of firms on DB teams co-located on the 4th floor. The work and the co-location are 2 separate issues that were discussed separately, co-location being discussed after the TO was executed. Hope this helps with context.

Nancy Beshaler

I-405 Business Manager

Direct Line: 425.456.8581 | Cell: 425.301.6493 | beshaln@wsdot.wa.gov

<<I-405 -\_COI\_Resp\_ltr\_rev5.doc>> <<RE: Y-9431AB, CH2MHill Traffic Analysis>>

<<RE: Y-9431AB, CH2MHill Traffic Analysis>>

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

From: Valerie Ikehara

Sent: Friday, February 16, 2007 9:07 AM

To: Nancy Beshaler

Cc: 'Doyle Dilley'; 'Gary Langrock (LangroG@wsdot.wa.gov)'; Nduta Mbutia

Subject: D-B Firewall policy

<< File: I-405 -\_COI\_Resp\_ltr\_rev5.doc >> << Message: RE: Y-9431AB, CH2MHill Traffic Analysis >> << Message: RE: Y-9431AB, CH2MHill Traffic Analysis >>

Nancy,

I came across this letter from CH2M Hill on the T drive that supported their position that they had "no conflict of interest" regarding their proposal on the Bellevue contract. They cite a portion of contract language from a task order which implies that the State waived any conflict of interest from the task order. I don't think this is true and thought you should be aware of it.

Thank you,

Valerie Ikehara

I-405 Consultant Contracts & Payment Manager

600 108th Ave NE, Suite 405

Bellevue, WA 98004

425 456-8586

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are NOT the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the e-mail to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

\*\*\* eSafe1 scanned this email and found no malicious content \*\*\*

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

TIME  
COST  
LEG PROCESS  
MESSAGE

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Friday, March 20, 2009 4:26 PM  
**To:** Paananen, Ron; Meredith, Julie  
**Subject:** Re: Leg. Contacts

10-4.

**From:** Paananen, Ron  
**To:** Meredith, Julie; White, John  
**Sent:** Fri Mar 20 16:17:14 2009  
**Subject:** Leg. Contacts

See Daves note below. There is a lot of leg contact activity right now. So we don't inadvertently send mixed messages, I will be reviewing the responses before they go out. Nothing wrong with the TBM answer.

**From:** Paananen, Ron  
**To:** Dye, Dave  
**Cc:** Reinmuth, Steve; Auyoung, Dillon  
**Sent:** Fri Mar 20 15:28:01 2009  
**Subject:** Re: TBM Costs

Sure. I will get the word out.

**From:** Dye, Dave  
**To:** Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** Reinmuth, Steve; Auyoung, Dillon  
**Sent:** Fri Mar 20 15:21:31 2009  
**Subject:** Re: TBM Costs

Yep - we better get the word out to all 520 and AWW staff (quickly and quietly) that all further leg staff contacts on these two projects comes through you personally, okay?

-dave

Steve and Dillon - things are heating up so please route staff questions you get to Ron - thanks!

**From:** Paananen, Ron  
**To:** Dye, Dave  
**Sent:** Fri Mar 20 14:54:48 2009  
**Subject:** Fw: TBM Costs

And we answer other questions too.

**From:** Fleckenstein, Mary  
**To:** Leiste, Willy; White, John  
**Cc:** Hicks, Elissa; Paananen, Ron; Hopkins, David A.

**Sent:** Fri Mar 20 14:45:31 2009

**Subject:** RE: TBM Costs

Y'all did great by me today. Thank you so much.

---

**From:** Leiste, Willy [mailto:LeisteW@wsdot.wa.gov]

**Sent:** Friday, March 20, 2009 2:18 PM

**To:** White, John; Fleckenstein, Mary

**Cc:** Hicks, Elissa; Paananen, Ron; Hopkins, David A.

**Subject:** RE: TBM Costs

Thanks, John, for your quick attention to this for us. Your assistance is greatly appreciated!!

Willy

---

**From:** White, John

**Sent:** Friday, March 20, 2009 1:57 PM

**To:** Mary Fleckenstein (fleckenstein.mary@leg.wa.gov)

**Cc:** Hicks, Elissa; Leiste, Willy; Paananen, Ron; Hopkins, David A.

**Subject:** FW: TBM Costs

Mary.

As discussed, a bit more detail on the tunnel boring machine procurement, costs and schedule.

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

---

**From:** Greco, Theresa

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2009 1:09 PM

**To:** Leathers, Kathryn

**Cc:** Smith, Helena Kennedy; White, John

**Subject:** TBM Costs

Good afternoon, Kathryn.

