

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

www.rctc.org

WORKSHOP AGENDA *

** Actions may be taken on any item listed on the agenda*

FEBRUARY 5-6, 2009

**SALON ROOM I AND II
Embassy Suites Hotel Palm Desert
74-700 Highway 111, Palm Desert**

In compliance with the Brown Act and Government Code Section 54957.5, agenda materials distributed 72 hours prior to the meeting, which are public records relating to open session agenda items, will be available for inspection by members of the public prior to the meeting at the Commission office, 4080 Lemon Street, Third Floor, Riverside, CA, and on the Commission's website, www.rctc.org.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if you need special assistance to participate in a Commission meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (951) 787-7141. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to meeting time will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility at the meeting.

2:30 P.M.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2009

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 2:30 p.m. – 2:45 p.m. | WELCOME AND WORKSHOP OVERVIEW
<i>Bob Magee, Chair</i>
<i>Anne Mayer, Executive Director</i> |
| 2:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. | DISCUSSION PANEL – FINANCING TRANSPORTATION
<i>John Standiford, Deputy Executive Director</i> |
| 4:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. | BREAK |
| 4:30 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. | GOODS MOVEMENT ACTIVITIES
<i>Tanya Love, Goods Movement Manager</i> |

This item is for the Commission to receive and file an update regarding Commission-related goods movement activities during the past year.

6:00 p.m. ADJOURNMENT

The Commission workshop will continue at 8:30 a.m., Friday, February 6, 2009, Salon Room I and II, Embassy Suites Hotel Palm Desert, 74-700 Highway III, Palm Desert.

**8:30 A.M.
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2009**

**8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. RAYMOND WOLFE, CALTRANS DISTRICT DIRECTOR
– GUEST SPEAKER**

8:45 – 9:15 a.m. RAIL ISSUES REVIEW
Sheldon Peterson, Rail Manager

This item is for the Commission to receive an oral report and provide comments.

**9:15 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. OVERVIEW OF WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY
DELIVERY PLAN**
Anne Mayer, Executive Director

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. OVERVIEW OF THE COMMISSION'S TOLL PROGRAM
Michael Blomquist, Toll Program Director

This item is for the Commission to receive an oral report and provide comments.

10:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. CLOSED SESSION

**CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL –
ANTICIPATED LITIGATION**
Pursuant to Subdivision (b) of Government Code
Section 54956.9
Number of cases: One

10:30 – 10:45 a.m. PROJECT AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT FIRM
Michael Blomquist, Toll Program Director

This item is for the Commission to issue a request for proposal (RFP) and commence a competitive selection process for project and construction management services. Staff will bring to the Commission a future request to approve the selection process and award a contract to the successful offerer.

10:45 – 11:00 a.m. MID COUNTY PARKWAY UPDATE
Cathy Bechtel, Project Development Director

This item is for the Commission to receive an oral report and provide comments.

11:00 – 11:30 a.m. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT HIGHWAY PROJECTS
Marlin Feenstra, Project Delivery Director

This item is for the Commission to receive an oral report and provide comments.

11:30 – 1:00 p.m. WORKSHOP WRAP UP AND CLOSING REMARKS
Bob Magee, Chair
Anne Mayer, Executive Director

1:00 p.m. ADJOURNMENT

The next Commission meeting is scheduled to be held at 9:30 a.m., **Wednesday, February 11, 2009**, Board Room, County of Riverside Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, First Floor, Riverside.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

DATE:	February 5, 2009
TO:	Riverside County Transportation Commission
FROM:	Tanya Love, Goods Movement Manager
THROUGH:	Anne Mayer, Executive Director
SUBJECT:	Goods Movement Activities

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for the Commission to receive and file an update regarding Commission-related goods movement activities during the past year.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach Expansion Projects

At last year's Commission workshop, staff was directed to monitor expansion projects proposed by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (Ports) in order to research opportunities to mitigate the negative impacts of delays caused by increased freight and truck traffic. In November 2008, staff provided an update on the following two proposed expansion projects:

- China Shipping Container Terminal Project – Port of Los Angeles – Berths 97-109; and
- Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project – Port of Long Beach.

