



LACCD OFFICE OF THE  
**INSPECTOR GENERAL**  
INTEGRITY \* TRUST \* COMMUNICATION

***CONFIDENTIAL REPORT***

# **Investigation Report**

## *Award of Waterline Relocation Work to FTR*



LACCD OFFICE OF THE  
**INSPECTOR GENERAL**

INTEGRITY \* TRUST \* COMMUNICATION

August 12, 2011

Chancellor Dr. Daniel J. LaVista  
Los Angeles Community College District  
770 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Chancellor LaVista:

This is the Office of Inspector General's Investigation Report on the Award of Waterline Work to FTR at Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC).

This Investigation Report addresses allegations of preferential treatment or favoritism towards FTR International in the award of change order work at Mission College.

The Office of Inspector General's investigation found evidence of a violation of the California False Claims Act (GC 12650) that has been acknowledged and verified by FTR International and the Campus Project Manager from Gateway Science and Engineering (GSE).

I appreciate the cooperation extended to us during this investigation.

Sincerely,

Christine E. Marez  
Inspector General  
Los Angeles Community College District

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ALLEGATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INVESTIGATION APPROACH .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>REPORT DISTRIBUTION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>EXHIBITS .....</b>	<b>11</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The investigation by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) of change orders and payments to FTR International (FTR) to relocate the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (DWP) waterline on the Los Angeles Mission College East Campus is complete.

The OIG's investigation has verified, and FTR has acknowledged, that FTR invoiced and certified as being 90% complete the change order work to relocate the on-site DWP waterline and was paid \$1,232,630.93 for the work. The change order was processed without any approval sign-offs on the invoice from either the Architect of Record or Inspector of Record<sup>1</sup> acknowledging completion of the work. FTR has acknowledged that the work had not been performed. This appears to constitute a violation of the California False Claims Act (GC 12650).

FTR asserts that the amount invoiced and paid for on the change order was done at the specific direction of the Campus Project Manager, Gateway Science and Engineering (GSE) to fund work on two other construction field orders that GSE's had not yet processed and was intended to pay for FTR's other completed change order work. GSE has also acknowledged that the work had not been performed.

The scope of work for the waterline relocation was eventually de-scoped by GSE in a subsequent change order and the amount credited back to the contract, less \$30,000 for FTR's claimed administrative costs.

The OIG's investigation has also found substantiating documentation of several other irregularities that occurred:

1. An award of change order work was given to FTR that was not related to the original contract scope of work, bypassing the public bid process.
2. Prejudice and predetermination existed in selecting and awarding the change order to FTR to perform the waterline relocation work.
3. GSE directed another contractor (Pankow) to subcontract FTR to relocate the waterline.
4. FTR contracted for work without the pre-qualifications required by DWP to work on DWP's systems.
5. The CPM (GSE) refused to allow substitution of FTR with a DWP prequalified firm.

The OIG finds that the actions and decisions of GSE increased the cost to relocate the DWP waterline from \$500,000 to over \$1,400,000 with additional potential delay costs still to be determined.

Based on the findings of this investigation, the OIG recommends that the District consider:

- Initiating proceedings to review the California False Claims Act violation, and take appropriate actions regarding FTR and GSE.

---

<sup>1</sup> FTR issued a credit for this work, which was never performed, approximately 12 months later in Change Order No. 3 and six (6) months after having received the payment.

- Establishing or enforcing a policy that ensures no change orders are issued for work not located within the project limits (i.e., offsite improvements) as defined on the DSA approved plans for the contract or in the LACCD contract documents.

The OIG further recommends initiation of a more in-depth investigation of GSE overall management of projects at the Los Angeles Mission College.

## **ALLEGATION**

---

Preferential treatment or favoritism towards FTR International is alleged in the unilateral award of a number of change orders for work at the Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) East College Campus based on directions or decisions of the Campus Project Management firm.

This investigation addresses the allegations that a change order was issued and paid to FTR under Contract 70302 to relocate a 24" DWP waterline for just under \$1,000,000 although the work was never done; and that a subsequent change order was issued to FTR by another contractor (Pankow) at the direction of GSE under Contract 32232 to relocate the same 24" DWP waterline at a cost of over \$1,400,000.

