
From: Day, Elizabeth <FTA>
To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
CC: Riklin, Sherry <FTA>
Sent: 7/10/2008 3:15:13 PM
Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

Ron -- when I said we could process a FD approval in 30 days, it was assuming we did not have to redo the financial or land use assessments. What you have written below differs from what you said during our meeting with the Honolulu folks (in your email you are saying a revised financial assessment will be done). I am concerned about some other matters with this project that I think need to be discussed during the NS bi-weekly mtg next Wednesday. This relates to when we require MOSs versus a single FFGA for a multi-phased project. I want to make sure we are treating this project in the same way we have treated others.

From: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
Sent: Thu 7/10/2008 6:01 PM
To: Nguyen, Kim <FTA>
Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Bell, John <FTA>; Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

All,

We met with the Honolulu project team today to discuss the travel forecasts and the status of the project. Highlights:

- The travel forecasts look pretty good. Some minor refinements may be made but with a cost effectiveness of \$19.87, it appears that cost effectiveness is acceptable, and the mega-risk assessment effort should be initiated.
- Between meetings I talked to Toru about the capital cost update. He said that there are working papers that describe the updates that have been made to the cost estimate reviewed by Booz. Those plus the materials that Booz reviewed are the materials that can be the basis of the mega-risk assessment review. I assured him that FTA is not asking for more work on updating the capital cost than what has already been done.
- Kim Nguyen told Honolulu staff that they could expect a finding from that review about 90 days after it is initiated.
- That means a PE request could be sent to FTA around October 10 if there are no serious cost problems.
- We told the project sponsor that Kim would be their contact for the mega-risk assessment, that the contractor for that effort would not be Booz, and that Booz will continue to be the PMO, but the next assessment in PE would be done by the risk assessment contractor.
- Beth Day said processing the request could take 30 days meaning they could be in PE in time for the Annual Report if there are no problems. Honolulu staff would like to be in the Report.
- We should receive a DEIS Aug 4. On Aug 12, Honolulu staff will come to SF to essentially go over the highlights of that document in an effort to facilitate FTA review. There may be a quarterly at that time as well, but Toru said the PMO has not been notified of that.
- The financial plan will be updated as there were some problems with farebox revenue projections.

Ron

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

From: Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2008 1:00 PM

To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Bell, John <FTA>

Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

Ron,

During the conference call on March 7th (attached above), we've raised the reliability question regarding the cost estimate reviewed by Booz Allen since it was based on assumptions coupled with many unknown project elements and the discussion of having the PMOC performs a Risk Assessment after the FMOC's determination of the project sponsor's ability to fund the project using their estimates. Even if we did not request a cost update from the grantee, I think it's reasonable to request an update given the project status/conditions have varied. This is normally handled via the region.

A pre-PE cost review using Risk Assessment products will look at grantee's technical capacity and capability, project cost, scope and schedule. The basis for performing this review is the project readiness, and we need the following information from the grantee:

- A defined vehicle technology, which has not been determined and is an essential element in determining project readiness.
- A travel forecasts/modeling is wrapped up.

The Risk Assessment review is to confirm/verify that the project has forecasts, and scoping the project to meet the forecast. TPM wants to ensure a solid scope, cost and schedule, as the type and number of vehicles is a considerable driver in scope and cost. It may not worth investing the time and resources to do the review if we are still waiting for information and the project is not ready.

Both Aaron and I will be present at today's meeting with the project sponsor and can answer any additional questions, as appropriate.

Kim

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

From: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>

Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2008 9:48 AM

To: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

Kim,

Can you clarify what TPM wants to use as the basis for the cost review?

Ron

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

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 6:31 PM

To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

Ron: My understanding from the visit here in SF by the Honolulu folks is that they were going to "refresh" their two year old budget as well as further define their financial plan that supports the refreshed budget, and to be included in the submission of the upcoming DEIS to us. This would support any subsequent PMOC cost reviews that TPM is currently setting up. I agree that anything more than that is not encouraged considering this stage of the project unless someone else otherwise weighs in.

