
From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2009 8:04 AM
To: Paananen, Ron
Subject: FW: Viaduct

[Missed cc-ing you when I replied to all.](#)

From: White, John
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2009 7:44 AM
To: Hopkins, David A.; Carpine, Joy; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Cc: Auyoung, Dillon; Leiste, Willy
Subject: Re: Viaduct

David,

The below point about the 2007 vote has been emphasized by the elevated supporters backing the initiative that would preclude a tunnel. There was also a Time op-ed focused on the issue.

The fact is that the 2007 vote was based on a waterfront cut and cover tunnel that had a variety of construction impacts we were never able to adequately mitigate. In addition, the cost estimate at the time was well above the funding available to us, and there was public skepticism in the City's ability to help cover the gap.

The current deep bored tunnel proposal would be built away from the waterfront utilizing technology that has been proven in Seattle and elsewhere around the world. It can also be built with minimal construction traffic and business disruption. We have had input on our estimate from some of the top tunneling experts in the country. Who have concurred with our estimate.

So, bottom line is it is an entirely different tunnel proposal.

John

From: Hopkins, David A.
To: Carpine, Joy; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)
Cc: Auyoung, Dillon; Leiste, Willy; White, John
Sent: Wed Jan 21 12:33:03 2009
Subject: FW: Viaduct

[Here is a request from Reuven Carlyle's new legislative aide regarding Viaduct messaging. Do we have anything we can share with him?](#)

David Hopkins
Director, Government Relations and Communications
Urban Corridors Office
Washington State Dept. of Transportation
401 Second Ave. South, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
206-464-1194
hopkida@wsdot.wa.gov

From: Gasparich, Matthew [mailto:Gasparich.Matthew@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2009 12:51 PM
To: Hopkins, David A.
Subject: Viaduct

Hi David,

It was good to see you the other day! I'm in the midst of responding to hundreds of constituent correspondence, many of which involve the viaduct replacement. Do you have any information that spells out the differences between the current tunnel proposal and the proposal that was rejected by the voters a couple years ago? A lot of messages go like this – we already rejected this thing, how can you go over the will of the people.” It would help if I could respond to the differences in layman’s terms. Thanks for any help you can provide or someone to forward this request on to..

Matt

*Matt Gasparich
Legislative Assistant
Representative Reuven Carlyle
(360) 786 - 7814*