## **BACKGROUND**

---

The expansion of LAMC, funded by Propositions A, AA, and state funds, required the acquisition of additional property. LAMC had initially negotiated with Los Angeles County to acquire a portion of the adjacent El Cariso Regional Park; however, in 2006, discussions with Los Angeles County were unsuccessful and were abandoned. Subsequently, two parcels of undeveloped land, containing a total of roughly six (6) acres, were quickly identified and purchased in order to meet the state fund requirements.

The two contiguous parcels are located approximately 1/3 mile southeast of the main campus. Both parcels were bisected by a DWP 24" waterline, bearing roughly north to south, through the center of the site. This waterline was constructed in 1917 and is a major water supplier for the San Fernando Valley.

The new site, commonly referred to as the East Campus, was to accommodate several new structures; including the Health and Physical Education/Fitness Center building, the Math and Science building, and a parking structure.

## **INVESTIGATION APPROACH**

---

To start the investigation, extensive documentation relating to the allegation was obtained and reviewed. This review included change orders, invoice payments, e-mails of parties involved, site plans, master plans, and other related documents.

Interviews were conducted with the following parties during which aspects of the waterline relocation work and Change Order #1 were discussed:

- Curtis Bywater, Construction Administration, Cannon Design
- Bill Conelli, Project Manager, GSE
- Jennifer Delgado, Project Manager (DSA), Cannon Design
- Craig Hamilton, AOR, Cannon Design

- Khal Jalade, LAMC Project Manager, FTR
- George Johnson, Current Campus Project Manager, GSE
- Nizar Katbi, President/CEO, FTR
- Chris McCarthy, IOR, Converse Consultants
- Jim Peschi, Project QA/QC, Cannon Design
- Victor Vaslavsky, PM, GSE
- Alysén Weiland, Project Civil Engineer, Psomas

## **FINDINGS**

---

The following section provides detailed and comprehensive account and findings of events and information obtained, reviewed and analyzed to support the investigation conclusions and recommendations.

### **Early Waterline Relocation Planning**

The requirement to relocate the DWP waterline was established when a parking lot to support temporary bungalows being located on the East Campus site was proposed to be constructed over the existing DWP waterline (Exhibit 1). On February 7, 2007, LAMC submitted a request to DWP to construct the proposed parking structure over the DWP waterline (Exhibit 2, V1). On March 17, 2007, LAMC received a letter from DWP denying its request and recommending no construction or grading work be done within DWP's easement area (Exhibit 2, V2, and V3).

Psomas was subsequently retained to prepare a design to relocate the DWP waterline. In the January 9, 2008 project meeting minutes for FTR Contract 70302, Item No. 10 reports that Psomas would complete the design in February 2008; however, Psomas was to submit its 50% design drawings to FTR for pricing. These meeting minutes also note that DWP had already proposed to relocate its waterline for \$500,000 with project duration of 120 days. Psomas, however, recommended Psomas, itself, complete the design allowing the District to avoid using DWP for constructing the relocated waterline (Exhibit 2, V5.4, and V5.5).

On February 7, 2008, in an email from Campus Project Manager Nick Quintanilla to Alysén Mayes, Psomas' Design Engineer, he advised that the work would be bid out (Exhibit 2, V6); however, on March 5, 2008, in an e-mail from Alyson Mayes, Psomas advised Nick Quintanilla of the DWP prequalification requirements for contractors working on DWP systems (Exhibit 2, V7).

### **Authorization of Change Order Work to FTR**

On May 9, 2008, Field Order #1 was issued to FTR adding the DWP waterline relocation to FTR's Health and Physical Education Facility contract (Exhibit 3). In a May 26, 2008 email from Nick Quintanilla to Steve Bell, CPM Project Manager, and others regarding FTR's completion of the PE Building, reference is made to ensuring that there are no "hang ups" with

the DWP application to relocate the waterline (Exhibit 2, V8.1). On May 27, 2008, Change Order #1 under FTR Contract 70302 was issued (Exhibit 4).

On August 11, 2008, FTR submitted Invoice #14 (Exhibit 5.1 - 5.17<sup>2</sup>) that included the payment of \$1,232,730.927 for Change Order #1 work identified and certified as being 90% complete (Exhibit 5.16/5.16a). On August 22, 2008, Invoice #14 was paid with Check #000504090 (Exhibit 5.2).