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

From: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 2:00 PM

To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Zakel, Anthony <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>

Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

I am not aware of such a request from region 9. Is this from TPM? Should be clarified and resolved in any case. (Let's blame Tony since he is no longer with FTA)

Nadeem S. Tahir, P.E., CCM.

Director, Office of Program Management and Oversight U.S.D.O.T. Federal Transit Administration, Region IX

201 Mission Street, Ste 1650

San Francisco, CA 94105

415-744-3113 (w), 301-928-3288 (c) 415-744-2726 (fax)

AR00144455

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

From: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 1:52 PM

To: Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Zakel, Anthony <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Subject: RE: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

All,

Our meeting with Honolulu staff is still scheduled for July 10 to review the project travel forecasts. I have also conveyed the financial plan assessment to the project sponsor - the project just meets an acceptable rating. Our consultant has reviewed the O&M cost methodology and has discussed corrections with Honolulu consultants. Finally, I understand from Toru that FTA has asked for all the capital costs of the project to be updated for our cost review that we would initiate if the travel forecasts look reasonable. If that in fact is what is desired, I think we need to back away from that request as it should have been made months ago and could take considerable effort by the project sponsor to accomplish that.

Can someone clarify if that was our request to them? I have always understood that the cost review would occur on the cost estimate reviewed by Booz Allen and have said that to the project sponsor.

Rpn

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

From: Sukys, Raymond <FTA>

Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2008 6:58 PM

To: Zakel, Anthony <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Subject: Honolulu - pre-PE cost review?

Hi Tony,

I spoke to Leslie about readiness and it really should be dependent on the outcome of an upcoming meeting with Jim Ryan on forecasting. If it appears that this element is very close to being ready then steps should be to start the pre-PE cost review. Otherwise, if there are going to be long delays due to a forecasting problem, it would not make sense to begin the cost review in the near term. Also, it seems that most of the other readiness elements are basically satisfied.

Ray

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

From: Zakel, Anthony <FTA>

Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2008 5:11 AM

To: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Subject: RE: honolulu Status?

Nadeem:

Kim is currently working on the TO, and will coordinate dates with you. Per our discussion at the Engineers' Meeting, a pre-PE review using our PG products will be conducted for the grantees technical capacity and capability, and the project scope schedule and cost.

However, the one thing we do want to see is that Leslie feels that this project is ready to enter PE. Per our discussion (and also the confab last fall), that is essentially the "trigger" for us to spend the time/resources to do the review. As the TRO is much closer to the project than we are in HQ, you probably have a better handle on the readiness of this project.

Lastly, the PMOC assigned to perform the review may or may not be BAH. We will look at which PMOC's do not have a COI in Honolulu, and will make the assignment based upon availability and cost (to a lesser extent). Our experiences from Dulles and Seattle have shown the benefits of having a second set of eyes, so to speak, on the project.

We will work with you this week to complete the Task Order. Hopefully, this e-mail clarifies some of the issues flying around. Thanks.

Tony

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

From: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 11:19 AM

To: Nguyen, Kim <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Zakel, Anthony <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Subject: RE: honolulu Status?

Kim: Please let me know what is being done to initiate the risk assessment for Honolulu. Last week I was informed that a task order would be issued this week to get this going. I would like to review the works scope, level of effort, task duration and what specific data will be requested from the grantee. If a team discussion is being considered, please let me know as well. Thanks.

Nadeem S. Tahir, P.E., CCM.

Director, Office of Program Management and Oversight U.S.D.O.T. Federal Transit Administration, Region IX

201 Mission Street, Ste 1650

AR00144457

San Francisco, CA 94105

415-744-3113 (w), 301-928-3288 (c) 415-744-2726 (fax)

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

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2008 7:29 AM

To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>

Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>; Zakel, Anthony <FTA>; Day, Elizabeth <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; James, Aaron <FTA>; OConnor, Mike <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

Subject: RE: honolulu

FYI to our New Starts team leader and members for this project. Ray appropriately reminded the Honolulu folks yesterday of the importance to not lose sight of the need to resolve any outstanding modeling issues as well. They stated they plan on visiting with Jim R on this very subject.