Working with staff from the Commission's legal counsel, Best, Best and Krieger, as well as staff from the on-call consulting firm of Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., the Commission provided written comments on each of the project's draft environmental impact reports (EIR). Although both projects acknowledged that State Routes 60 and 91 and Interstate 15 serve as key transportation corridors for freight movement to and from the Ports, the draft EIR did not evaluate traffic impacts to Riverside County. As highlighted on the following table, the projected increase in both rail and truck traffic as a result of the expansion projects is significant:

	<u>Projected Annual Increase - 2030</u>	
	Truck Trips	Train Trips
China Shipping Container Terminal	805,626	303,996
Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project	1,308,160	2,098
Total Projected Increase (Annual)	2,113,786	306,094

Although the project's region of influence (ROI) was defined as five counties – Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura - the impact analysis focused only on the Ports and the surrounding areas. The Commission's written response expressed its concern over the ROI as combined, both expansion projects are projected to handle over 3.4 million 20 foot equivalent units (TEUs) by 2015 and 4.9 million TEUs by 2030. The projected increase in freight traffic will have a negative impact on Riverside County's already congested streets. Combined, the two expansion projects are projected to increase the daily number of vehicle-hours of delay by 88.2 hours in 2005 and 293.3 hours in 2030:

	<u>Vehicle-Hours of Delay (Daily)</u>	
	Year 2005	Year 2030
China Shipping Container Terminal		
Without proposed expansion project	809.5	4321.8
With project	845.8	4441
Projected Increased	36.3	119.2
Middle Harbor Project		
Without proposed expansion project	793.9	4,266.90
With project	845.8	4441
Projected Increased	51.9	174.1
Total Projected Increase (Daily)	88.2	293.3

The draft EIRs also did not address the air quality impacts that are projected to occur as Riverside County residents and visitors wait for trains at at-grade crossings. The following two tables identify the potential change in emissions due to increased idling at rail crossings:

China Shipping Container Terminal		
	Potential Change in Emissions (grams per day) Due to Increased Idling at Rail Crossings in Riverside County	
	Year 2005	Year 2030
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	3.8	12.9
Nitrous Oxides	213	705

(NOx)		
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	613	2,016
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8,777	28,878
Greenhouse Gases (CO ₂ Equivalent)	16,611	54,545

Middle Harbor Project		
	Potential Change in Emissions (grams per day) Due to Increased Idling at Rail Crossings in Riverside County	
	Year 2005	Year 2030
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	5.4	18.6
Nitrous Oxides (NOx)	303.3	1,025.2
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	875	2,941.6
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	12,537.4	42,137
Greenhouse Gases (CO ₂ Equivalent)	23,749	79,666

As a result of the report provided in November 2008, staff was directed to continue to monitor the Ports' activities and to seek further direction from the Commission if the concerns identified were not addressed.

Intermodal Container Transfer Facility Expansion and Modernization Project

The Commission recently received an initial study/notice of preparation (IS/NOP) for an EIR for expansion and modernization of an intermodal container facility. The Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF) is a rail yard designed and operated to enhance the efficient flow of intermodal (truck and rail) cargo through the Ports. Although Commission staff and legal council are currently reviewing the IS/NOP to determine the potential impacts, if any, to Riverside County the following is provided as a general overview of the proposed project:

- The existing ICTF operational core is located approximately five miles from the Ports;

- The facility currently transfers containerized cargo from the terminals of the Ports to trains for distribution throughout the United States, and transfers cargo to the Ports for export;
- The proposed project will increase the number of containers currently handled at the ICTF from 725,000 to an estimated 1.5 million annually;
- On an annual basis, the project will increase one-way truck trips from 1.1 million to 2.3 million; and
- Annually, the number of rail trips will increase from 4,745 to 9,490.

Once the review is completed, written comments will be developed and submitted to the Ports under Chairman Magee's signature.

