

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: Judd, Ron (GOV) [Ron.Judd@GOV.WA.GOV]
Sent: Sunday, December 28, 2008 12:19 PM
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Hammond, Paula; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Ziegler, Jennifer; Stone, Craig
Subject: Re: AWV Cost Estimates

Thanks! I agree that we should compare apples to apples. I am just a little concerned that, at this late date, we start down a path that could bring a lot of questions from the press and elected officials about, why now??? and not raise this well before this.

Also, don't want to lose the objective of having our friends bring skin to the table, regarding the direction that she wants to go.

Now, since I was fired as an engineer, and my role is a quasi something or other, I leave the fine science of costing a project to you and others, who do this in their sleep.

From: Dye, Dave
To: Judd, Ron (GOV); Paananen, Ron ; Hammond, Paula; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant) ; Ziegler, Jennifer (GOV); Stone, Craig
Sent: Sun Dec 28 12:04:56 2008
Subject: Re: AWV Cost Estimates

Ron - each risk build up is based on the specifics of the option and the degree of development of each option - that said, most fall into the same general range. Still, there could be changes in some options more than others that could change to relative differences...will only know after the complete assessment...

-dave

From: Judd, Ron (GOV)
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Hammond, Paula; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Ziegler, Jennifer; Stone, Craig
Sent: Sun Dec 28 11:34:13 2008
Subject: Re: AWV Cost Estimates

Dave, do we apply the same risks assumptions to all scenarios?

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

From: Dye, Dave <DyeD@wsdot.wa.gov>
To: Paananen, Ron <PaananR@WSDOT.WA.GOV>; Hammond, Paula; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant) <GrotefA@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov>; Judd, Ron (GOV); Ziegler, Jennifer (GOV); Stone, Craig <StoneC@WSDOT.WA.GOV>
Sent: Sun Dec 28 11:04:56 2008
Subject: AWV Cost Estimates

Hey all - some vacation time gave me pause to ponder our work program regarding bored tunnel cost estimates and the obvious thought hit me: if we adjust the risk profile for the tunnel shouldn't we do the same (at least take the same approach) for the elevated and surface options? After all, it is still all relative and how might the dynamics change if the plain jane elevated can be done for 2.2 billion inclusive of seawall and utilities or frank's option can be done for 2.8 billion? What if the surface is way cheaper than any of those? It seems the opponents of a tunnel will want (demand) apples to apples comparisons, so I think we need to expand our work effort next week...this is likely going to take a couple of weeks to accomplish compounded by holidays.

First, we'll need to assemble a group of cost estimators to review the base costs and markups for things like design allowance, engineering and cm. Then, a group needs to review the risk profiles for the options to see if they are overstated as some tunnel experts suggest - and do it fairly. And, we need to asses that issue and whether or not the same holds true for surface and the elevated options too. All while trying to be true to our CEVP process. Need someone from the CRA office (Gable?) And Reilly

would be good...anyone know when he's back? Need to bring Larry Kyle too because the same issues are being raised on 520 so let's be consistent across the board - might learn a thing or two from 405 also...

Okay, enough for now - I think gov's office is expecting some update tomorrow and we can provide status but we need to not rush out a number before we get all this in context - we'll only get one chance to do this the right way - I'll check on work efforts in progress (tunnel focused) tomorrow via e-mail and will be in office Tuesday for a better assessment - in the mean time, a workshop is tentatively planned with city and county on Friday to review the tunnel option and what components go in and who pays...phew...

More later...

-dave