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

From: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2008 7:14 AM

To: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Subject: Re: honolulu

They mentioned 4 or 5 products technical capacity, cost risk etc. I will get clarification. Not sure it is bah. Could be someone else. Will find out.

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

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

To: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

Sent: Thu Jun 12 09:43:40 2008

Subject: Re: honolulu

Nadeem: Thanks for following up. We'll advise the grantee soon. Are we going with BAH as the risk assessor, or another PMOC? Also, do we know what element of PG-40 we are going to scope for this portion of the risk assessment? In other words, do we know what we want, and what more we expect from our grantee to support our PMOC's review effort. And finally, note that when several staffers from Honolulu were here yesterday as I mentioned to you, they told us they plan on submitting to us for review their steel wheel, Salt Lake, 19.5 mile project alignment DEIS in early August 2008. We together thought that maybe we invite our grantee and our PMOC to SF later in August to hear our grantee present to us the key elements of the DEIS and discuss other project readiness issues to support their upcoming request to enter into PE by this coming fall. You may want to give Cathy/Frank/Justine/Kim/Tony a heads up of this probable "quarterly like" meeting. Maybe Kim and/or Tony can make it here. Also, we need to be far enough along, thus the need to expedite, this risk assessment effort to support our PE

AR00144458

approval process. We can get Cathy and Ted together in July to coordinate the agenda, 18th floor conference timing, etc, etc. Please pass on, and we'll see you guys back from DC on Monday.

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

From: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

To: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

Sent: Thu Jun 12 09:20:44 2008

Subject: Re: honolulu

Talked to tony w/ cathy. They have decided to proceed with risk analysis and kim will issue task order on monday. We will work with her to expedite.

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

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>

To: Tellis, Ray <FTA>; Zakel, Anthony <FTA>

Cc: Barros, Philoki <FTA>; Davis, Jeffrey <FTA>; Hunt, John <FTA>; Lee Lorenzo, Charlene CL <FTA>; Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Lyubovny, Alla <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Kalt, William <FTA>

Sent: Wed Jun 11 11:34:24 2008

Subject: FW: Technical Expectations of the PMOC

My Lord! This presentation does hit the nail on the head, and supports many of our topics we discussed Monday afternoon in our pre-meeting session.

Tony: This is excellent, and reflects several of the "expectations" we aired within our own Region IX "TOM/PMOC Huddle" last year if you recall. I left you a long winded voicemail with a couple of thoughts from this end, and I'll miss hearing this presentation. Have a great meeting!

From: Tellis, Ray [<mailto:Ray.Tellis@fhwa.dot.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2008 9:21 PM

To: Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>

Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>

Subject: FW: Technical Expectations of the PMOC

Ed/Nadeem:

This presentation is good for discussions on the management of the PMOC contracts for Region 9. Too bad we didn't have it in time for our pre-engineer's meeting conference call. Please share as appropriate.

Thanks.

Ray

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

From: Zakel, Anthony <FTA>

To: Bell, John <FTA>; Hopson, Melody <FTA>; Herre, Susan <FTA>; Tellis, Raymond <FTA>

Cc: Reese, Gertrina <FTA>

Sent: Tue Jun 10 14:13:33 2008

Subject: Technical Expectations of the PMOC

Attached is the presentation on the discussion panel for Technical Expectations of the PMOC. The panel discussion format will be similar to last year, so please come up with some questions/answers to engage the audience in a dialogue of the attached issues, as well as any other issues you may have regarding this matter. Thanks, and see you tomorrow.

Anthony Zakel

Team Leader - General Engineer

Office of Program Management, TPM-20

Federal Transit Administration

Tel: (202) 493-0514

Fax: (202) 366-3394