Here's my contribution to the reply we owe US DOT, my answers in blue.

Facility Pricing  SHUMING

- Please clarify what authority or approvals are needed to toll the SR-520 bridge, and when those approvals will be finalized.  JEFF DOYLE (include reference to the letter from Gov and House/Senate transportation chairs)

  Answer:

  - RCW 47.56.031 requires legislative approval or voter approval to impose tolls on new or existing highways.  This applies to both conventionally-procured toll projects (i.e., through a public toll authority) and public-private partnership toll projects.
  - A public vote will occur in November, 2007 on a very large ($16+ billion) regional transportation investment plan.  The measure before voters proposes to fund roadway and light rail projects through a combination of taxes, fees, and tolls.  The finance plan specifically includes toll revenues from SR 520.  If approved by voters, tolls on SR 520 will be instituted.
  - Even if the tax measure is not approved by voters in 2007, the legislature has already approved a finance plan relying on the use of tolls on SR 520.  While the broad question of whether SR 520 will be tolled has been answered in the affirmative, the specific details (such as when tolls will be instituted, where the toll collection points will be placed, discounted or free access by transit/HOV's, etc.) will be addressed this coming legislative session.
  - The Governor and the Chairs of the House and Senate Transportation Committees have submitted a letter that verifies this information, expresses their collective intentions, and supports WSDOT's UP application.

Facility Pricing  SHUMING

- Please clarify when actual pricing of the bridge is scheduled to begin.  CRAIG STONE/JEFF DOYLE (I think we need to reference the Treasurer’s report and the financing plan being developed by 1/2008 that will look at early tolling scenarios for the legislature’s consideration—at least I assume it will)

  Answer (Craig, Amy/Helena should review and edit this):

  - A final decision has not been reached on exactly when tolls will be instituted on SR 520.  Analyses is now complete on both the financial impacts and the traffic impacts of tolling SR 520 prior to completing reconstruction of that bridge.  From both perspectives, “early tolling” has significant benefits.  For purposes of the SR 520 project, “early tolling” means the collection of tolls that could begin within approximately 12 months of legislative approval.  If statutory tolling policy is enacted in the 2008 legislative session as we expect, tolling could begin as early as mid-2009.
  - The State Treasurer recently issued a report on toll financing for the SR 520 project.  His conclusions clearly show the financial value of early tolling.  This comprehensive report was issued near the end of the
2007 legislative session; the 2008 legislature will have the opportunity to consider those findings in crafting their tolling policy legislation.

- If WSDOT is awarded one of the UP grants, we expect such an endorsement to further the already-strong case for early tolling.

**Facility Pricing** **SHUMING**

- The proposal also mentions the strong possibility of later pricing the parallel I-90 bridge across Lake Washington, although tolling authority would be required. When is that authority expected? JEFF DOYLE/CRAIG (I think we need to summarize the Treasurer’s rationale (funding needs and diversion) and the equity issues and key to the completion of the financing plan, and to the need to implement tolling relatively quickly when the legislature decides it would be appropriate)

*Answer (Craig, Amy/Helena should review and edit this):*

- We expect the issue of tolling an existing, parallel facility (“competing facility”) to be addressed in the 2008 tolling policy legislation. A point of reference is Substitute House Bill 1773 from the 2007 legislative session. This first draft of the tolling policy bill attempted to define where, and under what conditions, tolls could be placed on existing facilities. The House Transportation Committee wrestled with how broadly to apply this policy (e.g., Statewide? Only in urban areas? Within specific corridors? Parallel crossings? etc.), before ultimately setting the measure down for more work this interim. As the Governor and Transportation Committee Chairs indicated in their letter, they are working toward a unified legislative proposal, in hopes of resolving these definitional issues prior to beginning the 2008 session.
- The State Treasurer’s report echoes the conclusions of many transportation agencies and consultants: tolling both SR 520 and I-90 is required to obtain the strongest financing terms possible and to manage the adverse diversionary impacts that would occur if only one crossing (SR 520) is tolled. While the legislature must ultimately decide how broadly to apply the principle, there is a wealth of evidence in favor of tolling both bridges, federal and state law permitting. Approval in the form of a UP grant would provide critical federal support, likely easing the task of obtaining final state support for this proposal.

*Jeff Doyle, J.D.*
Director, Public/Private Partnerships
Washington State Department of Transportation
PO Box 47395
Olympia, WA 98504-7395
(360) 705-7023 Olympia office
DoyleJ@wsdot.wa.gov
For this morning's conversation.

Craig
Attached please find an expression of interest for tolling Interstate 90 in Seattle. This is a formal request, but we would appreciate your informal comments as soon as you have some. This proposal has been edited, but is substantially the same as what we have discussed over the phone.

Please let me know if you have any questions, comments or concerns.
Thank you,
-- Rob Fellows
(206) 464-1257
In case you haven't already seen this--

David Hopkins  
Director, Government Relations and Communications  
Urban Corridors Office  
Washington State Dept. of Transportation  
401 Second Ave. South, Suite 400  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-464-1194  
hopkida@wsdot.wa.gov

See below for Judy Clibborn’s response to her constituents regarding tolling.

Joy Carpine-Cazzanti  
Government and Community Relations Manager  
Urban Corridors Office  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
206.464.1186  
carpinj@wsdot.wa.gov  
www.wsdot.wa.gov

From: Lewis, Ann [mailto:Lewis.Ann@leg.wa.gov]  
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 11:00 AM  
To: Carpine, Joy  
Subject: Judy Clibborn's response to tolling

From: Clibborn, Rep. Judy  
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 10:39 AM  
To: Lewis, Ann
Thank you for the email regarding tolling on I-90. I have received many requests for information about where I am on this issue. As you know, the Tolling Implementation Committee held hearings all over the County this past month. I attended many of them and was impressed with the thoughtful comments. On Mercer Island it was apparent that the unique problem of our island was an issue. I have not formed a strategy that will go forward yet, but I can tell you I will be very certain to take the island concerns into account. The facts are:

* The Federal Government has nothing to give us and will gladly let us, even beg us, to toll.
* The tolling levels that are acceptable for 520 do not cover the cost of the bridge. At the present time, we have enough for about half the cost. I am working hard to identify other sources to make sure the 520 tolls stay within a reasonable level.
* I do not agree that we “naturally” jump into tolling I-90.
* If we toll I-90, some type of accommodation needs to be made for Mercer Island.

Lastly, I have heard from some that we should not be looking at tolls at all. The gas taxes we have are committed to over 400 projects across the state over the next 10 years. These revenues are going down like a rock as the high cost of fuel impacts our driving patterns. Taking revenue from other projects in the state goes back on promises made at the time we voted for the taxes. Taking revenue from the general fund takes money from education and healthcare. We have used most of the discretionary revenue in the Transportation budget keeping up with cost increases that are reflecting international increases in materials. We do not have a lot of choices and tolling will be a part of many of the projects in the Central Puget Sound because it has the density to make it possible. Other places around the state will not see tolling, but they will also not see any projects. It is a bad news/good news place for them.

Please know that I have heard your concerns and will keep your emails so I can let you know as we develop the plan next January. There are a lot of moving parts still in play.

Once again,

Thanks

Judy
Rob,

Here is a rough draft for your use / information only. It is un-edited and only sent to let you know what we are think at this point. Please know that it will be revised as it moves forward, especially as it goes through our Chief Counsel's Office. I am also enclosing two attachments that may help you understand the various tolling programs better.

Let me know what you think. Be happy to discuss.

Sorry for any delay in getting this draft back to you.

Wayne

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 4:28 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, I'm just checking in to see if there's been any progress on our express of interest to toll I-90 in Seattle. Can you tell me when we might expect to hear something? Sorry to pester you about this; I've been asked to find out what I can.

Thanks,
-- Rob Fellows
Pricing System Planning and Policy Manager
WISDOM Urban Planning Office
(206) 464-1257

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
This is a DRAFT response to our I-90 letter of interest, but it's promising. They recommend using the VPPP program, in which case no restrictions apply on use of the revenues - but stress that there is a Sept. 09 deadline to apply.

-- Rob

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov <Wayne.Berman@dot.gov> 
To: Fellows, Rob 
Cc: Jessie.Yung@dot.gov <Jessie.Yung@dot.gov>; Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov <Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov> 
Sent: Tue Nov 18 08:58:57 2008 
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest 

Rob, 

Here is a rough draft for your use / information only. It is un-edited and only sent to let you know what we are think at this point. Please know that it will be revised as it moves forward, especially as it goes through our Chief Counsel's Office. I am also enclosing two attachments that may help you understand the various tolling programs better. 

Let me know what you think. Be happy to discuss. 

Sorry for any delay in getting this draft back to you. 

Wayne 

-----Original Message----- 
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov] 
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 4:28 PM 
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA> 
Subject: I-90 letter of interest 

Wayne, I'm just checking in to see if there's been any progress on our express of interest to toll I-90 in Seattle. Can you tell me when we might expect to hear something? Sorry to pester you about this; I've been asked to find out what I can. 

Thanks, 
-- Rob Fellows 
Pricing System Planning and Policy Manager 
WISDOM Urban Planning Office 
(206) 464-1257
*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov
To: FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov
Cc: Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov; Jessie.Yung@dot.gov; Michael.Harkins@dot.gov
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest
Date: 12/8/2008 12:50:47 PM
Attachments: Response to Washington EoI for Tolling and Pricing LRS 2008 12 8 ELDP.doc; Pros and Cons of Various Tolling Options - 2008 10 17_001.doc; Federal Tolling Programs-Decision Guidance12-08-08.xls

Rob,

Here is the next draft and attachments. Remember, that this is not final as it still needs to go through some levels before it gets signed. I have made revisions following our last conference call.

If you have any questions, you can e-mail me or call; however, I will be out of the office a lot for the remainder of the week.

Thanks for you patience on this.