Voluntary Container Premiums

In 2008, two bills – SB 974 (Lowenthal) and HR 5102 (Calvert) – were introduced proposing the collection of fees to pay for transportation infrastructure and air quality improvement projects. Although a number of state and federal programs identified the need for container fee programs, neither bill was approved. It is widely recognized that any legally-mandated container fee program would likely result in some form of legal challenge; however, there continues to be a growing understanding of the need for additional investment for the nation's freight-related infrastructure and the need to mitigate its impacts.

Recognizing the need to work closely with regional agencies the Ports received approval from their respective boards, in January 2008, to implement a local Infrastructure Cargo Fee (ICF). The fee, once collected, would be used for bridge, railway, and road improves used in port-related goods movement, including replacement of the Gerald Desmond and Heim bridges, freeway connector improvements, and port-area rail enhancements, which reduce the need for local truck trips. In early 2008, members of the Southern California Consensus Group sent a letter to the Ports expressing its concern that the ICF concept needed to be broadened to include projects such as the Alameda Corridor-East Trade Corridor. In response, Port executives jointly responded to regional agencies' concerns:

"...the Ports remain committed to working with our regional partners and addressing regional intermodal transportation system needs, such as the Alameda Corridor-East Trade Corridor and the grade separation of the Colton Crossing....{Ports} firmly believe in the need for private investment....in the form of a cargo fee, and will continue to support these efforts whether they are achieved at the State or Port level."

While in support of a regional container fee, the Ports do not want to implement a local fee if state and/or federal container fee legislation is approved. However, since neither the Lowenthal or Calvert legislation were approved, and in response

to concerns identified regarding proposed expansion projects, the Ports are proposing to implement the ICF on a regional basis. At a recent workshop, staff from the Ports presented an overview of the ICF for Port projects; additionally, they provided an overview of how the project can be implemented on a regional basis.

At the February 5, 2009 Commission Workshop, staff will present an overview of ICF and will provide a status report as to what the next steps are in implementing the cargo fee. Following are highlights of the presentation:

- Overview/history of ICF;
- ICF will address regional needs;
- Fees collected will be for specific projects.
- Fees commence only after environmental clearance (i.e. fees pay for final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction); and
- Once project is constructed, fee will be discontinued. Construction phase fees will be collected when:
 - Railroad construction and maintenance agreement executed;
 - Design approved by the California Public Utilities Commission; and
 - All other required permits are obtained.

Overall, executive management representing the Southern California Consensus Group are in favor of the proposed ICF. As a result, Port staffs are currently developing the framework for implementing the regional ICF; it is anticipated that the draft framework will be available for preliminary review in mid-February 2009. A progress report on the status of the framework will also be presented at the Commission meeting.

Colton Crossing

The proposed Colton Crossing project would construct a railroad grade separation where the Union Pacific (UP) and Burlington Northern Santa Fee (BNSF) rail lines cross. Currently, the two major railroad cross each other at a 90 degree angle and during busy periods, it creates traffic jams consisting of mile-long trains that are laden with goods.

Caltrans nominated the Colton Crossing for \$97 million in Proposition 1B funding – the \$19.9 billion transportation bond initiative that was approved by the voters in November 2006. While this is an important infrastructure project, the Commission joined with other transportation agencies in Southern California in questioning the appropriateness of using voter-approved state bond money to benefit two major railroads. However, in the spirit of cooperation, the Commission indicated to the state that using public funds to construct a private facility could be appropriate if the Commission received commuter rail benefits such as additional train slots and

relief from the Commission's contractual obligation to fund 85% of BNSF's share per a shared use agreement executed in the early 1990's.

The state has not formally backed away from advocating for TCIF funding for the Colton Crossing project. Dale Bonner, the Secretary of the California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency has asked that the agencies, which are part of the Southern California Consensus Group provide recommendations for goods movement projects within the region. The Consensus Group, of which the Commission is a part, meets regularly, and will provide suggestions to the state for freight-related projects, which could include added rail capacity or safety projects. Given the current economic situation and the problems with the bond program, discussions of TCIF funding for any project are currently on hold.

