

## VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

---

**From:** White, John  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 10:02 AM  
**To:** Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa  
**Subject:** FW: BST Phase 1

FYI, please do not share this until we get past a decision. It also requires verification that the City has no desire to maintain BST in a bored tunnel future.

---

**From:** Paananen, Ron  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 9:59 AM  
**To:** White, John; Dye, Dave  
**Cc:** Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**Subject:** Re: BST Phase 1

I'm with you John. If we go with the bored tunnel, we should assume a very minimal project for BST.

---

**From:** White, John  
**To:** Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron  
**Cc:** Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant)  
**Sent:** Wed Jan 07 09:49:35 2009  
**Subject:** BST Phase 1

Hola amigos,

I decided I need to take one more run at this question with you. My understanding is that City opinion remains that BST would be closed under the bored tunnel option. If this is the case, I really struggle over building a very expensive new systems control room and new access/egress, including potential condemnation actions with Martin Selig over the required property, just to close the thing 3 or 4 years later. My guess is we are talking to the ballpark tune of \$20M. If we can jointly agree on BST's lack of a future, shouldn't we think about being ready to pull a bunch of scope and advance a much more basic safety project (new lights and signs, minor systems preservation work, clean walls, etc)?

John

---

**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

6/29/2009

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.