



# AGENDA ITEM

## Public Utilities Commission

*City and County of San Francisco*



DEPARTMENT Water Enterprise AGENDA NO. 12  
 MEETING DATE April 28, 2009

**Construction Award: Regular Calendar**  
**Project Manager:** Bryan Dessaure

**Contract No. WD-2568, Award, BDPL Nos. 3&4 Crossover Facilities**

<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>Approve the plans and specifications, and award Water Enterprise Water System Improvement Program-funded Contract No. WD-2568, Bay Division Pipeline (BDPL) Nos. 3&amp;4 Crossover Facilities, for construction of three crossover facilities on the BDPL Nos. 3 and 4 in the City of Santa Clara, the Town of Atherton and the City of Palo Alto, in the amount of \$12,695,000, to the lowest, qualified, responsible and responsive bidder, Shimmick Construction; authorize the General Manager to enter into agreements necessary for the Project, including: license agreements with the Sports and Open Space Authority of the City of Santa Clara, a license agreement and a lease with the Veterans Administration/General Services Administration for construction related and permanent land use and access rights, and two temporary construction easements with the California Water Service Company; authorize the General Manager, subject to approval of the Board of Supervisors pursuant to San Francisco Charter Section 9.118, to enter into two permanent easements for water discharge/flow with California Water Service Company; and, adopt Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).</p>
<b>Background:</b>	<p>This project is provided in response to the Delivery Reliability and Seismic Reliability Levels of Service (LOS) goals established for the SFPUC system. BDPL Nos. 3 and 4 extend approximately 34 miles around the south end of San Francisco Bay. While there are currently two isolation/crossover points on these 2 critical pipelines, the distance between them is approximately 8 miles. This relatively large distance makes it difficult to take segments of pipe out of service for planned inspection and maintenance, and results in a large number of customers that may be impacted by an emergency outage of a pipeline. The purpose of this project is to add three additional isolation/crossover facilities so that the distance between them will be approximately 4 miles, making the system easier to maintain and repair, and increasing the number of customers that would be likely to receive water within 24 hours following a major seismic event.</p>
<b>Budget:</b>	<p><b>Baseline Budget:</b> \$22,370,000  <b>Engineer's Estimate:</b> \$21,500,000  <b>Award:</b> \$12,695,000  <b>Funding:</b> Project No. CUW38001, BDPL No. 3&amp;4 Crossovers</p>

<b>Schedule:</b>	<b>NTP:</b> June 15, 2009 <b>End:</b> January 7, 2013 <b>Duration:</b> One Thousand One Hundred Fifty Nine (1159) consecutive calendar days (39 months)																									
<b>HRC goals:</b>	<b>Set:</b> 13% LBE <b>Submitted:</b> 14.03% LBE																									
<b>HRC Determination:</b>	HRC's originally determined that the lowest bidder, Shimmick Construction, did not meet the LBE subcontractor participation goal set for the project. However, pursuant to the HRC Director's review of the original determination and in consultation with the Deputy City Attorney, the HRC Director reversed the original determination and finds that Shimmick Construction's bid meets the LBE subcontractor participation goal of 13%.																									
<b>Environmental Review:</b>	The San Francisco Planning Department finalized a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Project No. CUW38001, BDPL No. 3&4 Crossover Facilities, on October 23, 2008. On December 9, 2008, this Commission adopted Resolution No. 08-0225, in which it (1) adopted CEQA Findings, the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (FMND), the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and the Standard Construction Measures and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Actions. On January 27, 2009, the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered SFPUC Resolution No. 08-0225 and adopted the FMND and the SFPUC CEQA Findings as its own with respect to the Project, including the MMRP. By this Resolution, this Commission would find that since the FMND was finalized, there have been no substantial project changes and no substantial changes in project circumstances that would require major revisions to the FMND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions set forth in the FMND.																									
<b>Bid History:</b>	<b>Advertised:</b> February 13, 2009 <b>Bids Received:</b> Sealed bids were received from 9 contracting firms on March 26, 2009, as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bid Rank</th> <th>Bid Amount</th> <th>Bid Preference</th> <th>Adjusted Bid</th> <th>Adjusted Rank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Shimmick Construction</td> <td>\$12,695,000</td> <td>0%</td> <td>\$12,695,000</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. West Bay Builders</td> <td>\$12,814,800</td> <td>0%</td> <td>\$12,814,800</td> <td>Non Responsive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Mountain Cascade</td> <td>\$13,249,000</td> <td>0%</td> <td>\$13,249,000</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Steve P. Rados, Inc.</td> <td>\$13,278,000</td> <td>0%</td> <td>\$13,278,000</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Bid Rank	Bid Amount	Bid Preference	Adjusted Bid	Adjusted Rank	1. Shimmick Construction	\$12,695,000	0%	\$12,695,000	1	2. West Bay Builders	\$12,814,800	0%	\$12,814,800	Non Responsive	3. Mountain Cascade	\$13,249,000	0%	\$13,249,000	2	4. Steve P. Rados, Inc.	\$13,278,000	0%	\$13,278,000	3
Bid Rank	Bid Amount	Bid Preference	Adjusted Bid	Adjusted Rank																						
1. Shimmick Construction	\$12,695,000	0%	\$12,695,000	1																						
2. West Bay Builders	\$12,814,800	0%	\$12,814,800	Non Responsive																						
3. Mountain Cascade	\$13,249,000	0%	\$13,249,000	2																						
4. Steve P. Rados, Inc.	\$13,278,000	0%	\$13,278,000	3																						