In spite of the funding uncertainties, Commission staff will continue to participate in the project development process currently being led by San Bernardino Associated Governments.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

DATE:	February 6, 2009
TO:	Riverside County Transportation Commission
FROM:	Michael Blomquist, Toll Program Director Mark Massman, Bechtel Project Manager
THROUGH:	Anne Mayer, Executive Director
SUBJECT:	Project and Construction Management Firm

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for the Commission to authorize staff to issue a request for proposal (RFP) and commence a competitive selection process for project and construction management services. Staff will bring to the Commission a future request to approve the selection process and award a contract to the successful offerer.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State Route 91 Corridor Projects and the 10-Year Delivery Plan

Due to the passage of the 2009 Measure A, in December 2006, the Commission adopted the 2009 Measure A Western County Highway 10-Year Delivery Plan (10-Year Delivery Plan). In this action, the Commission also directed staff to proceed with developing a project report/environmental document for all of the new projects identified in the plan. The SR-91 corridor improvement project and the 91/71 interchange project were included in the 10-Year Delivery Plan and given high priority by the Commission.

Both SR-91 corridor projects started the project approval/environmental document phase of work and are proceeding with preliminary engineering work and environmental studies. Both projects are scheduled to have state and federal environmental approval by the spring of 2011. State and federal environmental approval is a key milestone that must be realized prior to acquiring right-of-way under eminent domain, award of a design-build contract for final engineering and construction, and the sale of toll revenue bonds.

Project and Construction Management Firm's Role

The Commission resources necessary to successfully deliver the SR-91 corridor projects are significant. The current environmental phase of work requires approximately four years and \$38 million to obtain the required environmental

approvals and perform preliminary engineering for both SR-91 corridor projects. Commission and Bechtel staff currently oversees this phase of work and manage these contracts.

The effort and cost of the next phase of work for final engineering and construction is approximately 45 times greater in order of magnitude. The final engineering and construction for both projects is planned to be performed under a single design-build contract to be procured in 2011. However, there remains major work prior to hiring the design-builder to prepare for a large, design-build contract as well as significant work actually overseeing the design and construction work during the design-build phase. This major work is summarized in TABLE 1 below.

Staff proposes to hire a Project and Construction Management Firm dedicated to delivering the SR-91 corridor projects under a single, design-build contract in a timely and cost-effective manner. The Project and Construction Management Firm would be an extension of the Commission with a single focus – deliver the SR-91 corridor improvement project and the 91/71 interchange project through the final engineering and construction phases.

Scope of Work

The Project and Construction Management Firm would provide skilled and experienced professionals to perform engineering, management, construction oversight, and other services. Staff is seeking the highest-quality, “A-team” from firms with national resources and experience. These resources would be scaled up or down as-needed to meet the staffing needs during the course of this challenging project. The Project and Construction Management Firm would bring in the right resources at the right time resulting in efficient use of people and money. Initially, these resources would work on interagency agreements, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocations, advanced final engineering and procurement of a design-builder. Once the design-build contract is awarded, the Project and Construction Management Firm would also perform engineering plan reviews, inspect materials and construction, administer the design-build contract, and other duties summarized in TABLE 1 below.