Wayne

From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 2:04 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, I'm just checking in on the status of this letter - there is a meeting of our SR 520 Tolling Implementation Committee on Friday, and I'm being asked whether we might expect to see the letter before then or not.
Thanks!
-- Rob

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov <Wayne.Berman@dot.gov>
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Sent: Thu Nov 20 06:34:32 2008
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,

You are welcome to call me on Friday. Alternatively, we can set up a conference call for anytime after 4:00 p.m. on either Monday, November 24 or Tuesday, November 25th. Also, I am going to revise the draft that I sent you after I received some additional comments. I hope to send it to you later this week and we can talk it thru next week.

Do you have specific questions or points of clarification that you want
to let me know now. Please send me any questions.

Thanks

Wayne

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2008 8:05 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, it might be worth setting up a short conference call next week so we can ask a few questions - would you be willing and available? I will be in DC for a TRB meeting on Friday but can try to set something up for early next week if there's a time that would work for you. Let me know...

Thanks,
-- Rob

-----Original Message-----
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov [mailto:Wayne.Berman@dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2008 8:59 AM
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Jessie.Yung@dot.gov; Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,

Here is a rough draft for your use / information only. It is un-edited and only sent to let you know what we are think at this point. Please know that it will be revised as it moves forward, especially as it goes through our Chief Counsel's Office. I am also enclosing two attachments that may help you understand the various tolling programs better.

Let me know what you think. Be happy to discuss.

Sorry for any delay in getting this draft back to you.

Wayne

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 4:28 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, I'm just checking in to see if there's been any progress on our express of interest to toll I-90 in Seattle. Can you tell me when we might expect to hear something? Sorry to pester you about this; I've been asked to find out what I can.

Thanks,
-- Rob Fellows
  Pricing System Planning and Policy Manager
  WISDOM Urban Planning Office
  (206) 464-1257

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

ne*** eSafe1 scanned this email for malicious content ***ne*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
Patty, this is what we sent in originally. -- Rob

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 6:57 PM
To: TollingandPricingTeam@fhwa.dot.gov
Cc: Pope, David; Rubstello, Patty; Charlebois, Jennifer
Subject: I-90 Expression of Interest

Attached please find an expression of interest for tolling Interstate 90 in Seattle. This is a formal request, but we would appreciate your informal comments as soon as you have some. This proposal has been edited, but is substantially the same as what we have discussed over the phone.

Please let me know if you have any questions, comments or concerns.
Thank you,
-- Rob Fellows
(206) 464-1257
Here are some of my more detailed comments

Cover slide--project logo should go. should reflect WSDOT standard layout, with Paula's preferred title (which I think includes PE). Check in with communications folks about how that should look.

p.2 I would get rid of the word "evolution" and change it to update or something like that

p. 4 Just a couple of word selection questions. I think I like "jump-start" but it is a little vague. "Comes too late" needs a better description. Something like--Some funding is allocated/programmed? after the completion of construction, which will...

p.5 Last bullet, remove first sub bullet

p. 9 capitalize During (3rd bullet)

p. 10 open house attendees
220+ at three November open houses
375+ at six July/August open houses
I am confirming the other numbers to see if they also need to be updated.

p 12 last bullet -- add the word "from"

p. 15 I know this slide is from the project, but the PCP says "pontoons for catastrophic failure planning" Unless there is some environmental process reason for the work "planning" I would take it out.

p. 17 we talked about accelerated eastside issue, also to make the colors consistent with 2007 finance plan, blue and orange.
Also the federal funding on the bar charts doesn't seem to match the bar chart that Amy was using with the tolling committee. That chart shows federal funds in 2008 and 2009 but none in 2010 and 2011.

p. 18 same thing about accelerated eastside

p. 19 second sub bullet, I don't like the word "binary" (what about yes or no) and if you use this exemption as an example, I would pick either transit or HOV to feature, not both.
not sure the word bookends is needed on the next bullet
We talked about changing the wording in the fourth arrow set.
Final bullet-- I think this needs a better explanation, maybe just by adding the phrase "of contribution to funding"

p. 21 I would get rid of all caps on overnight note
my question about this chart is whether to include the 2010 and 2016 amounts and lines. I know it makes sense to fully disclose, but it is not something the committee chose to do.

p. 23 I would change the word impacted to affected or say "how does funding change..."
We need to get some guidance from the project directors and Craig/Ron/Dave on what the term of art they would like to use. Is it post and pre completion. Is it early. Is it tolling when construction begins and tolling when the bridge is complete?
Also the phrase "funding contribution" is used. The Tolling committee was all over the map on this one. I think that I like funding contribution. What do other folks think?

p. 24 second sub bullet, I would change the word traffic to people or drivers

p. 25 in title change impact to affect

p. 27 I would change the last sub bullet to read "Minor changes to traffic demand model results, and transponder market share and toll collection cost assumptions since 2007."

p. 28 title for arrow "tolls keep pace with inflation" or "tolls adjusted for inflation" and then tolls don't keep pace or tolls not adjusted. We talked about getting rid of the word escalate. I would change to increase in the first bullet and the second to "without the toll rate keeping pace with inflation."

p. 29 We talked about introducing the cost of all users benefitting construction of a new corridor as another reason for segment tolls.

p. 32 reverse the title. What are the effects of providing HOV and transit exemptions

p. 33 I would suggest actually putting the dollar amounts above the bars, but the slide might start to get a little busy.

p. 36 I sent you the list of scenarios. We never really came up with a good name for scenario 10 If we were to be consistent it would probably be something like "Toll 520 in 2010 and add HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes to I-90 in 2016 Fourth bullet, what if you were just to say "I-90 improvements are included in the combined..."
Need to get agreement on the numbers

p. 39 change the word impact in the title
I'm not sure about the wording on the third sub bullet. That may have been our intent, but I would keep to the maximum revenue theme as opposed to the maximum diversion theme.

p. 40 there's that word again (I actually don't hate it as much as it seems, but it seems to be verboten in WSDOT land)
second bullet, first sub bullet. This references scenario 12. Do we also need a slide that shows the scenarios that were examined beyond those that the Committee looked at.
second subbullet. shouldn't HOV be HOT?

p. 41 impact

p. 42 do we need this slide?
p. 43 we talked about a new title--what are the funding effects of different tolling approaches on I-90 or something like that.
first bullet, I think I would word it, Initial Tolling Implementation committee scenarios

p. 44 impacts
also need to retitle the second title to match earlier slide on exemptions
I think we should take a look at both slides that discuss the fixed rate versus variable tolls structure. To me, the bullet points are too wordy, but it is a hard concept to communicate. The key messages are that fixed rate tolls yield less funding and do not relieve congestion or provide bridge performance benefits as good as variable tolls.

p. 45 issue of using the word target

p. 50 change evolution to updates

p. 51 even after sitting through a lot of the mediation, the term bascule bridge still doesn't help me any--it's a drawbridge to we non-engineer types.
option L need to include fact that it is a draw...bascule bridge

p. 57 eliminate possible schedule delays line.

p. 58 discussion about the last bullet and what it should say--can't remember what we decided.

p. 61 need to decide what to do about shorthand names for these scenarios--do we need that?

p. 62 no caps on overnight
and just a comment, why did we make the assumption that scenario 13 tolling would begin in mid 2012? Is that because it would take it that long to get set up on I-90. If so I think we should say it on the previous slide and get rid of the comment box on the graphic (or make it a footnote)

p. 64 still need to resolve this question of when the federal funding is assumed. Should note somewhere that this evaluation is against option A

p. 71 second bullet. do you need the sub bullets underneath?

p. 72--did we do any analysis that indicated that we had reached or come close to the max revenue point with the toll rates being assessed on I-90 under this scenario?
From: Baker, T Brent [mailto:Baker@pbworld.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 10:44 PM
To: Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Hopkins, David A.; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Yan, Shuming; Singer, Rick; Catron, Heather (Consultant); Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Subject: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion
Importance: High

All --

Attached please find a draft 520 financial analysis presentation for discussion at Thursday's 520 Finance Plan Executive Group meeting (2:30 at the project office, Evergreen Pt. conference room or 206-440-4005 / 360-709-8068 PIN 108707).

The powerpoint file has been zipped due to its size so that it will go through email. Please let Scott Ladner know if you have trouble with the attachment (ladner@pbworld.com, 206-382-6346)

As the presentation covers a lot of information, including "hot off the press" results from the Treasurer for our refined scenarios with the Option A and K costs. Since some of you only have an hour, it would be good if you could take a look at it in advance. Please consider this a deck from which we can extract relevant slides for Legislative briefing in January rather than necessarily one single presentation.

While this is a refined draft, please note that there may be a few style items that need to be fixed. This will be completed after we receive your input.

Regards,

Brent

T. Brent Baker
Principal Consultant
PB Consult
999 Third Avenue | Suite 2200 | Seattle, WA 98104-4020
206.382.5284 | cell: 206.310.3291 | fax: 206.382.5222 | baker@pbworld.com

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***ne*** IMPORTANT: Do not open
I agree with David's comments and don't have any to add after reviewing the last presentation.

Here are some of my more detailed comments:

Cover slide--project logo should go. should reflect WSDOT standard layout, with Paula's preferred title (which I think should look.

p.2 I would get rid of the word "evolution" and change it to update or something like that

p.4 Just a couple of word selection questions. I think I like "jump-start" but it is a little vague. "Comes too late" n allocated/programmed? after the completion of construction, which will...

p.5 Last bullet, remove first sub bullet

p.9 capitalize During (3rd bullet)

p.10 open house attendees
220+ at three November open houses
375+ at six July/August open houses
I am confirming the other numbers to see if they also need to be updated.

p.12 last bullet -- add the word "from"

p.15 I know this slide is from the project, but the PCP says "pontoons for catastrophic failure planning" Unless it's "planning" I would take it out.
p. 17 We talked about accelerated eastside issue, also to make the colors consistent with 2007 finance plan, blue and orange. Also the federal funding on the bar charts doesn't seem to match the bar chart that Amy was using with the tolling between 2009 but none in 2010 and 2011.

p. 18 Same thing about accelerated eastside

p. 19 Second bullet, I don't like the word "binary" (what about yes or no) and if you use this exemption as an end, not sure the word bookends is needed on the next bullet.