On December 23, 2008, drawings for the fabrication of the waterline pipe prepared for FTR by Relax Afternoon LLC were completed; though not checked (Exhibit 6)<sup>3</sup>. The date of the drawing completion is roughly four (4) months after FTR's submittal of Invoice #14, in which it had certified that installation of the pipeline was 90% complete.

### **East Campus Project - Waterline Relocation Work**

On January 15, 2009, Pankow was awarded Design Build Contract 32232 for the East Campus Complex project.

On February 23, 2009, an e-mail from Steve Bell reports that the Psomas design shop drawings would be returned shortly and that FTR had reported that it had submitted all required paperwork to DWP for prequalification when FTR had been issued Change Order #1 (Exhibit 7, S1.1). The latter comment was in response to an attached e-mail dated January 9, 2009, in which DWP advised FTR at a pre-construction meeting that FTR had not submitted all required items, including insurance documentation, letter of credit guarantee, street restoration fee, etc. (Exhibit 7, S1.3).

On March 26, 2009, the CPM issued Field Order #114 to FTR to retract the DWP waterline relocation work from its Contract 70302 for the Health and P.E. Fitness Building (Exhibit 8).

On April 14, 2009, Nick Quintanilla directed Steve Bell to tell Pankow to meet with FTR regarding the pipeline relocation change order as FTR was already "prequalified" by DWP and it made sense for them to do the work (Exhibit 7m S2.1). On April 22, 2009, Nick Quintanilla directed Steve Bell to have Cannon Design complete their design work for the pipeline relocation and give it to FTR for pricing "...before we take the pipeline relocation CO back from them." (Exhibit 7, S3.1).

Change Order #3 to FTR Contract 70302, which includes a \$930,000 credit for the DWP waterline relocation, as well as a number of other additional change order work charges that still result in \$840,360.30 of added costs, was issued on August 10, 2009 (Exhibit 9).

### **Delays Due to FTR "Not Qualified" by DWP to Perform Work**

On November 24, 2009, an email from CPM Project Manager James Anderson to Kevin Smith advised that the FTR shop drawings for the waterline pipe fabrication had been submitted to DWP for review and approval, but that FTR still had not completed the DWP prequalification

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that the Change Order attached to the submitted invoice, Exhibit 5.17, is missing the required signatures and dates and that the "official" executed signatures would appear to have been altered.

<sup>3</sup> Only the cover sheet of the 26 sheet drawing set has been presented in Exhibit 6. The key information relevant to this investigation of dates drawn and date checked is duplicated on each page in the title block. **This is significant in that the drawings needed to manufacture the pipe used in the Change Order FTR certified, as having been 90% complete in Invoice #14 on August 11, 2008 had not even been completed.**

(Exhibit 10, J19.2). In a follow-up email, Nick Quintanilla directed James Anderson to contact Pankow and ensure the company that it (the pre-qualification) had been done (Exhibit 10, 19.1).

On December 7, 2009, Nick Quintanilla forwarded an e-mail from James Anderson to Nazir Katbi, FTR President and CEO, noting that FTR still had not submitted the required paperwork to DWP for prequalification, had made significant changes to Pankow's proposed contract, (including some DWP fabrication requirements) and would not commit to the required project schedule/duration. The e-mail also contains notes that Pankow had identified another contractor already prequalified by DWP that would sign Pankow's proposed contract including the proposed time for installation, and that Pankow was requesting GATEWAY allow Pankow to substitute them for FTR (Exhibit 10, J5.1).

### **Waterline Pipe Manufacturing Issues**

On December 22, 2009, the James Anderson authorized FTR to order the pipe from its foreign (Chinese) supplier (Exhibit 10, J4).

On December 29, 2009, Pankow advised the project team that FTR had threatened to delay the pipe order as Pankow had not signed a contract with FTR incorporating FTR's proposed changes, including DWP's requirement for cathodic protection of the pipe, and the required performance period (Exhibit 10, 10.1).

On December 30, 2009, FTR submitted a \$225,000 pay application to Pankow and a proposed schedule (Exhibit 10, J11.1).

On January 5, 2010, in an e-mail from Rick Schutter (Pankow) to the project team, he presented an analysis of FTR's new proposed schedule which indicated the work would not be complete until April or May, after the DWP cut-over/tie-in March deadline, which was the start of DWP's summer high water demand period (Exhibit 10, J6 and J7).