TABLE 1 Scope of Work Summary for the Project and Construction Management Firm

The Project and Construction Management Firm	<i>Toll Revenue Bond Sale (mid-2011)</i>	
	(Before) Phase 1	(After) Phase 2
<u>Agreements and Agency Coordination</u> (Caltrans [franchise agreement, design/right-of-way/construction, maintenance], OCTA [tolling cooperative agreement, tolling operation agreement], utility companies, railroads, California Highway Patrol [toll violation enforcement], California Toll Operators Committee [user fee processing], TCA [Fastrak licensing, cost sharing], FCC [RF antennas toll tag readers])	X	X
<u>Right-of-Way Acquisition</u> (right-of-way engineering, appraisals, fee acquisitions, utility easements, relocations, etc.)	X	X
<u>Utility Relocation</u> (agreements, coordination, and advanced utility relocation plans)	X	X
<u>Procurement of Design-Builder</u> (risk analysis, procurement strategy, industry review, RFQ, RFP, one-on-one meetings, alternate technical proposals, design-build contract provision input, selection process, contract negotiations, contract award process, Notice to Proceed)	X	
<u>Advanced Engineering to Support the RFP and Agreements</u> (Perform limited, advanced engineering in several areas including long-lead time bridges, surveying, stage construction, geotechnical explorations/reports, etc. prior to the procurement of a design-builder. Coordinate with existing PA/ED firm(s) as necessary for information and engineering work in support of the design-build RFP)	X	
<u>Project Controls and Implementation Planning</u> (schedule, budget, document control system, forecasting, reporting, Project Management Plans, project procedures)	X	X
<u>Toll Team Office</u> (provide interim, co-located office for all project staff)	X	
<u>Design-Build Industry Outreach</u> (AGC, consultants, suppliers)	X	
<u>Design-Build Contract Administration</u> (safety program, owner-controlled insurance program, invoice reviews, QA/QC program adherence, contract amendments, etc.)		X
<u>Design Plan Reviews</u> (review all permanent and temporary engineering plans and specifications, contract compliance)		X
<u>Design Oversight</u> (represent Commission with Caltrans and the Design-Builder on all engineering issues, facilitate other agency reviews/approvals)		X
<u>Construction Quality Assurance</u> (independent owner verification through inspection and material sampling, final owner acceptance, safety reviews, etc.)		X
<u>Project Closeout</u> (project records, right-of-way transfer, punch list activities, Caltrans project approval, etc.)		X
<u>Identify Technology Requirements</u> (tolling, ITS, etc.)	X	X
<u>Toll Operation Startup</u>		X
<u>Partnering</u> (aid in Partnering between Commission and the Design-Builder)		X
<u>Public Information/Outreach</u> (web sites, public meetings, newsletters, media reports, community outreach presentations, etc.)	X	X
<u>Environmental Mitigation Implementation</u> (construction and maintenance of commitments made during the NEPA/CEQA process)		X

Schedule of Work

Staff proposes to structure the Project and Construction Management Firm contract and scope of services in two phases with each phase having a separate authorization or notice to proceed. Phase 1 is planned to extend approximately two years (summer 2009 to summer 2011), while phase 2 has a planned duration of approximately five years (summer 2011 to 2016) through project closeout. Tasks for each phase are reflected in the two columns in TABLE 1.

Structuring the contract in two phases would result in a key decision point for the Commission. The initial phase 1 authorization would cover all work necessary from the Project and Construction Management Firm prior to the sale of toll revenue bonds. The successful sale of toll revenue bonds estimated in 2011 is paramount in order to commence phase 2 activities. Phase 2 authorization could be provided upon a successful sale of toll revenue bonds. A two-phase approach allows the Commission to control whether and when to begin phase 2 activities.

The proposed schedule for the Project and Construction Management Firm role is as follows:

February 6, 2009	Commission to authorize issuance of the Project and Construction Management Firm RFP;
February 16, 2009	Staff to issue the Project and Construction Management Firm RFP;
July 8, 2009	Commission to award the Project and Construction Management Firm contract and authorize phase 1 work;
Spring 2011	Complete environmental approval – federal record of decision
Summer 2011	Complete procurement of design-builder and award contract;
Summer/Fall 2011	Sale of toll revenue bonds, authorize the Project and Construction Management Firm phase 2 work, design-build contract notice to proceed;
2015/2016	Open lanes to traffic; and
2016	Completion of project and the Project and Construction Management Firm contract.

Cost of Work

The roles during final engineering and construction differ when using the design-build method of project delivery compared to the traditional design-bid-build method. Most notably, the final engineering and the construction are combined into a single, design-build contract rather than two, separate contracts as is typical for the traditional design-bid-build method. Additionally, the construction management role performed by the owner on a traditional contract is split between the owner

and the design-builder on a design-build contract. To summarize, the chief differences between the traditional and design-build methods are the final engineering and construction quality control work performed by the design-builder.