What we recently learned from credible tunneling sources (including tunnel contractors and boring machine manufacturers) is the cost of the tunnel boring machine (TBM) can range from \$60-85 million depending on the type of machine -- slurry or earth pressure balance (EPB). We anticipate that a design/build contractor would purchase the TBM as part of a larger fixed price contract to build the main tunnel structure. Given that the experienced tunnel contractors have established relationships with the TBM manufacturers worldwide, they would negotiate the final price and design terms with the manufacturer, based on performance requirements stipulated by WSDOT.

We anticipate bringing the tunneling contractor on early to work with us as they would determine the type of machine (based on soil conditions from core samples), and would work directly with the TBM manufacturer on the design and construction of the machine. In recent weeks, we have spoken and met with several TBM

manufacturers and tunnel contractors that have the ability to construct and operate a 54" TBM. There appear to be four companies worldwide that have the proven ability to construct this large of a TBM, and two of them have said that we should expect 16 - 18 months total for design, construction, shipping and on-site assembly of the machine. Per our current draft scheduling efforts, this would have the TBM on-site and operating in 2012.

Take care and have a good afternoon.

**Theresa Greco**  
Deputy Director  
Programs and Services  
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement Program  
(W) 206-267-3785  
(C) 206-713-0298  
Email: [greco@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:greco@wsdot.wa.gov)

Schedule	Late Mar to Dec 2009
2009	4 mths
2010	12 mths
2011	12 mths
2012	

consulting  
Holtgate  
PR

---

**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.

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** Struthers, James  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 23, 2009 11:37 AM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Williamson, Alec  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

The decision to supplement the Shannon & Wilson on-call agreement is based on the following considerations. The primary concern hinges on the accelerated schedule for delivery of the RFP package for the AWV bored tunnel. Shannon and Wilson has been heavily involved in this project since 2001. This long term familiarity with the project, project team operations, and the specific geotechnical constraints within the project corridor provides a significant advantage the project team in terms of meeting project delivery timelines. In addition, we are currently executing a phase geotechnical program to deliver design information for the proposed tunnel. I have significant concerns that switching consultants at this stage in the program would result in unacceptable delays in the timely delivery of geotechnical data and design recommendations that will be needed by the project team during development of the RFQ and RFP. As the RFQ is scheduled to go out in fall of 2009 and the RFP is scheduled for delivery in December 2009, I am concerned that a change-over of the program at this point would result in the project team not being able to hold these delivery dates.

I would however, like to get access to qualification and capability information for the other UCO on-call geotechnical consultants. There are several design issues that will unfold during the course of design that it will likely be appropriate use consultants on the list with good capability in specific areas of expertise. Any information that I could get on the capabilities of the other on-calls would be quite useful to me in the planning of future work.

Thank you.

James R. Struthers, C.E.G  
Assistant Chief Foundation Engineer  
Special Projects Manager  
WSDOT Engineering and Environmental Programs  
(360) 791-2847

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 23, 2009 8:52 AM  
**To:** Struthers, James  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594

Any thoughts? Too bad S&W won't bring on any support subs?

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-267-3775

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s).

6/22/2009

Timeline  
RFP  
RFQ

You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2009 12:10 PM  
**To:** Struthers, James  
**Subject:** FW: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594  
**Importance:** High

Jim, you'd better read this as it comes up all the time?

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-267-3775

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Kirsch, Carol  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2009 12:08 PM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594

Hi Tom,

Hey, in reviewing the agreement and the others on the On-Call list for that same category, we have found that Shannon & Wilson is the only firm that is being used. There are 7 other firms that have agreements currently in place that have not been used to date. Have you or your project team consider using some of the other firms. Please let me know if this is a possibility.

Thanks  
**Carol Kirsch**  
Contract Specialist 1  
Consultant Service Offices  
Phone (360)705-6962

"Only a life lived for others is a life worthwhile. We cannot live a full life unless we have a purpose bigger than ourselves."  
Albert Einstein

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2009 12:00 PM  
**To:** Kirsch, Carol  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594

Status Update please?

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-267-3775

6/22/2009

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2009 12:09 PM  
**To:** Kirsch, Carol  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594

Thanks for the update, Carol.

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-267-3775

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Kirsch, Carol  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2009 11:15 AM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Cc:** Scott, Stacy  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594

Tom,

It has been sent for approval. I'm just waiting. I did ask that this be rushed if possible.