	5. Ranger Pipeline	\$14,135,000	0%	\$14,135,000	4
	6. Monterey Mechanical	\$14,446,000	0%	\$14,446,000	5
	7. McGuire & Hester	\$14,482,000	0%	\$14,482,000	6
	8. Power Engineering	\$15,702,918	0%	\$15,702,918	7
	9. Diablo Contractors	\$21,450,000	0%	\$21,450,000	Non Responsive
	<p>Application of bid preferences do not apply to this contract as the engineer's estimate is in excess of \$10,000,000.</p> <p><b>Project Review Checklist:</b> (for WSIP contract awards only)  The attached Project Review Checklist (See Attachment A) documents all the reviews performed during the planning and design phases of Contract No. WD-2568.</p>				
<b>Description:</b>	<p>Contract work locations are City of Santa Clara, Town of Atherton and City of Palo Alto. The contract work consists of the installation of three crossover facilities constructed on BDPL Nos. 3 and 4. Each facility consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A concrete valve vault that houses four valves on the main two lines and one crossover valve</li> <li>• Four (4) 78-inch butterfly type isolation valves with electric actuators, two (2) on each BDPL, and one (1) 42-inch butterfly type crossover valve with electric actuator connecting the 2 parallel BDPLs</li> <li>• Electrical, control and communication systems</li> <li>• Back-up generator system</li> <li>• 78-inch welded steel pipe (about 40 to 50 feet on each side of the vault)</li> </ul>				
<b>Real Estate and Construction Related Agreements</b>	<p>In order to implement the Project, the SFPUC must enter into agreements with three other entities for various construction related temporary and permanent land use rights. At the City of Santa Clara site, the SFPUC would enter into agreements with the Sports and Open Space Authority of the City of Santa Clara, including (1) a license agreement for construction staging, storage of spoils and ingress and egress, valued by appraisal at \$1,700; and (2) a license agreement for discharge of water during construction. At the Town of Atherton site, the SFPUC would enter into agreements with the California Water Service Company, including (1) two temporary easements for construction staging and spoils storage, and (2) two permanent discharge/water flow easements, valued by appraisal, at \$ 1200. At the City of Palo Alto site, the SFPUC would enter into agreements with the United States General Services Administration, on behalf of the Veteran's Administration (VA), including (1) a license agreement to provide SFPUC with temporary access, construction staging and spoils storage rights, which agreement would be entered into concurrently with, and as consideration for, a lease granted by SFPUC, and (2) a lease agreement with the VA for its use of portions of the right of way for parking and recreation use, for a term of nine years at an annual rent of \$6,620 per year, subject to annual escalation rate, and SFPUC's right for ingress and egress over VA driveways for</p>				

