MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M. THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1988 AT THE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OFFICE 8149 KENNEDY AVENUE, HIGHLAND, INDIANA

AGENDA

1. Call to Order by Chairman John DeMeo
2. Recognition of Visitors, Guests
3. Approval of minutes of June 2, 1988 meeting
4. Reports of Standing Committees
   A. Finance/Policy Committee - Arlene Colvin, Chairperson
      • Financial status report
      • Approval of claims for June, 1988
      • Other issues
   B. Legislative Committee - George Carlson, Chairman
      • Federal legislative/funding issues update
      - Adopted amendment to Senate Energy & Water Appropriations Bill for 1989
      - Congressman Visclosky's participation in hearing on water resources projects implementation (June 16, 1988)
      - Chicago Corps of Engineers transmittal of 3A/3B project analysis to Sec. of Army office - late July presentation
      - Corps letter re: credit for project related activities
B. Legislative Committee (continued)

- State legislative/funding issues update
  - Mailing to area legislators re: project funding support
  - N.W. In Forum legislative meeting to set legislative priorities (presentation - June 28)
- Other issues

C. Land Acquisition/Management Committee - Charles Agnew, Chairman

- Land Acquisition Committee meeting at 5:30 p.m.
- Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
- Board action re: proposed extension of lease of fishing lake (Eller)
- Letter from Town of Schererville re: borrow site acquisition
- Other issues

D. Interim Flood Control/Planning Committee - Clyde Baughard, Chairman

- Report of LCRBC meeting on June 21st -1988 work projects - permits status
- Chase St. culverts replacement project (Lake County Highway Dept.)
- Black Oak/Gary meeting re: drainage improvements plan
- News article re: river wetland fill
- Erie R.R. bridge improvement update
- Other issues

E. Breakwaters/Marina Committee - Bill Tanke, Chairman

- "Request for Proposals" solicitation for development
- NIPSCO easement design layout - Cole Engineering
- General Telephone line relocation project status
- LMMDA - Portage fund breakdown
- Boat excise tax proposal update
- Other issues

5. Other Business

- Regional Trails Plan Grant - Project
  - National Park Service, Indiana D.N.R., Regional Planning Commission

6. Statements to Board from the floor

7. Set date for next meeting, adjournment
MINUTES OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
HELD AT 6:30 P.M. THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1988
AT THE COMMISSION OFFICES
8149 KENNEDY AVENUE, HIGHLAND, INDIANA

In Chairman John DeMeo's absence, Vice Chairman Doyle Niemeyer called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. There were seven Commissioners present. Guests were recognized and quorum was declared.

Development Commissioners:
William Critser
George Carlson
Charles Agnew
Jack Swike
Clyde Baughard
Doyle Niemeyer
William Tanke

Visitors:
Ernie Davis - Gary
Rob Pleva - Lake County Parks Planning Dept.
Jerry Pearson - The Times
Jim Stankiewicz - Attorney for Keith Eller
Ed Lukowski - Hammond
Stephen Davis - IN. DNR
Pete & Mary Ann Zak - South Shore Marina
Harold Mauger - Gary
Howard Marion - Gary
Carl Fisher - Portage Park Dept. Supt.

Staff:
Dan Gardner
Bruce Stouffer
Lou Casale
Sandy Mordus

A motion was made by Clyde Baughard to approve the minutes of the June 2nd meeting; seconded by Chuck Agnew; motion passed unanimously.

Finance/Policy Committee - In Treasurer Arlene Colvin's absence, Dan Gardner presented the financial report for April as well as the claims. Clyde Baughard made a motion to approve the claims as presented; seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.
Legislative Committee - Committee Chairman George Carlson referred to legislative articles contained in the packet. He reported that a letter transmitting latest budget needs and construction schedule update had been prepared for mailing to the area legislators. Mr. Gardner added that before the next budget biennium, we need to schedule a briefing time to meet with legislators so their knowledge/support of the overall project would be strong. After the November election, there may also be some new legislators that need to be brought up to date.

Mr. Gardner stated that Congressman Visclosky has met with Robert Page, Sec. of the Army Civil Works, and reiterated strong support for complete levee protection for Gary.

Land Acquisition/Management Committee - Committee Chairman Chuck Agnew reported the property closings of DC60, DC86 and DC115.

The attorney is awaiting the title update on the Erie R.R. bridge ownership.

Mr. Agnew reported that the land liability insurance renewal is now due. The premium from Allanson Insurance has increased from $10,521 in 1988 to $13,890 in 1989. Although the liability coverage also increased from $1 million to $2 million coverage, the attorney is checking into it to see whether the $2 million is necessary. A motion to renew the insurance pending modification by the attorney was made by Chuck Agnew; seconded by Clyde Baughard; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Agnew reported that staff is meeting with Illiana Fence tomorrow because the fencing they put in behind IXL Trailer Court was set for the wrong boundary lines. Illiana will correct the situation and move the fence at their expense.

Mr. Agnew stated that Attorney Jim Stankiewicz joined the Committee meeting and proposed an extension of the current land lease contract for Keith Eller to be through October 1989. The issue was deferred until the next meeting.