I'll let you know as soon as I hear

**Carol Kirsch**  
Contract Specialist 1  
Consultant Service Offices  
Phone (360)705-6962

"Only a life lived for others is a life worthwhile. We cannot live a full life unless we have a purpose bigger than ourselves."  
Albert Einstein.

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2009 11:10 AM  
**To:** Kirsch, Carol  
**Cc:** Scott, Stacy  
**Subject:** RE: Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594

Any news on our request?

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT

6/22/2009

999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-267-3775

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2009 10:51 AM  
**To:** Kirsch, Carol  
**Cc:** Scott, Stacy  
**Subject:** Supplemental 3 for Shannon & Wilson Agreement Y-9594  
**Importance:** High

Hi Carol. As requested, the back up cost for our Shannon and Wilson supplemental request.

Please contact me if you need anything else, and thanks very much for doing this for us.

Tom

Thomas Tobin  
Urban Corridor Office WSDOT  
999 Third Avenue, #2400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-267-3775

The information and data in this email may be proprietary, confidential or privileged and is intended for the sole use and benefit of the named addressee(s). You are hereby notified that any review, use, copying or dissemination of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please permanently delete it and destroy all copies. Thank you.

**From:** Struthers, James  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2009 10:48 AM  
**To:** Tobin, Thomas  
**Subject:**

Tom,

As requested, attached is a table of revised estimate of funds that will be required to continue geotechnical efforts for the bored tunnel and associated portals. This revised estimate is based on further review of the project as it has developed since our initial estimate. Based on this review, it is my opinion that our previous estimate was both under-conservative with respect to the required design effort and allows little latitude for ongoing design changes and changes that will likely occur as the project develops. Accordingly, it is my opinion that the attached revised costs should be used as a target value for the proposed fund supplement to Contract Y-9594.

Thank you.

James R. Struthers, C.E.G.  
Assistant Chief Foundation Engineer  
Special Projects Manager  
WSDOT Engineering and Environmental Programs  
(360) 791-2847

6/22/2009

TBM  
Industry Contract  
EIS

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Friday, May 01 2009 3:19 PM  
**To:** Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); Paananen, Ron; Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa  
**Cc:** Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); 'Smith, Jared'  
**Subject:** RE: Bored Tunnel Graphic & Proposed Board for UCA Conference on May 4

FYI for the others on this e-mail, we have concurred with the use of the new rendering, which will be shown at next week's presentations. - of North Portal Working Group - May 7?

**From:** Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 30, 2009 3:56 PM  
**To:** Paananen, Ron; White, John; Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa  
**Cc:** Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); 'Smith, Jared'  
**Subject:** Bored Tunnel Graphic & Proposed Board for UCA Conference on May 4

ADR

All,

Attached is a cross section of the tunnel – you may want to use it in your presentations on Monday. I would like to show it on a poster at our booth – also attached. I am out of the office tomorrow but will be picking up email at [clark@pbworld.com](mailto:clark@pbworld.com) via my blackberry. Please let me know if it is not OK to use the graphic.

Thanks

Gordon

Gordon T. Clark, PE  
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program  
Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Direct: 206-382-5246  
Cell: 206-915-1701  
WSDOT Email: [clarkgt@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:clarkgt@wsdot.wa.gov)  
PB Email: [clark@pbworld.com](mailto:clark@pbworld.com)

Cost  
Booth  
Video  
Personnel  
Purpose  
Follow-up contacts

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any hard copies.

Note; feeding info + plans to portal groups instead of public  
They will have inside track, public excluded.  
Reveal + defend participation planned for public  
"Portal Groups" = grand focus groups

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

**VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)**

**From:** Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Friday, May 15, 2009 1:57 PM  
**To:** Williamson, Alec  
**Cc:** Peiffer, Eric (Consultant)  
**Subject:** RE: Emailing Bored Tunnel Cross Section Study - OUTLINE.doc

Alec,

We will get this study to you as quickly as we can. Current priority is getting the plan set out. You will have a solid draft early next week and we should be able to complete this by the end of the week if there are not major comments.

Thank you for your patience.

