

Hackmann, Richard

From: mrhgoblue@aol.com
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2010 10:13 PM
To: IBRC
Subject: Reply to Richard Hackman's December 17 E-mail

I am replying to two parts of the e-mail and will address the third later.

I have reviewed at Attachment C dated 12-15-2010. I thought of one more question to put into the mix. It would be included in Section III under **Project Related Questions**.

• Are there any requirements, specifications or procedures (the "Palo Alto Process) in our bid documents that go out to potential contractors that could be modified or eliminated to significantly reduce the cost of capital projects without really compromising the quality of the final product?

The second item I will address here is Le's proposed reformatting of the information in Attachment D:

I feel that conceptually the format that Le has presented is a good one and will help the Commission start to put our arms around the issue and allow us to productively proceed with or mission. So my comments are more in the mode of suggested refinements.

• I suggest that the final two columns (F and G) be modified as follows: The overall title should Projected (or Anticipated) Funding. The two sub-headings: available (or identified) and the second one shortfall (or gap).

• Within the sub-column Available, it would be helpful if the source of fund would be identified right next to it. This could be done with letters corresponding to the 6 sources of funding identified in Attachment H (a = gas tax, b = grants....etc.)

• I like the idea of 000's of dollars because the use of 6 or 7 significant figures for costs to the nearest dollar is absurd and for me calls the number into question. I would even be more comfortable if the numbers were in millions with no more than 3 or 4 significant figures.

That's it for now.

Mark Harris