An e-mail from James Anderson to FTR on February 15, 2010 noted that fabrication of the pipe would continue after the Chinese New Year in response to an attached e-mail from Pankow inquiring about the status of the pipe manufacturing (Exhibit 10, J15.1 and J15.2). In the attached e-mail chain are notes that DPW dispatched an inspector to China on January 29, 2010 and that, based on the most current production schedule, the pipe would not arrive on-site until sometime in April (Exhibit 10, J15.4).

On March 26, 2010, Pankow was issued Change Order #2 in the amount of \$1,403,753 that authorized Pankow to utilize FTR as a subcontractor to relocate the DWP waterline (Exhibit 11).

On April 2, 2010, in an e-mail to Nick Quintanilla, James Anderson reported that the waterline pipe being manufactured in China did not meet a number of DWP specifications and requirements and could not be used on the project (Exhibit 10, J17).

On May 7, James Anderson forwarded to Nick Quintanilla the proposal from JIFCO, which was one of two prequalified firms identified to FTR by Pankow to manufacture the waterline pipe (Exhibit 10, J18.9 & J18.10). Included in the e-mail string was correspondence between FTR and Pankow on April 3, 2010, regarding Pankow's notice of potential default by FTR due to its inability to meet the agreed schedule. FTR threatened to stop the pipe manufacturing and implied Pankow was attempting to take the work away from them (Exhibit 10, J18.5 and J18.4).

On July 19, 2011, the OIG staff conducted a telephone interview with Alysen Weiland, Project Civil Engineer for the DWP waterline relocation. Ms. Weiland was the Waterline Relocation Project's primary interface with DWP starting in early 2007 through completion of the relocation in 2010. Ms. Weiland advised that DWP had approved a plan for relocation of its waterline in October of 2008, which was two (2) months after submittal of Invoice #14. When Pankow was awarded the Design Build contract for the East Campus Complex Project, its site grading plans required abandonment of the DWP approved plans and the reconfiguration and design of the waterline. The revised plans eventually used for the relocation were approved by DWP in December of 2009.

## **OIG Interview Findings**

On July 18, 2011, the OIG staff met with Chris McCarthy, the Inspector of Record (IOR) for the FTR project, at his current project site, to discuss the absence of his signature on FTR's Invoice #14. Mr. McCarthy said he refused to sign the invoice, because it included work for Change Order #1. He said at that time he had never seen, or had been provided, a copy of the change order, had no idea what the work was and if it had been done, and therefore would not sign-off on the work. When asked if he could verify that any of the Change Order #1 work had been done, Mr. McCarthy confirmed that the over excavation and other site work on the change order was done, even though he believed the work as a change order was unnecessary. He did not believe the waterline relocation work had ever been done since it would have needed his approval as IOR, and the original project plans had no impact on the waterline. Mr. McCarthy also related that there were other times when he was pressured to sign FTR's invoices for inflated percentage completions, was labeled a racist by the contractor at one meeting; and the project still has not been completed and received a 100% DSA Form 6.

On July 18, 2011, the OIG staff met in the Cannon Design offices with Craig Hamilton, Architect of Record (AOR), Curtis Bywater (Construction Administration), Jim Peschi, (QA/QC) and Jennifer Delgado (Project Manager, DSA) to discuss the Cannon disclaimer on FTR's Invoice #14. The Cannon staff related that they attached the disclaimer at the bottom of invoices to reflect that, in its assessment, Cannon Design had not believed the invoice accurately reflected the actual level of completion. When asked about Change Order #1, Mr. Bywater stated Cannon had never seen it, nor was aware of what it was about, when Invoice #1 was submitted. Cannon staff said they had not been aware of the waterline's location from the start of the project but that their project did not extend over, or impact, the waterline and that there was no need to relocate it for their project, and if they would have seen the change order, they would have rejected it.

Ms. Delgado added that, to date, DSA had approved three of the four change orders submitted – but had rejected Change Order #3, which included a \$930,000 credit for the waterline relocation, and that she suspects DSA may now be reviewing its previous approval of Change Order #1.

