

---

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 02, 2009 8:29 PM  
**To:** Neff, Emily (Consultant); Greco, Theresa; Preedy, Matt  
**Cc:** bmbohlke@hotmail.com; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Grotefendt, Amy  
**Subject:** RE: Updated presentations for May 4 & 5

A few more comments, sorry they're so late:

#### MONDAY CONFERENCE PRESENTATION

Slide 3: Add a speaking point bullet after the second one that says:

"A twin bore tunnel was studied for 14 months, but ultimately was not found to fit within the State's budget constraints due primarily to the increased amount of excavation and structure, the need for expensive mined cross passages, and a prolonged schedule (or the need to provide two TBM's)".

Slide 4: Add two bullets after the first bullet with the following bill text:

"If a bond less than the full contract price is authorized by the department, the bond must be in the form of a performance bond and a separate payment bond. "

"The amount of the performance bond must not be less than two hundred fifty million dollars."

Slide 6: First bullet under key contracts should state "Design support", second bullet should state "North Portal multiple construction contracts – mostly likely Design-Bid-Build"

Slide 8: Suggest adding a bullet that states "Construction beginning in 2009"

Slide 9: As discussed in another e-mail, let's call the slide "Potential Construction Staging Areas"

Slide 10: All lines titles "Preliminary Engineering" should be re-titled "Design Engineering", as the cover preliminary and final design. Also, it looks like there are inconsistencies in the schedules as shown. For example, the TBM Power Station is shown being designed and under construction before the ROD, yet the First Ave Utility Relocation and Ground Stabilization contract has a gap between design and construction, when we are talking about trying to go to construction ahead of the ROD. The SR 99 Single Bore Tunnel should show the Design Engineering overlapping more with Construction (which is what you get with Design-Build), suggest through 2012.

#### CONTRACTING FORUM

Make all relevant changes mentioned above, plus:

Slide 6: The wording is inaccurate in the second sentence, we are only considering one design-build contract at the moment. I'd suggest revising it as follows:

"Based on the expert's findings, we are considering design-build and design-bid-build contracting packages for the bored tunnel project:"

Slide 7: Last bullet should read "Seismic criteria Zone 3." Hoping Brenda or Harvey can confirm Zone 3 vs Zone 4, from what I can tell Seattle is Zone 3.

Think there need to be a couple more minor tweaks, will work on those tomorrow or Tuesday morning.

Thanks,

John

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

From: Neff, Emily (Consultant)

Sent: Fri 5/1/2009 5:37 PM

To: White, John; Greco, Theresa; Preedy, Matt

Cc: bmbohlke@hotmail.com; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); Grotfendt, Amy

Subject: Updated presentations for May 4 & 5

Hi all,

Here are the updated drafts of John's presentation for Monday afternoon and the presentation for the Tunneling Forum on May 5. Please send me any edits/changes/additions by tomorrow (Saturday) end of day so I can updated them before Monday.

I spoke with Jim Medina's assistant today (WSDOT Office of Equal Opportunity), unfortunately he is unavailable on Tuesday to attend the Tunneling Contracting Forum. I left the slide for DBE opportunities in the second presentation, and we can direct any questions we can't answer to Jim's office and follow up that way.

Thank you, and give me a ring with any questions.

Emily

cell: 206-351-8184