Table 2 below presents an illustrative example of the differing roles between the two methods of project delivery. The gray-shaded area in the *Design-Build Owner* area represents the Project and Construction Management Firm role (project and construction management). This is the role more fully described previously in this agenda report. The Project and Construction Management Firm role is significant in scope, responsibility, and cost.

TABLE 2 Role Comparison between Traditional and Design-Build

Traditional	*%CC	Design-Build	*%CC
Owner		Owner	
Owner Management	2%	Owner Management	2%
Planning, Environmental, and Preliminary Engineering	3%	Planning, Environmental, and Preliminary Engineering	3%
Final Engineering	6%	<i>n/a</i>	
Construction Management, Quality Control and Quality Assurance	10%	Project and Construction Management and Quality Assurance (91 Program Manager)	7.0%
OWNER SUB-TOTAL	21%	OWNER SUB-TOTAL	12%
Contractor		Design-Builder	
		Final Engineering	6 %
Construction	79%	Construction	79%
		Construction Quality Control	3%
CORRIDOR TOTAL	100%	CORRIDOR TOTAL	100%

Notes:

- 1) *%CC = cost of work as a percentage of the total SR-91 corridor cost including PA/ED, final engineering, construction, Project and Construction Management Firm, agency staff, etc.
- 2) Percentages are for illustrative and comparison purposes only and represents significant economies of scale for certain roles given the size of the corridor improvements.
- 3) Costs for right-of-way capital, sale of toll revenue bonds, legal services, contingency, etc. are not included for simplicity and clarity of comparison.

The Project and Construction Management Firm services during phase 1 (approximate two-year period before the toll revenue bond sale) are vital to advance the development of the project. These phase 1 services outlined in TABLE 1 are estimated to cost \$10-\$12 million and would be split approximately evenly between FY 2009/10 and FY 2010/11. Upon authorization of the phase 2

work, the balance of the Project and Construction Management Firm contract would be expended from FY 2011/12 through FY2016/17, which approximately corresponds to the design-build contract term.

SR-91 Corridor Mission and Goals

Based on the Commission's leadership, direction, and desire to quickly deliver projects, staff has pursued methods to complete much-needed improvements to the SR-91 corridor. Funding the majority of the SR-91 corridor work through toll revenue bonds provides a funding source not previously used in the Inland Empire. Another first for Riverside County will be the use of the design-build method of project delivery to expedite the SR-91 corridor improvements by approximately three years. These methods reflect the Commission's desire to be resourceful and innovative to deliver transportation improvements for Riverside County.

Consistent with the Commission's vision, staff developed a mission statement for the SR-91 corridor projects: *"In partnership with our stakeholders, develop a breakthrough mobility project for State Route 91 which meets Measure A commitments, creates a long-term revenue source for transportation improvements, is delivered with a businesslike efficiency, and maintains public and agency support."* The Project and Construction Management Firm role is consistent with this mission and the Commission's goals.

Staff recommends the procurement of the Project and Construction Management Firm for the SR-91 corridor projects for the following reasons:

- Provides a full range of services and national "A-team" expertise that is flexible and can be applied in a cost-effective manner to fit the project's needs;
- Offers the depth of resources needed through a large, multi-disciplined team of professionals drawing on their collective company resources;
- Allows services to be provided through one contract resulting in a single point of responsibility for the Commission and staff that also streamlines contract administration duties;
- Provides project management continuity between the environmental, right-of-way acquisition, final engineering, and construction phases;
- Allows the design-build phase to proceed without Commission and Bechtel staff resource constraints and thereby keep other Commission capital projects on-track.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission authorize staff to issue a RFP and commence a competitive selection process for the Project and Construction Management Firm to provide project and construction management services. Staff will bring to the Commission a future request to approve the selection process and award a contract to the successful proposer.

Financial Information					
In Fiscal Year Budget:	N/A	Year:	2009/10 +	Amount:	To be determined
Source of Funds:	Debt proceeds			Budget Adjustment:	N/A
GLA No.:	262-31-81XXX P3021 and P3026				
Fiscal Procedures Approved:	<i>Theresa Iuvino</i>			Date:	01/28/2009