On July 26, 2011, the OIG staff met with FTR staff and counsel at the OIG office to review and discuss FTR's having been certified that the work in Invoice #14 was complete and that the invoice included reimbursement for 90% of Change Order #1 work and had been submitted for payment. This meeting was attended by:

- Nizar Katbi, FTR, President/CEO

- Roger Heyman, Heymand & Densmore, Legal Counsel for the OIG
- Khal Jalade, FTR, Project Manager for the Contract
- Bradley Raisin, Raisin & Kavcioglu, Legal Counsel for FTR
- John Tonsik, OIG Investigator
- Cliff Dewey, OIG Staff

During this meeting, both FTR President Katbi and Project Manager Jalade acknowledged, after reviewing of a copy of Invoice #14, that FTR had certified, signed and submitted for payment an invoice declaring that all work as shown on the application for payment had been completed, materials supplied, etc.

During this meeting, both Katbi and Jalade acknowledged that the work, as shown on the application for payment, had not been completed or materials supplied. FTR stated that the inflation of the percentage complete to 90% had been done at the direction of the GSE Campus Project Manager. FTR stated that the funds were needed to execute Construction Field Orders #36 and #37 that had been issued to FTR on July 26, 2008. This was approximately \$1,000,000 worth of work for excavation of a trench for location and geotechnical inspection of the site fault zone; removal of the over excavation soils left on the site from Change Order #1 work; and grading of the rest of the site per the Civil Engineer's site plan. As substantiation of the need for the advanced funds, FTR also presented a list of \$918,340 worth of Proposed Change Orders for work it had submitted to GSE in the preceding 12 months but which GSE had not processed or paid.<sup>4</sup>

On August 2, 2011, the OIG staff met with GSE staff and counsel at the OIG's office to review and discuss GSE's having been certified that the work had been complete in Invoice #14, which included reimbursement for 90% of Change Order #1 work, and submitted it for payment. This meeting was attended by:

- George Johnson, GSE, CPM
- Kevin Collins, Alston & Bird, FTR Legal Counsel
- Cliff Dewey, OIG Staff
- Julia Stokes, OIG Staff
- Roger Heyman, Heymand & Densmore, Legal Counsel for the OIG

During this meeting, both Mr. Johnson and Mr. Collins acknowledged, after reviewing of a copy of Invoice #14, that GSE had certified, signed and submitted for payment an invoice declaring that all the work as shown had been completed, materials supplied, etc.

During this meeting, Mr. Johnson acknowledged that the work, as shown on the application for payment, had not been completed or materials supplied. GSE asserted that it had approved the inflated percentage to fund FTR's ongoing operations and execution of Construction Field Orders #36 and #37.

---

<sup>4</sup> Of the \$918,340 listed, GSE approved and processed as part of Change Order #3 only \$117,343 of the Proposed Change Orders.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The OIG concludes that FTR intentionally billed and certified in its submittal of Invoice #14 for Contract 70302 that 90% of the work in Change Order #1 was complete. As the work was not in fact done, this appears to constitute a false claim as defined in the False Claims Act, California Government Code, §12650 et seq.

Based on the findings of this investigation, the OIG recommends the following:

- Initiating proceedings to review the California False Claims Act violation, and take appropriate actions regarding FTR and GSE.
- Establishing or enforcing a policy that ensures no change orders are issued for work not located within the project limits (i.e., offsite improvements) as defined on the DSA approved plans for the contract or in the LACCD contract documents.
- Establishment of a District policy that ensures no direction or influence is given by the CPM, BuildLACCD, District or campus management to compel any contractor to subcontract work to any firm not identified in their bid submittal or that is found to be behind schedule on other LACCD projects as established by pay application percentage complete when compared to the percentages of the current, approved contract days used.

The OIG further recommends initiation of a more in-depth investigation of GSE's overall management of projects at LAMC based on its findings of this investigation including:

- GSE at LAMC failed to visually verify in the field that the work had been performed (either upon submittal of the invoice or at any time during the period covered by the invoice) and still approved and processed the invoice in the absence of signature approvals from the project IOR (who had been on-site each day) or the AOR. The approval and processing of this invoice may also constitute a false claim as defined in the False Claims Act, California Government Code, §12650 et seq.

CPM (GSE) consciously and deliberately manipulated the DWP pipeline relocation work to FTR – directions and decisions which apparently increased the cost to relocate the DWP waterline from the \$500,000 proposed by DWP to the over \$1.4 million charged for Pankow's Change Order #2 of Contract 32232 for the East Campus Complex project.

