

---

**From:** Posthuma, Ron [Ron.Posthuma@kingcounty.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 2:48 PM  
**To:** Paananen, Ron; Powers, Bob  
**Cc:** Taniguchi, Harold; OClaire, Christina  
**Subject:** RE: Simplified Cost Table

In this simplified version, we should list transit pathways or transit priority as an example under city streets. If not, King County can't be assigned the \$25 million.

Also, I assume this cost chart will be accompanied by a funding chart showing the actual sources, e.g., new county MVET tax and Federal Stimulus funding. We can't agree to a table that implies we can do this without those new sources.

Another way to do that would be to list the \$88M of federal stimulus funding and \$20M of other federal grants in its own column entitled Federal Stimulus/Grant funding. The County column could then be renamed County MVET with a new capital total of \$95 million. The remaining \$20M and \$90M from the City of Seattle cell on city streets would move to the new federal column.

---

**From:** Paananen, Ron [mailto:PaananR@wsdot.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 2:13 PM  
**To:** robert.powers@seattle.gov; Posthuma, Ron  
**Subject:** Fw: Simplified Cost Table

Please review

---

**From:** Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**To:** Paananen, Ron  
**Sent:** Wed Jan 07 11:23:02 2009  
**Subject:** FW: Simplified Cost Table

[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)  
**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

7/2/2009

**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.