We talked about changing the wording in the fourth arrow set.

Final bullet--I think this needs a better explanation, maybe just by adding the phrase "of contribution to funding"

p. 21 I would get rid of all caps on overnight note.

My question about this chart is whether to include the 2010 and 2016 amounts and lines. I know it makes sense to do.

p. 23 I would change the word impacted to affected or say "how does funding change..."

We need to get some guidance from the project directors and Craig/Ron/Dave on what the term of art they would like, tolling when construction begins and tolling when the bridge is complete.

Also the phrase "funding contribution" is used. The Tolling committee was all over the map on this one. I think the

p. 24 Second bullet, I would change the word traffic to people or drivers.

p. 25 In title change impact to affect

p. 27 I would change the last sub bullet to read "Minor changes to traffic demand model results, and transponder 2007."

p. 28 Title for arrow "tolls keep pace with inflation" or "tolls adjusted for inflation" and then tolls don't keep pace or escalator. I would change to increase in the first bullet and the second to "without the toll rate keeping pace with infl

p. 29 We talked about introducing the cost of all users benefitting construction of a new corridor as another reason

p. 32 Reverse the title. What are the effects of providing HOV and transit exemptions

p. 33 I would suggest actually putting the dollar amounts above the bars, but the slide might start to get a little bus

p. 36 I sent you the list of scenarios. We never really came up with a good name for scenario 10. If we were to be 2010 and add HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes to I-90 in 2016

Fourth bullet, what if you were just to say "I-90 improvements are included in the combined...".

Need to get agreement on the numbers

p. 39 Change the word impact in the title.

I'm not sure about the wording on the third sub bullet. That may have been our intent, but I would keep to the max theme.

p. 40 There's that word again (I actually don't hate it as much as it seems, but it seems to be verboten in WSDOT second bullet, first sub bullet. This references scenario 12. Do we also need a slide that shows the scenarios that second subbullet. Shouldn't HOV be HOT?

p. 41 Impact
p. 42 do we need this slide?

p.43 we talked about a new title--what are the funding effects of different tolling approaches on I-90 or something I think I would word it, Initial Tolling Implementation committee scenarios

p. 44 impacts
also need to retitle the second title to match earlier slide on exemptions
I think we should take a look at both slides that discuss the fixed rate versus variable tolls structure. To me, the bullet points are too wordy, but it is a hard concept to communicate. The key messages are that fixed rate tolls yield less funding and do not relieve congestion or prov

p. 45 issue of using the word target

p. 50 change evolution to updates

p. 51 even after sitting through a lot of the mediation, the term bascule bridge still doesn't help me any--it's a drawbrid...bascule bridge

p. 57 eliminate possible schedule delays line.

p. 58 discussion about the last bullet and what it should say--can't remember what we decided.

p. 61 need to decide what to do about shorthand names for these scenarios--do we need that?

p. 62 no caps on overnight
and just a comment, why did we make the assumption that scenario 13 tolling would begin in mid 2012? Is that be think we should say it on the previous slide and get rid of the comment box on the graphic (or make it a footnote)

p. 64 still need to resolve this question of when the federal funding is assumed. Should note somewhere that this

p. 71 second bullet. do you need the sub bullets underneath?

p. 72--did we do any analysis that indicated that we had reached or come close to the max revenue point with the

David Hopkins
Director, Government Relations and Communications
Urban Corridors Office
Washington State Dept. of Transportation
401 Second Ave. South, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
206-464-1194
From: Baker, T Brent [mailto:Baker@pbworld.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 10:44 PM
To: Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Hopkins, David A.; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, F (Consultant); Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Subject: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion
Importance: High

All --

Attached please find a draft 520 financial analysis presentation for discussion at Thursday's 520 Finance Plan Executive Group meeting (2:30 at the project office, Evergreen Pt. conference room or 206-440-4005 / 360-709-8068 PIN 1C)

The powerpoint file has been zipped due to its size so that it will go through email. Please let Scott Ladner know if you have trouble with the attachment (ladner@pbworld.com, 206-382-6346)

As the presentation covers a lot of information, including "hot off the press" results from the 1 Option A and K costs. Since some of you only have an hour, it would be good if you could take a deck from which we can extract relevant slides for Legislative briefing in January rather than the whole presentation.

While this is a refined draft, please note that there may be a few style items that need to be fixed. This will be completed after we receive your input.

Regards,
Brent

T. Brent Baker
Principal Consultant
PB Consult
999 Third Avenue | Suite 2200 | Seattle, WA 98104-4020
206.382.5284 | cell: 206.310.3291 | fax: 206.382.5222 | baker@pbworld.com

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***ne*** IMPORTANT: Do not open
From: Hopkins, David A. HopkiDA@wsdot.wa.gov
To: Baker, T Brent Baker@pbworld.com; Arnis, Amy ArnisA@wsdot.wa.gov; Stone, Craig StoneC@wsdot.wa.gov; Dye, Dave DyeD@wsdot.wa.gov; Meredith, Julie MereDJL@wsdot.wa.gov; Smith, Helena Kennedy SmithH@wsdot.wa.gov; Paananen, Ron PaananR@wsdot.wa.gov; Yan, Shuming YanS@wsdot.wa.gov; Singer, Rick SingerR@wsdot.wa.gov; Kyle, Larry (Consultant) KyleL@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov; Pelley, Suanne (Consultant) pelleys@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov; Waters, Mia WatersY@wsdot.wa.gov
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant) RicharA@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov; Ladner, Scott Ladner@pbworld.com; Helmann, Craig HelmanC@wsdot.wa.gov; 70700 70700@pbworld.com; Palmer, Brian PalmerB@pbworld.com; Sears, Megan (Consultant) SearsMe@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: RE: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion
Date: 12/21/2008 5:10:28 PM
Attachments:

I agree with David's comments and don't have any to add after reviewing the last presentation.

Here are some of my more detailed comments

Cover slide--project logo should go. should reflect WSDOT standard layout, with Paula's preferred title (which I think includes PE). Check in with communications folks about how that should look.

p.2 I would get rid of the word "evolution" and change it to update or something like that.

p.4 Just a couple of word selection questions. I think I like "jump-start" but it is a little vague. "Comes too late" needs a better description. Something like--Some funding is allocated/programmed? after the completion of construction, which will...

p.5 Last bullet, remove first sub bullet

p.9 capitalize During (3rd bullet)

p.10 open house attendees
220+ at three November open houses
375+ at six July/August open houses
I am confirming the other numbers to see if they also need to be updated.

p.12 last bullet -- add the word "from"

p.15 I know this slide is from the project, but the PCP says "pontoon for catastrophic failure planning" Unless there is some environmental process reason for the work "planning" I would take it out.
p. 17 we talked about accelerated eastside issue, also to make the colors consistent with 2007 finance plan, blue and orange.
Also the federal funding on the bar charts doesn't seem to match the bar chart that Amy was using with the tolling committee. That chart shows federal funds in 2008 and 2009 but none in 2010 and 2011.

p. 18 same thing about accelerated eastside

p. 19 second sub bullet, I don't like the word "binary" (what about yes or no) and if you use this exemption as an example, I would pick either transit or HOV to feature, not both.
not sure the word bookends is needed on the next bullet.
We talked about changing the wording in the fourth arrow set.
Final bullet-- I think this needs a better explanation, maybe just by adding the phrase "of contribution to funding"

p. 21 I would get rid of all caps on overnight note
my question about this chart is whether to include the 2010 and 2016 amounts and lines. I know it makes sense to fully disclose, but it is not something the committee chose to do.

p. 23 I would change the word impacted to affected or say "how does funding change..."
We need to get some guidance from the project directors and Craig/Ron/Dave on what the term of art they would like to use. Is it post and pre completion. Is it early. Is it tolling when construction begins and tolling when the bridge is complete?
Also the phrase "funding contribution" is used. The Tolling committee was all over the map on this one. I think that I like funding contribution. What do other folks think?

p. 24 second sub bullet, I would change the word traffic to people or drivers

p. 25 in title change impact to affect

p. 27 I would change the last sub bullet to read "Minor changes to traffic demand model results, and transponder market share and toll collection cost assumptions since 2007."

p. 28 title for arrow "tolls keep pace with inflation" or "tolls adjusted for inflation" and then tolls don't keep pace or tolls not adjusted. We talked about getting rid of the word escalate. I would change to increase in the first bullet and the second to "without the toll rate keeping pace with inflation.

p. 29 We talked about introducing the cost of all users benefitting construction of a new corridor as another reason for segment tolls.

p. 32 reverse the title. What are the effects of providing HOV and transit exemptions

p. 33 I would suggest actually putting the dollar amounts above the bars, but the slide might start to get a little busy.

p. 36 I sent you the list of scenarios. We never really came up with a good name for scenario 10. If we were to be consistent it would probably be something like "Toll 520 in 2010 and add HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes to I-90 in 2016.
Fourth bullet, what if you were just to say "I-90 improvements are included in the combined..."
Need to get agreement on the numbers

p. 39 change the word impact in the title
I'm not sure about the wording on the third sub bullet. That may have been our intent, but I would keep to the maximum revenue theme as opposed to the maximum diversion theme.
p. 40  there’s that word again  (I actually don’t hate it as much as it seems, but it seems to be verboten in WSDOT land)
second bullet, first sub bullet.  This references scenario 12.  Do we also need a slide that shows the scenarios that were examined beyond those that the Committee looked at.
second subullet.  shouldn’t HOV be HOT?

p. 41 impact

p. 42 do we need this slide?