Gordon

Gordon T. Clark, PE  
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Direct: 206-382-5246  
Cell: 206-915-1701  
WSDOT Email: clarkgt@wsdot.wa.gov  
PB Email: clark@pbworld.com

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

**From:** Williamson, Alec  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 14, 2009 4:53 PM  
**To:** Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant)  
**Cc:** Rodenbough, Ben P. (Consultant); Peiffer, Eric (Consultant); Gerte, Rick (Consultant); Phelps, Don (Consultant)  
**Subject:** RE: Emailing Bored Tunnel Cross Section Study - OUTLINE.doc

Gordon- This study is way behind and is holding up our ability to settle on a section and agree to the trade-offs. This should have been done at least 2 weeks ago. Please light a fire under this and get me a draft ASAP. Please let me know when Don and I can expect to see something. Ditto for horizontal alignment and vertical profile studies. These studies will play a huge role in the design approval package and documenting our decisions. Please make it a high priority.

Thanks,  
Alec

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

**From:** Peiffer, Eric (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 12, 2009 5:07 PM  
**To:** Williamson, Alec  
**Cc:** Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); Rodenbough, Ben P. (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Emailing Bored Tunnel Cross Section Study - OUTLINE.doc

This is the start of the document for the Bored Tunnel Cross Section Study. More to come. Let me know if you have any questions or comments. Thanks. - Eric

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

Bored Tunnel Cross Section Study - OUTLINE.doc

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2009 10:35 PM  
**To:** Greco, Theresa; Preedy, Matt  
**Subject:** Re: AWW Bored Tunnel RFQ/RFP Preparation

*Proj. led by  
consultants'  
expediencies*

Let's request a review with Eldon then. Whatever we do, we need to move quickly, but not sacrifice our principles in the approach to developing the scopes and budget needs

**From:** Greco, Theresa  
**To:** White, John; Preedy, Matt  
**Sent:** Wed May 13 21:59:52 2009  
**Subject:** FW: AWW Bored Tunnel RFQ/RFP Preparation

*despite "objection"  
signed amendment to TO*

FYI - we just signed a \$300K+ Task Order for Eldon's participation. I am not pleased by Mike's statement in the final paragraph since they have budget and staff currently dedicated to the immediate work. Mike did not bring up any specifics about his concern on schedule risk at our meeting on Friday and I am surprised by his strong statement. We agreed on Friday that they would get a scope to us today with our turnaround by Friday. His approach in this email is characteristic of his past practices that accelerates work prior to approval and budget. I personally believe we need Eldon talking to us about schedule risks on the RFP and not funneled through Mike.

**Theresa**

**From:** Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Wed 5/13/2009 1:40 PM  
**To:** White, John  
**Cc:** Preedy, Matt; Everett, Susan; Greco, Theresa; Reilly, John; Reilly, John; Bohlke, Brenda (Consultant); bmbohlke@hotmail.com; Phelps, Don (Consultant); Conte, Rick (Consultant); Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant); 'abbott@pbworld.com'  
**Subject:** AWW Bored Tunnel RFQ/RFP Preparation

John,

Eldon, Rick, Gordon, and I have developed the attached documents for the AWW Bored Tunnel RFQ/RFP in an effort to help expedite the work planning process.

1. Draft Work Plan Task List. This document outlines all the preliminary engineering and RFQ/RFP preparation tasks by discipline. It also indicates which tasks result in Deliverables (D) and which are primarily an Assembly (A) of work done by us or others. The Lead/Support column indicates the role of the PB team in that task, and is, of course, totally up to you. We have put down our best shot based on discussions to date. Overall, this is a pretty good compilation of the tremendous amount of work that need to be done.
2. Draft Work Plan Schedule. This is a very high level, preliminary schedule based on the current milestones as we understand them. Once the work plan is approved, this will need to be fleshed out in much greater detail, but this is a starting point.
3. Draft Task Order CL Amendment Scope. This is a draft of a proposed amendment to Task Order CL that would incorporate the task list and schedule. We recommend that some version of this be processed in an expedited manner.

In addition, we would like for you to consider an immediate amendment to our current Task Order CL that currently funds just Eldon's participation. We would like to add an additional 4 FTE to provide Eldon with some immediate resources to begin to get this important work going. We are concerned that if we don't move quickly the overall schedule is at risk. We would like to complete the amendment this week so these people can begin

6/19/2009

work next week, if possible.

- TBM/Constructability/Risk - Joe O'Carroll
- Structural Engineer - Jim Schettler
- Geotechnical Engineer - Don Richards
- RFP Coordinator - Peter Donahue (.25)/Glenn Cross (.75)

We are trying to be as proactive as possible and do not mean to presume or preclude any decisions by WSDOT on how this work should be done or who should do it. We want to work closely with you to get a defined scope, schedule, and budget and do all we can to help you deliver. Please let me know if you have any questions or need more information. Thanks, John.

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