
From: White, John
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 8:51 PM
To: Paananen, Ron
Subject: Re: Tunnel estimate validation

Agreed. John R will be in to continue work on the tunnel CEVP stle one-pager, maybe we should also have a check-in with Alec and Mike M regarding the surface estimates.

From: Paananen, Ron
To: White, John
Sent: Wed Jan 07 20:26:29 2009
Subject: RE: Tunnel estimate validation

Sounds good, but I'm still a little confused. Need to understand Alasksn Way minimal costs and connection to Western / Elliot. Lets check in tomorrow AM.

From: White, John
Sent: Wed 1/7/2009 7:54 PM
To: Paananen, Ron; Dye, Dave
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John
Subject: Re: Tunnel estimate validation

We will peel out the utility costs in the AM (and double check them), and will ensure that the detailed tunnel estimate is for tunnel only. All other surface street and utility costs will be reflected elsewhere.

Given the \$1.9B total estimate, \$50M does not visibly affect the total.

From: Paananen, Ron
To: Dye, Dave; White, John
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John
Sent: Wed Jan 07 19:16:42 2009
Subject: RE: Tunnel estimate validation

We need to be on the same page here. I thought the tunnel only estimate would include viaduct tear down, minimal Alaskan Way restoration, and connection of Elliot / Western to the surface Alaskan Way. No Seattle Utilities (SPU or SCL) should be included. We are probably close enough at \$1.9 billion, but need to be clear about scope.

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Wed 1/7/2009 6:40 PM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John
Subject: RE: Tunnel estimate validation

John - so, the \$40 million is in the tunnel only estimate which is 1.9 billion -- did the city utilities go up and if so how much due to what?

From: White, John
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 4:03 PM
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John
Subject: RE: Tunnel estimate validation

There are \$40M (\$32M to \$54M range) of utility relocations still in the estimate. All other items shown separately on the tri-government spreadsheet have been pulled out (viaduct demo, Alaskan Way restoration, north end reconnection, etc). Other than utilities, and \$10M to widen Mercer and vacate Broad, as far as I can tell this is strictly a bored tunnel estimate.

From: Dye, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 12:55 PM
To: White, John; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John
Subject: Re: Tunnel estimate validation

John - are north utilities in or out of that number?

From: White, John
To: Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron
Cc: Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); Reilly, John
Sent: Wed Jan 07 12:50:32 2009
Subject: Tunnel estimate validation

Here's where we're at:

We pulled apart the base estimate with John Reilly and validated base costs. We then re-built the estimate with specific risk/contingency ranges for each item based on professional judgment on the relative level of risk associated with each piece of work (sounds CEVPish, right?). The range as it stands based on the last two days of work is \$1.4B to \$2.3B. The most probable number per the revised effort was \$1.7B. Given the D-B with accelerated schedule proposal, we are recommending sticking with the original \$1.9B most probable number, which rounds to about 60% on the risk meter.

All other materials are in motion.

John