p.43 we talked about a new title--what are the funding effects of different tolling approaches on I-90 or something like that.
first bullet, I think I would word it, Initial Tolling Implementation committee scenarios

p. 44 impacts
also need to retitle the second title to match earlier slide on exemptions
I think we should take a look at both slides that discuss the fixed rate versus variable tolls structure.  To me, the bullet points are too wordy, but it is a hard concept to communicate.  The key messages are that fixed rate tolls yield less funding and do not relieve congestion or provide bridge performance benefits as good as variable tolls.

p. 45 issue of using the word target

p. 50 change evolution to updates

p. 51 even after sitting through a lot of the mediation, the term bascule bridge still doesn't help me any--it's a drawbridge to we non-engineer types.
option L need to include fact that it is a draw...bascule bridge

p. 57 eliminate possible schedule delays line.

p. 58 discussion about the last bullet and what it should say--can't remember what we decided.

p. 61 need to decide what to do about shorthand names for these scenarios--do we need that?

p. 62  no caps on overnight
and just a comment, why did we make the assumption that scenario 13 tolling would begin in mid 2012?  Is that because it would take it that long to get set up on I-90. If so I think we should say it on the previous slide and get rid of the comment box on the graphic (or make it a footnote)

p. 64 still need to resolve this question of when the federal funding is assumed.  Should note somewhere that this evaluation is against option A

p. 71 second bullet.  do you need the sub bullets underneath?

p. 72--did we do any analysis that indicated that we had reached or come close to the max revenue point with the toll rates being assessed on I-90 under this scenario?
All --

Attached please find a draft 520 financial analysis presentation for discussion at Thursday’s 520 Finance Plan Executive Group meeting (2:30 at the project office, Evergreen Pt. conference room or 206-440-4005 / 360-709-8068 PIN 108707).

The powerpoint file has been zipped due to its size so that it will go through email. Please let Scott Ladner know if you have trouble with the attachment (ladner@pbworld.com, 206-382-6346)

As the presentation covers a lot of information, including "hot off the press" results from the Treasurer for our refined scenarios with the Option A and K costs. Since some of you only have an hour, it would be good if you could take a look at it in advance. Please consider this a deck from which we can extract relevant slides for Legislative briefing in January rather than necessarily one single presentation.

While this is a refined draft, please note that there may be a few style items that need to be fixed. This will be completed after we receive your input.

Regards,
Brent

**T. Brent Baker**
Principal Consultant
PB Consult
999 Third Avenue | Suite 2200 | Seattle, WA 98104-4020
206.382.5284 | cell: 206.310.3291 | fax: 206.382.5222 | baker@pbworld.com

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
From: Catron, Heather (Consultant)
To: Hopkins, David A.; 'Baker, T Brent'; Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Yan, Shuming; Singer, Rick; Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700 <70700@pbworld.com>; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Sent: Sun Dec 21 16:10:28 2008
Subject: RE: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion

I agree with David's comments and don't have any to add after reviewing the last presentation.

---

From: Hopkins, David A.
Sent: Fri 12/19/2008 1:01 PM
To: 'Baker, T Brent'; Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Yan, Shuming; Singer, Rick; Catron, Heather (Consultant); Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Subject: RE: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion

Here are some of my more detailed comments

Cover slide--project logo should go. should reflect WSDOT standard layout, with Paula's preferred title (which I think should look.

p.2 I would get rid of the word "evolution" and change it to update or something like that

p. 4 Just a couple of word selection questions. I think I like "jump-start" but it is a little vague. "Comes too late" allocated/programmed? after the completion of construction, which will...

p.5 Last bullet, remove first sub bullet

p. 9 capitalize During (3rd bullet)

p. 10 open house attendees
220+ at three November open houses
375+ at six July/August open houses
I am confirming the other numbers to see if they also need to be updated.
p 12  last bullet -- add the word "from"

p. 15  I know this slide is from the project, but the PCP says "pontoons for catastrophic failure planning" Unless the
"planning" I would take it out.

p. 17  we talked about accelerated eastside issue, also to make the colors consistent with 2007 finance plan, blue =
Also the federal funding on the bar charts doesn't seem to match the bar chart that Amy was using with the tolling.
2009 but none in 2010 and 2011.

p. 18  same thing about accelerated eastside

p. 19  second sub bullet, I don't like the word "binary" (what about yes or no) and if you use this exemption as an ε
not sure the word bookends is needed on the next bullet
We talked about changing the wording in the fourth arrow set.
Final bullet-- I think this needs a better explanation, maybe just by adding the phrase "of contribution to funding"

p. 21  I would get rid of all caps on overnight note
my question about this chart is whether to include the 2010 and 2016 amounts and lines.  I know it makes sense to do.

p. 23  I would change the word impacted to affected or say "how does funding change..." We need to get some guidance from the project directors and Craig/Ron/Dave on what the term of art they would like to use when construction begins and tolling when the bridge is complete? Also the phrase "funding contribution" is used. The Tolling committee was all over the map on this one. I think the

p. 24  second sub bullet, I would change the word traffic to people or drivers

p. 25  in title change impact to affect

p. 27  I would change the last sub bullet to read "Minor changes to traffic demand model results, and transponder
2007."

p. 28  title for arrow "tolls keep pace with inflation" or "tolls adjusted for inflation" and then tolls don't keep pace or t
escalate. I would change to increase in the first bullet and the second to "without the toll rate keeping pace with inflation"

p. 29  We talked about introducing the cost of all users benefitting construction of a new corridor as another reason

p. 32  reverse the title. What are the effects of providing HOV and transit exemptions

p. 33  I would suggest actually putting the dollar amounts above the bars, but the slide might start to get a little bus

p. 36  I sent you the list of scenarios. We never really came up with a good name for scenario 10 If we were to be
2010 and add HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes to I-90 in 2016
Fourth bullet, what if you were just to say "I-90 improvements are included in the combined..."
Need to get agreement on the numbers

p. 39  change the word impact in the title
I'm not sure about the wording on the third sub bullet. That may have been our intent, but I would keep to the max theme.
p. 40 there's that word again (I actually don't hate it as much as it seems, but it seems to be verboten in WSDOT second bullet, first sub bullet. This references scenario 12. Do we also need a slide that shows the scenarios that second subbullet. shouldn't HOV be HOT?

p. 41 impact

p. 42 do we need this slide?

p.43 we talked about a new title--what are the funding effects of different tolling approaches on I-90 or something l first bullet, I think I would word it, Initial Tolling Implementation committee scenarios

p. 44 impacts
also need to retitle the second title to match earlier slide on exemptions
I think we should take a look at both slides that discuss the fixed rate versus variable tolls structure. To me, the bullet points are too wordy, but it is a hard concept to communicate. The key messages are that fixed rate tolls yield less funding and do not relieve congestion or provide for bridge performance benefits.

p. 45 issue of using the word target

p. 50 change evolution to updates

p. 51 even after sitting through a lot of the mediation, the term bascule bridge still doesn't help me any--it's a drawbridge option L need to include fact that it is a draw...bascule bridge

p. 57 eliminate possible schedule delays line.

p. 58 discussion about the last bullet and what it should say--can't remember what we decided.

p. 61 need to decide what to do about shorthand names for these scenarios--do we need that?

p. 62 no caps on overnight
and just a comment, why did we make the assumption that scenario 13 tolling would begin in mid 2012? Is that because we think we should say it on the previous slide and get rid of the comment box on the graphic (or make it a footnote)

p. 64 still need to resolve this question of when the federal funding is assumed. Should note somewhere that this

p. 71 second bullet. do you need the sub bullets underneath?

p. 72--did we do any analysis that indicated that we had reached or come close to the max revenue point with the I

David Hopkins
Attached please find a draft 520 financial analysis presentation for discussion at Thursday's 520 Finance Plan Executive Group meeting (2:30 at the project office, Evergreen Pt. conference room or 206-440-4005 / 360-709-8068 PIN 108707).

The powerpoint file has been zipped due to its size so that it will go through email. Please let Scott Ladner know if you have trouble with the attachment (ladner@pbworld.com, 206-382-6346)

As the presentation covers a lot of information, including "hot off the press" results from the Treasurer for our refined scenarios with the Option A and K costs. Since some of you only have an hour, it would be good if you could take a deck from which we can extract relevant slides for Legislative briefing in January rather than a single presentation.

While this is a refined draft, please note that there may be a few style items that need to be fixed. This will be completed after we receive your input.

Regards,
Brent

T. Brent Baker
Principal Consultant
PB Consult
999 Third Avenue | Suite 2200 | Seattle, WA 98104-4020
206.382.5284 | cell: 206.310.3291 | fax: 206.382.5222 | baker@pbworld.com
Thanks

---

From: Catron, Heather (Consultant)
To: Hopkins, David A.; 'Baker, T Brent'; Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Yan, Shuming; Singer, Rick; Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700 <70700@pbworld.com>; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Sent: Sun Dec 21 16:10:28 2008
Subject: RE: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion

I agree with David's comments and don't have any to add after reviewing the last presentation.