	<p>maintenance, inspections and repairs. The resolution authorizes the General Manager to enter into these agreements, as described above, with such additional terms that are in the public interest, and in the judgment of the General Manager, in consultation with the City Attorney, are reasonable and appropriate for the scope and duration of the requested use as necessary for the Project, and approved as to form by the City Attorney. To the extent that the terms and conditions of the agreements will require SFPUC to indemnify the respective jurisdictions, those indemnity obligations are subject to the review and approval of the San Francisco Risk Manager. The resolution provides that the General Manager's authority to enter into the two permanent easements with California Water Service Company is further subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to San Francisco Charter section 9.118.</p>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	SFPUC staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached resolution.
<b>Attachments:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) SFPUC Resolution</li><li>2) HRC Memo</li><li>3) Project Review Checklist (for WSIP contract awards only)</li></ol>

WHEREAS, on January 27, 2009, the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered SFPUC Resolution No. 08-0225 and adopted the IS/FMND and the SFPUC CEQA Findings as its own with respect to the Project, including the MMRP, and directed the Clerk of the Board to forward Resolution 23-09 to the Controller; and

WHEREAS, Nine (9) bids were received and opened publicly on March 26, 2009; and

WHEREAS, SFPUC staff and Human Rights Commission ("HRC") review of the bids for qualifications, responsibility, responsiveness and application of bid preferences resulted in the establishment of Shimmick Construction, Inc. as the lowest, qualified, responsible and responsive bidder; and

WHEREAS, An HRC subcontracting goal of 13% Local Business Enterprise ("LBE") participation has been established for this contract; and

WHEREAS, The firm being awarded a contract by the SFPUC must be in compliance with the Equal Benefits Provisions of Chapter 12B of the City's Administrative Code either at the time of the award, or within 2 weeks of the date of the Commission award; failure of the bidder to obtain compliance certification from HRC may result in award of the contract to the next lowest, responsible and responsive bidder, or re-bidding of the contract at the discretion of the City; and

WHEREAS, Failure to reach successful agreement on contract terms and conditions within 60 days of the date of the Commission award may result in award of the contract to the next lowest, responsible and responsive bidder, or re-bidding of the contract at the discretion of the City; and

WHEREAS, In order to implement the Project, the SFPUC is engaged in negotiations to enter into agreements with three other entities for construction related and permanent use rights necessary for the Project; and

WHEREAS, At the City of Santa Clara site, the SFPUC will enter into agreements with the Sports and Open Space Authority of the City of Santa Clara, including (1) a license agreement for construction staging, storage of spoils and ingress and egress; and (2) a license agreement for discharge of water during construction (the "Santa Clara Agreements"); and

WHEREAS, At the Town of Atherton site, the SFPUC will enter into agreements with the California Water Service Company, including (1) two temporary easements for construction staging and spoils storage (the "California Water Temporary Easements"), and (2) two permanent discharge/water flow easements, valued by appraisal at \$1,200 (the "California Water Permanent Easements"); and

WHEREAS, At the Palo Alto site, the SFPUC will enter into agreements with the United States General Services Administration, acting on behalf of the Veteran's Administration ("VA"), including (1) a license agreement to provide SFPUC with temporary access, construction staging and spoils storage rights, which agreement would be entered into concurrently with, and as partial consideration for, a lease granted by SFPUC, and (2) a lease agreement with the VA for its use of portions of SFPUC's right of way for parking and recreation use, for a term of nine years at an annual rent of \$6,620 per year, subject to annual escalation rate, and providing for SFPUC's right for ingress and egress over the VA driveways for maintenance, inspections and repairs (the "VA License and Lease Agreements"); and

WHEREAS, Funds are available from Project No. CUW38001, BDPL 3&4 Crossovers; and

WHEREAS, The Project files, including the IS/FMND and SFPUC Resolution No. 08-0225 have been made available for review by the SFPUC and the public, and those files are part of the record before this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the IS/FMND, the findings contained in SFPUC Resolution No. 08-0225 and all written and oral information provided by the Planning Department, the public, relevant public agencies, SFPUC and other experts and the administrative files for the Project; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, The Commission has reviewed and considered the FMND and record as a whole, finds that the FMND is adequate for its use as the decision-making body for the action taken herein to award contract WD-2568 BDPL No. 3&4 Crossover Facilities and incorporates the CEQA findings contained in Resolution No. 08-0225 by this reference thereto as though set forth in this Resolution; and be it


