
From: Smith, Helena Kennedy
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 7:33 AM
To: White, John; Greco, Theresa
Cc: Stone, Craig; Paananen, Ron
Subject: RE: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWV contingency

Thanks. Can I have the reply by noon?

From: White, John
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 5:54 PM
To: Smith, Helena Kennedy; Greco, Theresa
Cc: Stone, Craig; Paananen, Ron
Subject: RE: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWV contingency

Helena,

We'll work on the contingency question tomorrow, it is more complicated than it may seem in that it has been fluctuating as we nail down the scope of the portal connections.

John

From: Smith, Helena Kennedy
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 4:44 PM
To: Greco, Theresa; White, John
Cc: Stone, Craig
Subject: RE: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWV contingency

If the "most probable cost" is \$1.9B, what's the contingency?

From: Greco, Theresa
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 4:41 PM
To: Smith, Helena Kennedy; White, John
Cc: Stone, Craig
Subject: RE: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWV contingency

Hi there. We did not assume additional funding because we are generating similar information in the Environmental Impact Statement process. Since we will include tolling in the EIS, the subsequent traffic analysis will already be generated. Similarly, public outreach is a key aspect and requirement of the EIS and we will use existing open houses and public meetings to cover the tolling aspects of the bill.

With regard to her last question question, we identified an expected cost range between \$1.4 billion to \$2.2 billion for the bored tunnel. We are relying on the most probable cost within that range at \$1.9 billion.

From: Smith, Helena Kennedy
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 3:38 PM
To: White, John; Greco, Theresa
Cc: Stone, Craig

7/2/2009

Subject: Fw: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWW contingency

Can you answer the question re contingency? (The question makes more sense if you read the entire email below.)

From: Stone, Craig
To: Smith, Helena Kennedy
Sent: Mon Mar 16 15:33:11 2009
Subject: FW: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWW contingency

Helena?

From: Leathers, Kathryn [mailto:Leathers.Kathryn@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 9:41 AM
To: Stone, Craig
Subject: SB 5768 fiscal note - AWW contingency

Hi, Craig. SB 5768 is scheduled for a hearing in the House on Wednesday, 3/18. I'm trying to anticipate questions from the Members, and am hoping you can help me with the fiscal note assumption that the cost to perform the tolling/traffic analysis and public outreach (\$550K - \$750K) is assumed to be absorbed in the existing project budget. I assume that since tolling the facility is a somewhat new idea, that performing this work is one of those unanticipated costs that would be covered in the built-in "cushion" (contingency funding).

The question I anticipate getting is, "What is the total contingency amount/percentage build into the Viaduct project budget?"

Thanks for your help.
Kathryn