---

From: Hopkins, David A.
Sent: Fri 12/19/2008 1:01 PM
To: 'Baker, T Brent'; Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Yan, Shuming; Singer, Rick; Catron, Heather (Consultant); Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Subject: RE: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion

Here are some of my more detailed comments

Cover slide--project logo should go. should reflect WSDOT standard layout, with Paula's preferred title (which I think includes PE). Check in with communications folks about how that should look.

p.2 I would get rid of the word "evolution" and change it to update or something like that

p. 4 Just a couple of word selection questions. I think I like "jump-start" but it is a little vague. "Comes too late" needs a better description. Something like--Some funding is allocated/programmed? after the completion of construction, which will...

p.5 Last bullet, remove first sub bullet

p. 9 capitalize During (3rd bullet)

p. 10 open house attendees
220+ at three November open houses
375+ at six July/August open houses
I am confirming the other numbers to see if they also need to be updated.

p 12 last bullet -- add the word "from"

p. 15 I know this slide is from the project, but the PCP says "pontoons for catastrophic failure planning" Unless there is some environmental process reason for the work "planning" I would take it out.

p. 17 we talked about accelerated eastside issue, also to make the colors consistent with 2007 finance plan, blue and orange. Also the federal funding on the bar charts doesn't seem to match the bar chart that Amy was using with the tolling committee. That chart shows federal funds in 2008 and 2009 but none in 2010 and 2011.

p. 18 same thing about accelerated eastside

p. 19 second sub bullet, I don't like the word "binary" (what about yes or no) and if you use this exemption as an example, I would pick either transit or HOV to feature; not both. not sure the word bookends is needed on the next bullet We talked about changing the wording in the fourth arrow set. Final bullet-- I think this needs a better explanation, maybe just by adding the phrase "of contribution to funding"

p. 21 I would get rid of all caps on overnight note my question about this chart is whether to include the 2010 and 2016 amounts and lines. I know it makes sense to fully disclose, but it is not something the committee chose to do.

p. 23 I would change the word impacted to affected or say "how does funding change..." We need to get some guidance from the project directors and Craig/Ron/Dave on what the term of art they would like to use. Is it post and pre completion. Is it early. Is it tolling when construction begins and tolling when the bridge is complete? Also the phrase "funding contribution" is used. The Tolling committee was all over the map on this one. I think that I like funding contribution. What do other folks think?

p. 24 second sub bullet, I would change the word traffic to people or drivers

p. 25 in title change impact to affect

p. 27 I would change the last sub bullet to read "Minor changes to traffic demand model results, and transponder market share and toll collection cost assumptions since 2007."

p. 28 title for arrow "tolls keep pace with inflation" or "tolls adjusted for inflation" and then tolls don't keep pace or tolls not adjusted. We talked about getting rid of the word escalate. I would change to increase in the first bullet and the second to "without the toll rate keeping pace with inflation.

p. 29 We talked about introducing the cost of all users benefitting construction of a new corridor as another reason for segment tolls.

p. 32 reverse the title. What are the effects of providing HOV and transit exemptions

p. 33 I would suggest actually putting the dollar amounts above the bars, but the slide might start to get a little busy.

p. 36 I sent you the list of scenarios. We never really came up with a good name for scenario 10 If we were to be consistent it would probably be something like "Toll 520 in 2010 and add HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes to
I-90 in 2016
Fourth bullet, what if you were just to say "I-90 improvements are included in the combined..."
Need to get agreement on the numbers

p. 39 change the word impact in the title
I'm not sure about the wording on the third sub bullet. That may have been our intent, but I would keep to the maximum revenue theme as opposed to the maximum diversion theme.

p. 40 there's that word again (I actually don't hate it as much as it seems, but it seems to be verboten in WSDOT land)
second bullet, first sub bullet. This references scenario 12. Do we also need a slide that shows the scenarios that were examined beyond those that the Committee looked at.
second subbullet. shouldn't HOV be HOT?

p. 41 impact

p. 42 do we need this slide?

p.43 we talked about a new title--what are the funding effects of different tolling approaches on I-90 or something like that.
first bullet, I think I would word it, Initial Tolling Implementation committee scenarios

p. 44 impacts
also need to retitle the second title to match earlier slide on exemptions
I think we should take a look at both slides that discuss the fixed rate versus variable tolls structure. To me, the bullet points are too wordy, but it is a hard concept to communicate. The key messages are that fixed rate tolls yield less funding and do not relieve congestion or provide bridge performance benefits as good as variable tolls.

p. 45 issue of using the word target

p. 50 change evolution to updates

p. 51 even after sitting through a lot of the mediation, the term bascule bridge still doesn't help me any--it's a drawbridge to we non-engineer types.
option L need to include fact that it is a draw...bascule bridge

p. 57 eliminate possible schedule delays line.

p. 58 discussion about the last bullet and what it should say--can't remember what we decided.

p. 61 need to decide what to do about shorthand names for these scenarios--do we need that?

p. 62 no caps on overnight
and just a comment, why did we make the assumption that scenario 13 tolling would begin in mid 2012? Is that because it would take it that long to get set up on I-90. If so I think we should say it on the previous slide and get rid of the comment box on the graphic (or make it a footnote)

p. 64 still need to resolve this question of when the federal funding is assumed. Should note somewhere that this evaluation is against option A

p. 71 second bullet. do you need the sub bullets underneath?
p. 72—did we do any analysis that indicated that we had reached or come close to the max revenue point with the toll rates being assessed on I-90 under this scenario?

David Hopkins
Director, Government Relations and Communications
Urban Corridors Office
Washington State Dept. of Transportation
401 Second Ave. South, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
206-464-1194
hopkida@wsdot.wa.gov

From: Baker, T Brent [mailto:Baker@pbworld.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 10:44 PM
To: Arnis, Amy; Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave; Hopkins, David A.; Meredith, Julie; Smith, Helena Kennedy; Paananen, Ron; Yan, Shuming; Singer, Rick; Catron, Heather (Consultant); Kyle, Larry (Consultant); Pelley, Suanne (Consultant); Waters, Mia
Cc: Richardson, Andrew (Consultant); Ladner, Scott; Helmann, Craig; 70700; Palmer, Brian; Sears, Megan (Consultant)
Subject: 2008 520 Financial Analysis Leg Briefing Presentation - DRAFT for Meeting Discussion
Importance: High

All --

Attached please find a draft 520 financial analysis presentation for discussion at Thursday's 520 Finance Plan Executive Group meeting (2:30 at the project office, Evergreen Pt. conference room or 206-440-4005 / 360-709-8068 PIN 108707).

The powerpoint file has been zipped due to its size so that it will go through email. Please let Scott Ladner know if you have trouble with the attachment (ladner@pbworld.com, 206-382-6346)

As the presentation covers a lot of information, including "hot off the press" results from the Treasurer for our refined scenarios with the Option A and K costs. Since some of you only have an hour, it would be good if you could take a look at it in advance. Please consider this a deck from which we can extract relevant slides for Legislative briefing in
January rather than necessarily one single presentation.

While this is a refined draft, please note that there may be a few style items that need to be fixed. This will be completed after we receive your input.

Regards,
Brent

**T. Brent Baker**
Principal Consultant
PB Consult
999 Third Avenue | Suite 2200 | Seattle, WA 98104-4020
206.382.5284 | cell: 206.310.3291 | fax: 206.382.5222 | baker@pbworld.com

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
Craig, this just in. I haven't read it yet. Patty and David H have copies.
-- Rob

-----Original Message-----
From: Colyar, James [mailto:James.Colyar@fhwa.dot.gov]
Sent: Wed 1/7/2009 8:51 AM
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Rubstello, Patty; Thompson, Laura Ann; Hopkins, David A.
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Here is the electronic version. They will probably be mailing you an
official version.
James

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 8:42 AM
To: Colyar, James
Cc: Rubstello, Patty; Thompson, Laura Ann; Hopkins, David A.
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

James, I haven't seen it yet. Could you forward it please?
Is it in the mail, or electronic? If mail, could you fax it to
206-464-1286?

Laura, I think this is the UFO fax number, right? I'm working in a
coffee shop this morning - if a fax comes from James, could you get a
copy to David Hopkins and Patty Rubstello?

Thanks all,
-- Rob

-----Original Message-----
From: Colyar, James [mailto:James.Colyar@fhwa.dot.gov]
Sent: Wed 1/7/2009 8:09 AM
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,

I just got a copy of the final letter from Wayne. I'm assuming you also
got it, but let me know if you didn't and I can forward to you.

James
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2008 4:39 PM
To: Colyar, James
Cc: Yung, Jessie <FHWA>; Rubstello, Patty
Subject: FW: I-90 letter of interest

James, this is what I got from Wayne earlier in the week.

-- Rob

From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov [mailto:Wayne.Berman@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 2:06 PM
To: Fellows, Rob
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

It will not get signed this week.

From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 4:56 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Thanks Wayne. I'm guessing that this will not get finalized this week then, which would answer my question. Is that a good guess?

I'll pass this around internally here and see if anyone has any further questions.

-- Rob

From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov [mailto:Wayne.Berman@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 11:51 AM
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov; Jessie.Yung@dot.gov; Michael.Harkins@dot.gov
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,
Here is the next draft and attachments. Remember, that this is not final as it still needs to go through some levels before it gets signed. I have made revisions following our last conference call.

If you have any questions, you can e-mail me or call; however, I will be out of the office a lot for the remainder of the week.

Thanks for you patience on this.

Wayne

From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 2:04 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, I'm just checking in on the status of this letter - there is a meeting of our SR 520 Tolling Implementation Committee on Friday, and I'm being asked whether we might expect to see the letter before then or not.

Thanks!

-- Rob

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

From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov <Wayne.Berman@dot.gov>
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Sent: Thu Nov 20 06:34:32 2008
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,
You are welcome to call me on Friday. Alternatively, we can set up a conference call for anytime after 4:00 p.m. on either Monday, November 24 or Tuesday, November 25th. Also, I am going to revise the draft that I sent you after I received some additional comments. I hope to send it to you later this week and we can talk it thru next week.

Do you have specific questions or points of clarification that you want to let me know now. Please send me any questions.

Thanks

Wayne

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2008 8:05 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, it might be worth setting up a short conference call next week so we can ask a few questions - would you be willing and available? I will be in DC for a TRB meeting on Friday but can try to set something up for early next week if there's a time that would work for you. Let me know...

Thanks,

-- Rob
Rob,

Here is a rough draft for your use / information only. It is un-edited and only sent to let you know what we are think at this point. Please know that it will be revised as it moves forward, especially as it goes through our Chief Counsel's Office. I am also enclosing two attachments that may help you understand the various tolling programs better.

Let me know what you think. Be happy to discuss.

Sorry for any delay in getting this draft back to you.