FURTHER RESOLVED, The Commission further finds that since the FMND was finalized, there have been no substantial Project changes and no substantial changes in Project circumstances that would require major revisions to the FMND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions set forth in the FMND; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, The Commission authorizes the General Manager to enter into the Santa Clara Agreements, the California Water Temporary Easements and the VA License and Lease Agreements, as described above, with such additional terms that are in the public interest, and in the judgment of the General Manager, in consultation with the City Attorney, are reasonable and appropriate for the scope and duration of the requested use as necessary for the Project, and approved as to form by the City Attorney. To the extent that the terms and conditions of these agreements will require SFPUC to indemnify the respective jurisdictions, those indemnity obligations are subject to the review and approval of the San Francisco Risk Manager; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, The Commission authorizes the General Manager to enter into the California Water Permanent Easements, subject to the same limitations provided above with respect to the other agreements, and subject to the approval by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to San Francisco Charter section 9.118; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Commission hereby approves the plans and specifications and awards Water Enterprise Water System Improvement Program Program-funded Contract No. WD-2568, BDPL No. 3&4 Crossover Facilities, in the amount of \$12,695,000, to the lowest, qualified, responsible and responsive bidder, Shimmick Construction, Inc.

*I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its meeting of* \_\_\_\_\_ *April 28, 2009*

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael J. Joush". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Secretary, Public Utilities Commission*



Gavin Newsom  
 Mayor

Chris Iglesias  
 Executive Director

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: April 27, 2009  
 To: Harlan Kelly, Assistant General Manager, PUC  
 From: Chris Iglesias, Executive Director, HRC *Ch. Iglesias*  
 Subject: WD-2568, BDPL 3 and 4 Crossover Facilities

HRC has reviewed the bids, the application of the appropriate discounts/bonuses, and determined responsiveness to Chapter 14B.

**Bid Discount**

None of the bidders were eligible for a 10% bid discount.

**Bids**

Nine firms submitted bids as follows:

Bidder	Status	Base Bid	Adjusted Bid Taking Into Account Bid Discount
Shimmick Construction	Non-LBE	\$12,695,000	\$12,695,000
West Bay Builders	Non-LBE	\$12,814,800	\$12,814,800
Mountain Cascade	Non-LBE	\$13,249,000	\$13,249,000
Steve P. Rados, Inc.	Non-LBE	\$13,278,000	\$13,278,000
Ranger Pipelines	Non-LBE	\$14,135,000	\$14,135,000
Monterey Mechanical	Non-LBE	\$14,446,000	\$14,446,000
McGuire & Hester	Non-LBE	\$14,482,000	\$14,482,000



Power Engineering	Non-LBE	\$15,702,918	\$15,702,918
Diablo Contractors	Non-LBE	\$21,450,000	\$21,450,000

The following bids were deemed non-responsive:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Reason</u>
West Bay Builders	Not compliant with SFPUC pre-qualification requirement
Diablo Contractors	Not compliant with SFPUC pre-qualification requirement

Shimmick Construction, the lowest responsible bidder, met the 13% LBE subcontracting goal by listing the following LBE firms:

<b>Subcontractor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Listed Amount</b>	<b>Participation</b>
Eighteen Trucking	LBE	\$80,000	0.63%
Watertight Restoration	LBE	\$84,000	0.66%
Noel Fitzgibbon Masonry	LBE	\$28,000	0.22%
Brown Sheet Metals	LBE	\$490,000	3.86%
All West	LBE	\$1,110,000	8.75%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,792,000</b>	<b>14.12%</b>

Based on the foregoing, HRC has determined that Shimmick Construction has complied with pre-award HRC 14B requirements and is eligible for award of this contract.

Should you have any questions, or if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at 252-2511.

