

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2008 3:00 PM
To: Williamson, Alec
Cc: Paananen, Ron; Preedy, Matt
Subject: RE: For Review -- Hybrid Costs and Funding Matrices
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Alec - it looks to me like we can remove all but 519, the spokane loop ramp actual cost, and the money we have actually committed to transit leases (plus whatever operating if any we have agreed to) for south end construction - the rest of its stuff should be paid for by others...how much does that save?

-dave

From: Williamson, Alec
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2008 2:26 PM
To: Dye, Dave
Cc: Paananen, Ron; Preedy, Matt
Subject: RE: For Review -- Hybrid Costs and Funding Matrices

We have assumed that the entire \$125 initial transit enhancements bucket is spent- no savings were accounted for. We budgeted \$25 million for the loop ramp and \$25 million to Spokane widening (we later pulled \$10 out to cover other program costs). I understand that the city has \$8 million in fed funds for the loop ramp project already in hand. The bids came in at \$17 million so there may be some money there.

Other commitments out of the \$125: See the attachment summary. I don't think there is much flexibility in reallocating any of these funds?

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2008 1:24 PM
To: Williamson, Alec
Cc: Paananen, Ron
Subject: RE: For Review -- Hybrid Costs and Funding Matrices

Alec - Also, how much in the moving forward projects have we committed to spokane street -- seems like there was some money hanging around, and a bunch of downtown ITS stuff...I'd suggest all that is not either spent, immediate transit, or south end or spokane ramp be moved...how much is that and is that included in the numbers below?

-dave

From: Williamson, Alec
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2008 1:17 PM
To: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Paananen, Ron; White, John; Powers, Bob; 'bob.chandler@seattle.gov'; 'Posthuma, Ron'; Parsons, Jim; Dye, Dave; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Preedy, Matt; 'bennett@concurinc.net'; Morrison, Mike (Consultant)
Cc: 'Tracie Sunday'; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); 'O'Claire, Christina'

Subject: RE: For Review -- Hybrid Costs and Funding Matrices

Dave- Matt and I just met and wanted to make sure you were clear that we have elected to change our strategy back to showing the full \$1,067,000,000 moving forward and prior expenditures at the top, and to show a funding source at the bottom of the sheet reflecting potential savings in moving forward. This was agreed to at the RP meeting this morning. Those savings would be on the order of \$140 million for the bored tunnel and elevated options and up to \$220 million for the surface and transit option. The delta in these two figures amounts to whether or not the south transition structure is built or not.

Thanks,
Alec

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)

Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2008 11:50 AM

To: Paananen, Ron; White, John; Powers, Bob; 'bob.chandler@seattle.gov'; 'Posthuma, Ron'; Parsons, Jim; Dye, Dave; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Williamson, Alec; Preedy, Matt; 'bennett@concurinc.net'; Morrison, Mike (Consultant)

Cc: 'Tracie Sunday'; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant); 'O'Claire, Christina'

Subject: RE: For Review -- Hybrid Costs and Funding Matrices

Attached is the revised spreadsheet based on this morning's meeting.

Use only the first worksheet. Please DO NOT use the worksheets that include detail about each hybrid. Those have not been updated to reflect the summary sheet -- Powers and Posthuma will bring back up with them to explain the surface and transit numbers on the summary sheet. I think the plan is also for Powers to bring print outs of this summary sheet and try to have a computer and projector there as well.

Thanks and good luck on Friday!
AJG

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)

Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2008 5:43 PM

To: Paananen, Ron; White, John; 'robert.powers@seattle.gov'; 'bob.chandler@seattle.gov'; 'Posthuma, Ron'; 'James D. Parsons'; Dye, Dave; Rigsby, Mike (Consultant); Williamson, Alec; Preedy, Matt; 'bennett@concurinc.net'; Morrison, Mike (Consultant)

Cc: 'Tracie Sunday'; Van Ness, Kristy (Consultant)

Subject: For Review -- Hybrid Costs and Funding Matrices

Attached are spreadsheets which reflect two things:

1. The conversation at today's tri-agency about the total costs of the elements (transit, city streets, etc.) should be included in three hybrid alternatives as well as which agencies should be responsible for the costs of the elements. (reflected on the first worksheet)
2. Details about the line items for two of the three hybrid scenarios (reflected on the next three worksheets). The bored tunnel hybrid is not as detailed, which I think will be part of the conversation during tomorrow morning's meeting. Some of the "total" numbers on the summary sheet do not necessarily match the totals when the details are added up; I think we'll need to verify which elements we actually want to include in each hybrid scenario and revise the totals accordingly. The details match what was included in Mike Morrison's cost sheet as of Dec. 18.

And this is my best guess based on multiple conversations, emails, and spreadsheets -- I am sure there are still things that are wrong. If you do make changes directly on the spreadsheets, please highlight them in yellow so they're easy to find. You can also drop off changes at Kristy's office in the morning -- I'll be there in the morning.

6/25/2009

Thanks
AJG