Wayne
Wayne, I'm just checking in to see if there's been any progress on our express of interest to toll I-90 in Seattle. Can you tell me when we might expect to hear something? Sorry to pester you about this; I've been asked to find out what I can.

Thanks,

-- Rob Fellows

Pricing System Planning and Policy Manager

WISDOM Urban Planning Office

(206) 464-1257

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

*** eSafel scanned this email for malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov  
To: FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov  
Cc: James.Colyar@fhwa.dot.gov  
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest  
Date: 1/14/2009 7:37:06 PM  

Here is a PDF just in case you do not have it.

---

From: Fellows, Rob  
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2009 7:37 PM  
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>  
Cc: Colyar, James <FHWA>  
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, you can disregard this. I went across the street to King County Metro Transit, where I used to work, and found it had been delivered there by mistake.

-- Rob

---

From: Fellows, Rob  
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2009 3:57 PM  
To: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov  
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, James Colyar told me that the I-90 letter to us was finalized, but I haven't seen it in the mail yet. Can you give me an update?

Thanks,  
-- Rob

---

From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov  
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 2:06 PM  
To: Fellows, Rob  
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

It will not get signed this week.

---

From: Fellows, Rob  
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 4:56 PM  
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>  
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Thanks Wayne. I'm guessing that this will not get finalized this week then, which would answer my question. Is that a good guess?
I'll pass this around internally here and see if anyone has any further questions.

-- Rob

From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov [mailto:Wayne.Berman@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 11:51 AM
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov; Jessie.Yung@dot.gov; Michael.Harkins@dot.gov
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,

Here is the next draft and attachments. Remember, that this is not final as it still needs to go through some levels before it gets signed. I have made revisions following our last conference call.

If you have any questions, you can e-mail me or call; however, I will be out of the office a lot for the remainder of the week.

Thanks for you patience on this.

Wayne

From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 2:04 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, I'm just checking in on the status of this letter - there is a meeting of our SR 520 Tolling Implementation Committee on Friday, and I'm being asked whether we might expect to see the letter before then or not.

Thanks!

-- Rob

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov <Wayne.Berman@dot.gov>
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Sent: Thu Nov 20 06:34:32 2008
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,

You are welcome to call me on Friday. Alternatively, we can set up a conference call for anytime after 4:00 p.m. on either Monday, November 24 or Tuesday, November 25th. Also, I am going to revise the draft that I sent you after I received some additional comments. I hope to send it to you later this week and we can talk it thru next week.

Do you have specific questions or points of clarification that you want to let me know now. Please send me any questions.
Thanks

Wayne

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2008 8:05 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Cc: Rubstello, Patty
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Wayne, it might be worth setting up a short conference call next week so we can ask a few questions - would you be willing and available? I will be in DC for a TRB meeting on Friday but can try to set something up for early next week if there's a time that would work for you. Let me know...

Thanks,
-- Rob

-----Original Message-----
From: Wayne.Berman@dot.gov [mailto:Wayne.Berman@dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2008 8:59 AM
To: Fellows, Rob
Cc: Jessie.Yung@dot.gov; Angela.Jacobs@dot.gov
Subject: RE: I-90 letter of interest

Rob,

Here is a rough draft for your use / information only. It is un-edited and only sent to let you know what we are think at this point. Please know that it will be revised as it moves forward, especially as it goes through our Chief Counsel's Office. I am also enclosing two attachments that may help you understand the various tolling programs better.

Let me know what you think. Be happy to discuss.

Sorry for any delay in getting this draft back to you.

Wayne

-----Original Message-----
From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 4:28 PM
To: Berman, Wayne <FHWA>
Subject: I-90 letter of interest
Wayne, I'm just checking in to see if there's been any progress on our express of interest to toll I-90 in Seattle. Can you tell me when we might expect to hear something? Sorry to pester you about this; I've been asked to find out what I can.

Thanks,
-- Rob Fellows
  Pricing System Planning and Policy Manager
  WISDOM Urban Planning Office
  (206) 464-1257

---

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
Thanks for keeping me in the loop.

Did you talk about bond authorization? This will need to be a separate bill since bond authorizations must pass by 60%+1. Amy will be integral to this discussion, and I suspect that what you’re talking about below means we have to reevaluate as well as recalculate. So, the sooner we think about this aspect, the better.

We have a strategy meeting on Tuesday afternoon, including an hour Craig set aside to discuss tolling. If things go the way it was discussed yesterday (and it could change depending on Clibbons discussions with other legislators and Dave/Paula discussions with the Governors office), we should be seeing a draft tolling bill soon. In the meantime, we will need to develop the cashflow needs for the floating bridge project. Phasing scenario 2 showed a surplus of about $370 million above what is needed to deliver the floating bridge. The actual amount of course will change depending on tolling approach and financing cash flow. These are program funds that will be allocated to the west and east side projects to advance them through the EIS / EA processes, R/W and PE. So there is some work to do sorting out how much cash flow will be needed and or available to keep these projects moving forward. The eastside of course will be ready for construction first, and hence may be a good candidate for stimulus funding.

I'm glad we're moving forward and I'm glad Rep Clibborn is behind early pontoon construction. Looking forward to the bill! Great work!

Scenarios 2 and 7 are dead anyhow. They used the outdated cost as well as the outdated cashflow. This new plan changes both. Sounds like we'll need a new cashflow discussion and then can see what new finance planning looks like. Can you enlighten me as to lag between the three pieces?

One thing - HOT lanes on I-90 potentially complicates R8A. Who is sorting that out? Not sure this does anything good for 520 project, as summarized in your email, but there may be some more information.

Who will get back to me and when?
From: Paananen, Ron  
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 9:26 AM  
To: Smith, Helena Kennedy  
Subject: FW: Meeting with Clibborn

Fyi, lets see if Dave agrees with my summary of the discussion and how we proceed from here.

From: Paananen, Ron  
Sent: Fri 1/30/2009 3:56 PM  
To: Meredith, Julie  
Cc: Stone, Craig; Dye, Dave  
Subject: Meeting with Clibborn

Julie, we had a good meeting with Rep. Clibborn today. I'll try and capture the outcome and to do's and Dave can jump in if I missed anything.

Rep. Clibborn's proposed approach:
1. We will officially break up the 520 program into three distinct separate projects: West side, Floating Bridge, and Eastside. Each project will have its own budget, cash flow and finance plan and strategy.

2. The first project fully funded will be construction of pontoons and their installation on Lake Washington (phasing scenario 2). Need to figure out if we can get the bike/ped path connected on the ends (among other things, like the exact project limits). Need to finalize the environmental approach for installation of the pontoons on the lake.

3. Continue development of the West side SDEIS and Eastside EA. For the eastside, we may need to launch into a dual track of developing DB documents, and continuing design work. There was some discussion of obtaining federal stimulus funds for the eastside, so we should be ready to go DB if the opportunity arises.

Using this approach, projects will be built as they are ready for construction and funding is available. Paula is concerned about the west side lagging too far behind given our seismic issues. We will need to fully develop the fall back strategy for the west side and show a budget and timeline for that. We should discuss the environmental approach (include in SDEIS, or separate parallel environmental document.)

The tolling bill will be early tolling on 520, and maybe I-90 HOT lanes. Something between tolling scenario 2 and 7 on 520 initially. Rep. Clibborn speculated that this is just the first step in tolling and future tolling authorizations (perhaps including I-90) will have to be considered with other funding sources to complete funding for the corridor. Sounds like Jennifer will be drafting the bill for Clibborn.

Dave, did I capture it correctly?
Thanks for keeping me in the loop.

Did you talk about bond authorization? This will need to be a separate bill since bond authorizations must pass by 60%+1. Amy will be integral to this discussion, and I suspect that what you’re talking about below means we have to reevaluate as well as recalculate. So, the sooner we think about this aspect, the better.

We have a strategy meeting on Tuesday afternoon, including an hour Craig set aside to discuss tolling. If things go the way it was discussed yesterday (and it could change depending on Clibbons discussions with other legislators and Dave/Paula discussions with the Governors office), we should be seeing a draft tolling bill soon. In the meantime, we will need to develop the cashflow needs for the floating bridge project. Phasing scenario 2 showed a surplus of about $370 million above what is needed to deliver the floating bridge. The actual amount of course will change depending on tolling approach and financing cash flow. These are program funds that will be allocated to the west and east side projects to advance them through the EIS / EA processes, R/W and PE. So there is some work to do sorting out how much cash flow will be needed and or available to keep these projects moving forward. The eastside of course will be ready for construction first, and hence may be a good candidate for stimulus funding.

I'm glad we're moving forward and I'm glad Rep Clibborn is behind early pontoon construction. Looking forward to the bill! Great work!

Scenarios 2 and 7 are dead anyhow. They used the outdated cost as well as the outdated cashflow. This new plan changes both. Sounds like we'll need a new cashflow discussion and then can see what new finance planning looks like. Can you enlighten me as to lag between the three pieces?

One thing - HOT lanes on I-90 potentially complicates R8A. Who is sorting that out? Not sure this does anything good for 520 project, as summarized in your email, but there may be some more information.

Who will get back to me and when?
Fyi, lets see if Dave agress with my summary of the discussion and how we proceed from here.

Julie, we had a good meeting with Rep. Clibborn today. I'll try and capture the outcome and to do's and Dave can jump in if I missed anything.

Rep. Clibborns proposed approach:
1. We will officially break up the 520 program into three distinct separate projects: West side, Floating Bridge, and Eastside. Each project will have its own budget, cash flow and finance plan and strategy.

2. The first project fully funded will be construction of pontoons and their installation on Lake Washington (phasing scenario 2). Need to figure out if we can get the bike/ped path connected on the ends (among other things, like the exact project limits). Need to finalize the environmental approach for installation of the pontoons on the lake..

3. Continue development of the West side SDEIS and Eastside EA. For the eastside, we may need to launch into a dual track of developing DB documents, and continuing design work. There was some discussion of obtaining federal stimulus funds for the eastside, so we should be ready to go DB if the opportunity arises.