## **REPORT DISTRIBUTION**

---

Board of Trustees

Chancellor Daniel J. LaVista

Dr. Adriana Barrera, Deputy Chancellor

Tom Hall, Director of Facilities Planning & Development

Camille Goulet, General Counsel

## EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description		No. of Pages
1	WLAC East Campus Waterline Location Maps		1-4
2	Files/Emails from Victor Vaslavsky		
	V1	Email from Oscar Castro, 02/08/07 @ 1:20 pm	1
	V2	Email to Oscar Castro from Luis Nuno, 03/14/07	1
	V3	Letter to Alysén Mayes from Marc D. Garcia, 03/15/07	1
	V4	Psomas LAMC Meeting Notes, 10/24/07	V4.1-V4.4
	V5	Psomas LAMC Meeting Notes, 01/09/08	V5.1-V5.5
	V6	Build LACCD Mail – Bid Packages	1
	V7	Psomas Memorandum to Nick Quintanilla, 06/24/11	1
V8	Email from Nick Quintanilla, 5/26/08	V8.1-V8.2	
3	FTR Construction Field Order No. 1, Including DWP Waterline Relocation		1
4	FTR Change Order No. 1, Including DWP Waterline Relocation		1-10
5	FTR Invoice No. 14 Package with Waterline Change Order Claiming for 90% Completion of the Change Order Work		1-16
	5.1	OIG Blow Up of FTR Application for Payment, Pg 11 of 11	1
	5.2	FTR Change Order No. 1, Pg 1 of 2	1
6	FTR Waterline Pipe Fabrication Drawings		1
7	Files/Emails from Steve Bell		
	S1	Email to Nitin Bandi, 02/23/09 @ 8:06 am	S1.1-S1.4
	S2	Email to Bill Corneli, 04/14/09 @ 9:56 am	S2.1-S2.2
	S3	Email to Nick Quintanilla, 04/22/09 @ 7:18 am	S3.1-S3.4
8	FTR Construction Field Order No. 114, Including Delete Waterline Relocation from Contract Direction		1
9	FTR Change Order No. 3, Including Delete DWP Waterline Relocation Credit		1-16
10	Emails to/from James Anderson		
	J1	Email from Mohamed Felo, 05/07/10 @ 10:26 am	1
	J2	Email from James Park, 05/18/10 @ 10:28 am	1
	J3	Email from Patrick Schee, 12/28/09 @ 9:02 am	1
	J4	Email from Patrick Schee, 12/28/09 @ 10:54 am	J4.1-J4.2
	J5	Email from Nick Quintanilla, 12/07/09 @ 8:44 am	J5.1-J5.2
	J6	Email from Rick Schutter, 01/05/10 @ 8:59 am	1
	J7	Email from Rick Schutter, 01/05/10 @ 9:28 am	1
	J8	Email from Peter, 12/18/09 @ 5:49 pm	J8.1-J8.4
	J9	OAC Meeting 7 Meeting Notes	J9.1-J9.5
	J10	Email from Rick Schutter, 12/29/09 @ 12:34 pm	J10.1-J10.3
	J11	Email from Rick Schutter, 01/05/10 @ 10:02 am	J11.1-J11.2
J11A	Email from Rick Schutter, 01/08/10 @ 7:29 am	J11A.1-J11A.6	

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Exhibit Description</b>		<b>No. of Pages</b>
	J12	Email from Scott Fitzsimmons, 05/18/10 @ 8:46 am w/DWP Waterline Meeting Agenda Attachment	J12.1-J12.7
	J13	Email to Nick Quintanilla, 05/11/10 @ 11:23 am	1
	J14	Email to Nick Quintanilla, 12/06/09 @ 8:02 pm	1
	J15	Email to Khal Jalad, 02/15/10 @ 4:45 pm	J15.1-J15.5
	J16	Email to Mohamed Felo, 05/14/10 @ 12:37 pm	J16.1-J16.3
	J17	Email to Nick Quintanilla, 04/02/10 @ 7:51 am	J17.1-J17.2
	J18	Email to Nick Quintanilla, 04/12/10 @ 1:34 pm	J18.1-J18.10
	J19	Email to Kevin Smith, 11/24/09 @ 11:51 am	J19.1-J19.3
11	Pankow Change Order No. 2, Including DWP Waterline Relocation		1-7