
From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 11:23 AM
To: Paananen, Ron
Subject: FW: Simplified Cost Table
Attachments: Cost_Table_Simplified.doc

[Here is the latest and greatest.](#)

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 7:20 PM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave
Subject: RE: Simplified Cost Table

Here is the updated table -- I changed the cost of the bored tunnel to \$1.9 billion since we were moving the \$100 million in funding down to the utilities line. Hopefully this is close now -- Reilly will hopefully be confirming numbers for us in the morning. Thanks. AJG

From: White, John
Sent: Tue 1/6/2009 5:12 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Simplified Cost Table

[One more question: does the City utility funding commitment start after the State Moving Fwd investment, or are we not planning on expending the full \\$65M in the south end?](#)

From: Paananen, Ron
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 4:52 PM
To: Dye, Dave; White, John; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Simplified Cost Table

[I think we talked about extending the portal to Harrison, which is probably more like a block or two, but I don't think we had a exact location for the portal to extend from. My notes from the meeting are at the viaduct office. We may just want to get a couple of folks from the City together with project team to nail it down. I'll touch base with Powers.](#)

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 4:24 PM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Subject: Re: Simplified Cost Table

[I think we agreed to extend tunnel portal north half a block to accomodate street crossings - that's it - the rest is by others since we spent our money...ron, okay?](#)

-dave

From: White, John
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)

6/25/2009

Sent: Tue Jan 06 16:21:57 2009
Subject: RE: Simplified Cost Table

Thanks for clarifying that. I had been wondering if there was any investment in city grid connections north of BST, and had initially thought that was what the \$100M was for. Was north of BST understanding clarified?

John

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 4:19 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); White, John
Subject: Re: Simplified Cost Table

Concur - put it in the utility column...

From: Paananen, Ron
To: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Dye, Dave; White, John
Sent: Tue Jan 06 16:14:37 2009
Subject: RE: Simplified Cost Table

My only comment is the \$100 million from the City towards the tunnel. This represents the public utility relocation costs associated with the tunnel. It should probably be shown as such, or we could just lump it into a total cost for utility relocation, and not distinguish between the Alaskan Way utility costs and tunnel utility relocation costs.

From: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 3:25 PM
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; White, John
Subject: Simplified Cost Table

We talked about this on the call yesterday -- is this a happy medium between the details and Jennifer's abbreviated handout from Saturday? I'm also thinking something like this could go in the folio with the funding information. I think she needs this for the governor's briefing paper.

Still working on...

- Schedule that shows 2015
- Summary of travel time benefits

Dave - I'm assuming you're chasing the jobs info with OFM? If not let us know.

With all of that I think everything Jennifer needs is a work in progress. Let me know if we're missing anything.

6/25/2009