Using this approach, projects will be built as they are ready for construction and funding is available. Paula is concerned about the west side lagging too far behind given our seismic issues. We will need to fully develop the fall back strategy for the west side and show a budget and timeline for that. We should discuss the environmental approach (include in SDEIS, or separate parallel environmental document.)

The tolling bill will be early tolling on 520, and maybe I-90 HOT lanes. Something between tolling scenario 2 and 7 on 520 initially. Rep. Clibborn speculated that this is just the first step in tolling and future tolling authorizations (perhaps including I-90) will have to be considered with other funding sources to complete funding for the corridor. Sounds like Jennifer will be drafting the bill for Clibborn.

Dave, did I capture it correctly?
All,

In early January we received a letter from Regina McElroy responding to our expression of interest in tolling Interstate 90 in the Seattle area. Recently we've been asked some new questions about this topic, and we're wondering whether there are simple answers or whether we might have a short conference call to discuss them. We are meeting with legislators on this topic this Thursday, so if it's possible to learn something about these questions before then it would be fantastic.

The legislators are interested in understanding the possibilities and restrictions for using toll revenues collected on I-90 to contribute to funding the parallel SR 520 bridge replacement. Here are our questions:

1. If the VPP program was not included in reauthorization, would it be possible to use a "Section 129 agreement" to establish tolls on the I-90 floating bridge and use surplus revenues generated to fund improvements on SR 520? In our expression of interest we asked about tolling a longer segment of I-90, and we were recommended to use the value pricing program (for general tolls) or the HOV program (for HOT lanes). But if we'd asked about tolling the bridge only, would the section 129 agreement be a possible avenue? If we chose that route, could we still use surplus revenues for a project on a different, parallel route, or apply funds to transit operating or capital if desired?

Where it says "No" for this program for the question "manage demand by varying toll", does the answer mean tolls cannot be used to manage traffic, or that the don't need to be used to manage traffic?

2. Is there a difference between the six programs outlined in the matrix "Federal Tolling Programs - Decision Support Guidance" in regard to whether tolls can continue to be collected after the project they were intended to fund has been paid for?

3. Can you give us an estimate of how long it would take to gain authorization if requested under these programs (perhaps a range from shortest to longest time to process?)

4. We plan to tell legislators that it would not be permissible to establish a toll on a federally funded facility and use the revenues for a non-transportation use (under title 23). Are there cases where that might not be true?

5. Is there anything in the response provided in early January that you believe has changed or is interpreted differently by the new administration that we should be aware of?

Are there some of these that you could answer easily, and would it be helpful to find time to discuss some of the others? Please let me know how you would like to address these, and if it's possible to do so quickly we'd appreciate it.
Michael Harkins, our attorney, is available today. His response is in cap and highlight. Let me know if you prefer to discuss in more details over a conference call.

> In early January we received a letter from Regina McElroy responding to our expression of interest in tolling Interstate 90 in the Seattle area. Recently we've been asked some new questions about this topic, and we're wondering whether there are simple answers or whether we might have a short conference call to discuss them. We are meeting with legislators on this topic this Thursday, so if it's possible to learn something about these questions before then it would be fantastic.

> The legislators are interested in understanding the possibilities and restrictions for using toll revenues collected on I-90 to contribute to funding the parallel SR 520 bridge replacement. Here are our questions:

> 1. If the VPP program was not included in reauthorization, would it be possible to use a "Section 129 agreement" to establish tolls on the I-90 floating bridge and use surplus revenues generated to fund improvements on SR 520? UNDER SECTION 129, INTERSTATE BRIDGES MAY BE TOLLED ONLY IN CONJUNCTION WITH A BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION OR REPLACEMENT PROJECT. IF TOLLED, REVENUES IN EXCESS OF THE FACILITY'S DEBT SERVICE, O&M, AND REASONABLE RETURN ON INVESTMENT TO PRIVATE PARTIES MAY BE USED FOR TITLE 23, ELIGIBLE PROJECTS. Thus, if there are excess toll revenues, those revenues may be used for title 23, eligible projects. Thus, if there are excess toll revenues, those revenues may be used for title 23, eligible projects on SR 520. In our expression of interest we asked about tolling a longer segment of I-90, and we were recommended to use the value pricing program (for general tolls) or the HOV program (for HOT lanes). But if we'd asked about tolling the bridge only, would the section 129 agreement be a possible avenue? Yes - but only if you intend to reconstruct or replace the bridge. If we chose that route, could we still use surplus revenues for a project on a different, parallel route, or apply funds to transit operating or capital if desired? As explained above, excess toll revenues may be used for title 23, eligible projects. Transit operating costs are only eligible for the extent eligible under CMAQ (new starts or expanded service for the first 3 years). Transit capital is title 23 eligible. Where it says "No" for this program for the question "manage demand by varying toll", does the answer mean tolls cannot be used to manage traffic, or that the don't need to be used to manage traffic? Not quite sure what "No" the question is referring to. Under 129, states may vary the toll, but is not required to. Variable tolling is required under 23 USC 166 and VPPP.

> 2. Is there a difference between the six programs outlined in the
> matrix "Federal Tolling Programs - Decision SupportGuidance" in
> regard to whether tolls can continue to be collected after theproject
> they were intended to fund has been paid for? THE ONLY PROGRAM WHERE THIS MAY
> BE AN ISSUE IS THEINTERSTATE RECONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PILOT PROGRAM.
>
> 3. Can you give us an estimate of how long it would take togain
> authorization if requested under these programs (perhaps a rangefrom
> shortest to longest time to process?) 23 USC 166 IS THE QUICKEST SINCE THIS
> PROGRAM DOESNOT REQUIRE AN APPLICATION AND NEPA IS NOT REQUIRED IF TOLLING IS THE
> ONLY ACTIVITY TAKING PLACE. 23 USC 129 IS THE NEXT QUICKEST SINCE NO APPLICATION
> IS REQUIRED, BUT THERE MUST BE A NEPA APPROVAL. THE REST OF THE PROGRAMS DEPEND ON
> THE LENGTH OFTIME IT TAKES FOR THE STATE TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION AND FOR THE
> FHWA'SCONSIDERATION. LENGTH OF TIME COULD DEPEND ON A VARIETY OF FACTORS,
> BUT, MOST SIGNIFICANTLY, APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS. INTERSTATE RECONSTRUCTIONAND
> INTERSTATE CONSTRUCTION HAVE THE MOST ONEROUS APPLICATIONREQUIREMENTS. VPPP AND
> ELDP HAVE EACH BEEN FASTER.
>
> 4. We plan to tell legislators that it would not bepermissible to
> establish a toll on a federally funded facility and use therevenues
> for a non-transportation use (under title 23). Are therecases where
> that might not be true? THIS ISTRUE FOR ALL CASES REQUIRING FEDERAL TOLL
> AUTHORITY.
>
> 5. Is there anything in the response provided in earlyJanuary that
> you believe has changed or is interpreted differently by the new
> administration that we should be aware of?
>
> Are there some of these that you could answer easily, and would itbe
> helpful to find time to discuss some of the others? Pleaselet me
> know how you would like to address these, and if it's possible todo
> so quickly we'd appreciate it.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Colyar, James (FHWA)
> Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2009 9:59 AM
> To: Fellows, Rob
> Cc: Yung, Jessie (FHWA)
> Subject: RE: Follow-up questions from I-90 Expression of Interest (HOTM-1)
>
> Rob,
> Jessie and I are generally available today to talk, but Jessie believethat we
> would need to get our legal team’s input on the majority of thesequestions. She is
> checking now to see whether they would be available to talktoday.
> James
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Fellows, Rob [mailto:FellowR@wsdot.wa.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2009 3:27 PM
> To: Berman, Wayne (FHWA);Yung, Jessie (FHWA); Colyar, James(FHWA)
> Cc: Mathis, Daniel (FHWA);Stone, Craig
> Subject: Follow-up questions from I-90 Expression of Interest (HOTM-1)
>
> All,
>
> In early January we received a letter from Regina McElroyparticipating
to our expression of interest in tolling Interstate 90 in the Seattle area. Recently we've been asked some new questions about this topic, and we're wondering whether there are simple answers or whether we might have a short conference call to discuss them. We are meeting with legislators on this topic this Thursday, so if it's possible to learn something about these question before then it would be fantastic.

The legislators are interested in understanding the possibilities and restrictions for using toll revenues collected on I-90 to contribute to funding the parallel SR 520 bridge replacement. Here are our questions:

1. If the VPP program was not included in reauthorization, would it be possible to use a "Section 129 agreement" to establish tolls on the I-90 floating bridge and use surplus revenues generated to fund improvements on SR 520? In our expression of interest we asked about tolling a longer segment of I-90, and we were recommended to use the value pricing program (for general tolls) or the HOV program (for HOT lanes). But if we'd asked about tolling the bridge only, would the section 129 agreement be a possible avenue? If we chose that route, could we still use surplus revenues for a project on a different, parallel route, or apply funds to transit operating or capital if desired? Where it says "No" for this program for the question "manage demand by varying toll", does the answer mean tolls cannot be used to manage traffic, or that the don't need to be used to manage traffic?

2. Is there a difference between the six programs outlined in the matrix "Federal Tolling Programs - Decision Support Guidance" in regard to whether tolls can continue to be collected after the project they were intended to fund has been paid for?

3. Can you give us an estimate of how long it would take to gain authorization if requested under these programs (perhaps a range from shortest to longest time to process?)

4. We plan to tell legislators that it would not be permissible to establish a toll on a federally funded facility and use the revenues for a non-transportation use (under title 23). Are there cases where that might not be true?

5. Is there anything in the response provided in early January that you believe has changed or is interpreted differently by the new administration that we should be aware of?