# ATTACHMENT A

## Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) Quality Management Program PROJECT REVIEW CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION			
Project Name: <u>BDPL 3rd CROSSOVERS</u>	Project No.: <u>CUN 380.01</u>		
Region: <u>BAY DIVISION</u>	Date: <u>2/9/09</u>		
PM Name: <u>BRYAN DESSAURE</u>	PM Phone No.: <u>551-4619</u>		
PE Name: <u>BILL WONG</u>	PE Phone No.: <u>551-4879</u>		
Design Performed By: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SFPUC-EMB <input type="checkbox"/> City Department <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant (check all that apply)			
REQUIRED REVIEWS			
<b>Technical Peer Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed	
AAR: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>5/19/06</u>	35%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>8/27/07</u>
CER: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>10/17/06</u>	65%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>1/7/08</u>
DCR: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>6/7/07</u>	95%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>7/24/08</u>
<b>Cost Estimate Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed	
35%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>11/6/07</u>	95%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>10/7/08</u>
<b>Independent Technical Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed	
35%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>3/17/07</u>	95%: By: <u>CDM</u>	Date: <u>11/7/08</u>
65%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>3/21/08</u>		
<b>Constructibility Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed	
35%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>1/19/07</u>	95%: By: <u>JACOBS</u>	Date: <u>1/30/09</u>
65%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>4/2/08</u>		
<b>Steering Committee Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed	
AAR: By: <u>PM</u>	Date: <u>6/27/06</u>	95%: By: <u>PM</u>	Date: <u>12/10/08</u>
CER: By: <u>PM</u>	Date: <u>11/19/06</u>		
<b>Important:</b> If "All Completed" box is not checked for all required reviews, attach explanation to checklist.			
AS NEEDED REVIEWS			
<b>Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) Reviews</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Completed	
Briefly Describe Reviews: <u>N/A</u>			
<b>Value Engineering Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Completed	
35%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>4/20/07</u>		
<b>Project Management Reviews</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Completed	
Briefly Describe Reviews: <u>COURTESY REVIEW BY SANTA CLARA, CALIFORNIA</u> <u>VA HOSPITAL OF 95% DESIGN 2/11/08</u>			
SIGNATURES			
Project Manager (PM): <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2/7/09</u>		
Project Engineer (PE): <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2/10/09</u>		
WSIP Director: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2/10/09</u>		

**Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) Quality Management Program  
PROJECT REVIEW CHECKLIST**

PROJECT INFORMATION			
Project Name: <u>BDPL 304 CROSSOVERS</u>	Project No.: <u>CVW 380.01</u>		
Region: <u>BAY DIVISION</u>	Date: <u>2/9/09</u>		
PM Name: <u>BRYAN DESSAURE</u>	PM Phone No.: <u>551-4619</u>		
PE Name: <u>BILL WONG</u>	PE Phone No.: <u>551-4879</u>		
Design Performed By: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SFPUC-EMB <input type="checkbox"/> City Department <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant (check all that apply)			
REQUIRED REVIEWS			
<b>Technical Peer Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed			
AAR: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>5/19/06</u>	35%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>8/27/07</u>
CER: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>10/17/06</u>	65%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>1/7/08</u>
DCR: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>6/7/07</u>	95%: By: <u>EMB</u>	Date: <u>7/24/08</u>
<b>Cost Estimate Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed			
35%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>11/8/07</u>	95%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>7/27/08</u>
<b>Independent Technical Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed			
35%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>8/17/07</u>	95%: By: <u>CDM</u>	Date: <u>11/7/08</u>
65%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>8/21/08</u>		
<b>Constructibility Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed			
35%: By: <u>CMR</u>	Date: <u>1/19/07</u>	95%: By: <u>JACOBS</u>	Date: <u>1/30/09</u>
65%: By: <u>CMR</u>	Date: <u>4/2/08</u>		
<b>Steering Committee Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Some Completed <input type="checkbox"/> None Completed			
AAR: By: <u>PM</u>	Date: <u>6/27/06</u>	95%: By: <u>PM</u>	Date: <u>12/12/08</u>
CER: By: <u>PM</u>	Date: <u>11/14/06</u>		
Important: If "All Completed" box is not checked for all required reviews, attach explanation to checklist.			
AS NEEDED REVIEWS			
<b>Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) Reviews</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Completed			
Briefly Describe Reviews: <u>N/A</u>			
<b>Value Engineering Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Completed			
35%: By: <u>PARSONS</u>	Date: <u>4/20/07</u>		
<b>Project Management Reviews</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Completed			
Briefly Describe Reviews: <u>COURTESY REVIEW BY SANTA CLARA, CALIFORNIA</u> <u>VA HOSPITAL OF 95% DESIGN</u> <u>8/11/08</u>			
SIGNATURES			
Project Manager (PM): <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2/7/09</u>		
Project Engineer (PE): <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2/10/09</u>		
WSIP Director: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2/10/09</u>		