Are there some of these that you could answer easily, and would it be helpful to find time to discuss some of the others? Please let me know how you would like to address these, and if it's possible to do so quickly we'd appreciate it.
I had an interesting afternoon of phone calls that all started with Christie Parker et al briefing Judy Clibborn about the 2211 work program. Next week let's discuss what is being prepared for the upcoming 2211 presentation material and our analysis of HOT lanes/full tolling of I-90. Consider this a reminder e-mail to make sure we follow-up...preferably Monday morning.

Craig

---

From: Smith, Helena Kennedy  
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 2:21 PM  
To: Dye, Dave; Arnis, Amy; Ziegler, Jennifer; Meredith, Julie  
Cc: Stone, Craig; Catron, Heather (Consultant); Singer, Rick; Caldwell, Jeff; Yao, Yanming; 'Baker, T Brent'; 'Ladner, Scott'; Auyoung, Dillon; Vaughn, Doug  
Subject: Response to Christie Parker re 520 Finance Options - need your buyoff on interpretation  
Importance: High

Somewhat separate from the 2211 work but in line with it, Christie Parker is asking WSDOT to do some additional work. She has asked for a reply by 1/11 but Amy and I want to get it to her before Christmas. In order to get things underway very quickly, I'd like you to read her request and then say if you concur with our approach. Can we get your reply if not by COB today, by 10 am Monday morning?

Also note that there are some questions we need to track down in order to do the modeling. I've indicated who I'll look to for an answer, but if others care to weigh in, please do.

Thanks!

---

Christie asked WSDOT to run a number of options. She has directed us to focus on A+ and has specified whether other funding sources are in or out of each option. Her requests have been reviewed and we are proposing how to approach each request. (Note that for all options except Option 1, we are assuming O&M costs consistent with previous 3/1/11 work and revenue to start 4/1/11.)

Detail by option.

1 - Floating bridge and landings only. We already have a response; proposal: we use scenario just tested by OST/SNW. The only difference was we assumed a March 1, 2010
2 - Floating bridge and landings + Eastside. We believe the goal is to have a funded project. Current work has shown a funding gap. Proposal:

- do this option in two pieces:
  - 2A: undo TIGER/ pontoon acceleration. Scenario 7 tolls on 520. Identify gap.
  - 2B: builds on 2A and adds in I-90 express lane tolling. I-90 reversible express toll lanes would be tolled in fiscal years 2013, 14, and 15, transitioning to outer roadway dual express toll lanes both directions (R8A) starting FY 2016. Identify gap, if any.
  - (Q#1: how big is capital investment on I-90.) (Q#2: WHEN do we need to pay for capital investment for I-90.) Need answers from Patty asap.
  - (Q#3: do we have the correctly "unaccelerated pontoon/ eastside cashflow.) Need answer from Rick.

3 - Floating bridge and landings + Westside. We believe the Westside option is as defined in A+ (i.e., not retrofit). Proposal:

- Scenario 7 tolls on SR 520. Identify gap that needs to be filled with state, federal and/or I-90 toll funding.
  - (Q#4: Does Westside definition change if we only do westside?) Need answer from Julie

4 – Overall Program. Same toll scenario as 2B above. Note: we’re assuming we keep tolling the reversible lanes for 3 yrs because it’s not cost effective to only toll I-90 for two yrs. Proposal:

- Scenario 7 tolls on SR 520. Toll reversible lanes in fiscal years 2013, 14, and 15. Start full tolling of I-90 at Scenario 7 rates starting in FY 2016. Identify gap, if any.

5 - Overall Program, assuming some TIGER grant investment. Proposal:

- Scenario 7 toll rates on SR 520. Toll reversible lanes in fiscal years 2013, 14, and 15. Start full tolling of I-90 at Scenario 7 rates starting in FY 2016. Identify gap, if any.
  - (Q#5: Is this what people think Christie means by phasing east side project?) Need answer from Dave & Julie.

6 - Overall Program. We think the remaining funding potential under Scenario 7 tollrates is approximately $500m. We need to test this. Proposal:

- Scenario 7 tolls on SR 520 against $4.65B cashflow.
fyi...will be discussing and working with Helena and SR 520 team.

I called Christie too and asked what assumptions she wanted for the Westside -- said A+. Asked what tolling assumptions she wanted -- said HOT lane center roadway, etc....I reminded her that the work group said ...."give us a couple of years to get state and federal funds, then go to full tolling I-90 if we don’t get the money". I imagine we will be providing more that just 5 financial plans.... I’m also suspecting that she will be writing a follow-up email.

---

Hi, Amy.

As you know, we will soon be in session. In order to prepare for discussions regarding 520 bridge financing, I am requesting that legislative staff be provided with five financial scenarios by the first day of session, i.e. January 11, 2010. These scenarios should be based on a tolling start date of March 19, 2011. (That said, if you believe a different date would be more reasonable, please let me know.)

The scenarios should include capital and operating costs, state funding, federal funding (without TIGER grant), toll revenue and bond proceeds for the following scenarios:

1. Floating bridge and landings
2. Floating bridge and landings + Eastside
3. Floating bridge and landings + Westside
4. Floating bridge and landings + Westside + Eastside
5. Floating bridge and landings + Eastside as a phased approach (e.g. if some TIGER funds are available or if the state can partially fund the Eastside) -- Please include an explanation of what the phased approach would look like in addition to the financing information.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about this request, please let me know. We can modify this request if necessary.

I know that this request will be time consuming, but the information is needed to provide us with options as we move through session. Your efforts to help the legislature prepare for session are truly very much appreciated!

Thank you,
Christie
NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.
This morning I am transmitting the "Christie" scenarios to the OST for analysis. They were due Friday, but more work was needed and they came in Saturday. Whatever this is all about, it would be helpful to get it resolved so we don't waste a lot of peoples time.

FYI

I had an interesting afternoon of phone calls that all started with Christie Parker etal briefing Judy Clibborn about the 2211 work program. Next week lets discuss what is being prepared for the upcoming 2211 presentation material and our analysis of HOT lanes/full tolling of I-90. Consider this a reminder e-mail to make sure we follow-up...preferably Monday morning.

Craig
Somewhat separate from the 2211 work but in line with it, Christie Parker is asking WSDOT to do some additional work. She has asked for a reply by 1/11 but Amy and I want to get it to her before Christmas. In order to get things underway very quickly, I'd like you to read her request and then say if you concur with our approach. Can we get your reply if not by COB today, by 10 am Monday morning?

Also note that there are some questions we need to track down in order to do the modeling. I've indicated who I'll look to for an answer, but if others care to weigh in, please do.

Thanks!

Christie asked WSDOT to run a number of options. She has directed us to focus on A+ and has specified whether other funding sources are in or out of each option. Her requests have been reviewed and we are proposing how to approach each request. (Note that for all options except Option 1, we are assuming O&M costs consistent with previous 3/1/11 work and revenue to start 4/1/11.)

Detail by option.

1 - Floating bridge and landings only. We already have a response; proposal: we use scenario just tested by OST/SNW. The only difference was we assumed a March 1, 2010 start date.

2 - Floating bridge and landings + Eastside. We believe the goal is to have a funded project. Current work has shown a funding gap. Proposal:

- do this option in two pieces:
  - 2A: undo TIGER/ pontoon acceleration. Scenario 7 tolls on 520. Identify gap.
  - 2B: builds on 2A and adds in I-90 express lane tolling. I-90 reversible express toll lanes would be tolled in fiscal years 2013, 14, and 15, transitioning to outer roadway dual express toll lanes both directions (R8A) starting FY 2016. Identify gap, if any.
- (Q#1: how big is capital investment on I-90.) (Q#2: WHEN do we need to pay for capital investment for I-90.) Need answers from Patty asap.
- (Q#3: do we have the correctly "unaccelerated pontoon/ eastside cashflow.) Need answer from Rick.

3 - Floating bridge and landings + Westside. We believe the Westside option is as defined in A+ (i.e., not retrofit). Proposal:

- Scenario 7 tolls on SR 520. Identify gap that needs to be filled with state, federal and/or I-90 toll funding
- (Q#4: Does Westside definition change if we only do westside?) Need answer from Julie

4 – Overall Program. Same toll scenario as 2B above. Note: we're assuming we keep tolling the reversible lanes for 3 yrs because it's not cost effective to only toll I-90 for two yrs. Proposal:

- Scenario 7 tolls on SR 520. Toll reversible lanes in fiscal years 2013, 14, and 15. Start full tolling of I-90 at Scenario 7 rates starting in FY 2016. Identify gap, if any.

5 - Overall Program, assuming some TIGER grant investment. Proposal:

- Scenario 7 toll rates on SR 520. Toll reversible lanes in fiscal years 2013, 14, and 15. Start full tolling of I-90 at Scenario 7 rates starting in FY 2016. Identify gap, if any.
- (Q#5: Is this what people think Christie means by phasing east side project?) Need answer from Dave & Julie.

6 - Overall Program. We think the remaining funding potential under Scenario 7 toll rates is approximately $500m. We need to test this. Proposal:

- Scenario 7 tolls on SR 520 against $4.65B cashflow.
financing, I am requesting that legislative staff be provided with five financial scenarios by the first day of session, i.e. January 11, 2010. These scenarios should be based on a tolling start date of March 19, 2011. (That said, if you believe a different date would be more reasonable, please let me know.)

The scenarios should include capital and operating costs, state funding, federal funding (without TIGER grant), toll revenue and bond proceeds for the following scenarios:

1. Floating bridge and landings
2. Floating bridge and landings + Eastside
3. Floating bridge and landings + Westside
4. Floating bridge and landings + Westside + Eastside
5. Floating bridge and landings + Eastside as a phased approach (e.g. if some TIGER funds are available or if the state can partially fund the Eastside) -- Please include an explanation of what the phased approach would look like in addition to the financing information.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about this request, please let me know. We can modify this request if necessary.

I know that this request will be time consuming, but the information is needed to provide us with options as we move through session. Your efforts to help the legislature prepare for session are truly very much appreciated!

Thank you,
Christie