Proposals for the placing of a Type 6 Seal Coat on the gravel roadway at Lake Etta were sent out to six firms: (1) Palmer's Blacktop Paving, (2) Asphalt Service, (3) Ristics & Sons Asphalt Paving, (4) Standard Paving Company, (5) Kirk Asphalt Corp. and (6) Walsh & Kelly Construction. Two bids were received from Kirk Asphalt Corp. for $11,058 and Walsh & Kelly Const. for $19,200. Mr. Agnew made a motion to award the contract to Kirk Asphalt for $11,058; motion seconded by Clyde Baughard; motion passed unanimously.
Mr. Gardner stated he had met with Lake Station park superintendent Dewey Lemley concerning possible joint venture for park development.

Interim Flood Control Planning Committee - Committee Chairman Clyde Baughard reported on the tour of the project lands that was held on May 21st. It gave the new Commissioners a chance to view the marina area, the breakwaters, leased farm land, Lake Etta, etc.

Mr. Gardner reported he met with the Lake County Surveyor and the Lake County Highway Superintendent. They discussed the permits being secured by the Drainage Board for the dredging of the river from Indianapolis Blvd. to Kennedy and the permit for culvert replacement at Penn Central R.R.

Breakwaters/Marina Committee - Committee Chairman Bill Tanke reported that he, Dan Gardner and Barbara Waxman met with Mayor Maletta to discuss marina issues. It was agreed to by the mayor that the telephone line on the marina site needs to be relocated. The mayor will put together a proposal for relocating it. The approximate cost is around $200,000; possible removal cost money could be shared equally between the city, the LCRBDC and General Telephone Company.

A motion was made by Bill Tanke to approve the solicitation of bids for development of a marina on the site in Portage; motion seconded by Clyde Baughard; motion passed unanimously. It was stated that a financial capability statement will be required from potential developers.

Mr. Gardner reported he had attended a meeting at Midwest Steel concerning the settling ponds phase-out. Permit approval to dispose of the material on site is being sought. Midwest is looking for support.

It was stated that $100,000 has been approved for a public fishing site for the Burns Harbor Port for development by the Indiana D.N.R.

Statements from the Floor - Harold Mauger, resident of Gary, spoke about Chase Street culverts and the debris in the river at that point that needs to be cleared out.

Rob Pleva from Lake County Parks Dept. stated that the park dept. has been in discussions with a concessionaire who would like to open an instruction course for horse riding on the property in the vicinity of Lake Etta park. When they have a
definite proposal for the land, he was asked to submit it to the Land Acquisition Committee.

Ernie Davis, Black Oak resident and member of the LCRBC, asked whether the Development Commission could help with bridge replacement at Burr St. and Colfax St. He stated that they were now 2 lane bridges and they should be upgraded to 4 lane. Commissioner Jack Swike suggested to Mr. Davis that he write a letter to the County Council urging an increase in the bridge tax fund.

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, July 7.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned 7:30 p.m. by a motion from Clyde Baughard; seconded by George Carlson.
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MERCANTILE NATIONAL BANK

JANUARY 1, 1988 - MAY 31, 1988

CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 1988
Checking Account
  Land Acquisition $ 43,505.08
  General Fund 38,699.96
  Tax Fund 1,707.50
Investments 868,500.00

$952,412.54

RECEIPTS: January 1, 1988 - May 31, 1988
  Lease Rents $ 10,916.02
  Interest 25,171.96
  Land Acquisition 99,930.68
  Taxes 1,197.22

$137,215.88

DISBURSEMENTS: January 1, 1988 - May 31, 1988
  1987 Expenses paid in 1988 $ 22,874.98
  Per Diem 212.00
  Legal Service 1,722.65
  NIRPC 23,414.56
  Taxes 2,807.78
  Travel & Mileage 141.27
  Printing & Advertising 208.00
  Bonds & Insurance 701.00
  Meeting Expense 337.03
  L/A Legal Services 10,191.00
L/A Professional Services
  (a) Appraisal Services 150.00
  (b) Surveying Services 3,830.00
  (d) Land Purchase Contractual 16,264.67
  (e) Operational Contractual 12,938.14
  L/A Land Purchase Cost 65,788.54

$161,581.62

CASH POSITION - MAY 31, 1988
Checking Account
  Land Acquisition $ 21,945.33
  General Fund 17,504.53
  Tax Fund 96.94
Investments 888,500.00

$928,046.80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Salaries (Dan Gardner/Sandy Mordus) @ 75%</td>
<td>$ 2,460.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated OH Charges @ 35% of Project Salaries</td>
<td>861.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mileage/Expenses</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Rental (July 1988)</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Service</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics/Printing Time @ $15/hr. (Attachments)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: Local Service</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: Billable Charges (Attachments) (ESTIMATE MAY 1988)</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying Charges @ $.07 per copy</td>
<td>30.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Costs (Attachments)</td>
<td>29.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs (Attachments)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total May 1988 Costs</td>
<td>$ 3,934.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Payment Due</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payment Due</td>
<td>$ 3,934.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 27, 1988

TO: Dan Gardner, Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
8149 Kennedy Avenue
Highland, Indiana 46322

Please accept this statement as billing to the Development Commission for payment of $16.00 per hour as per contract for work performed as Land Acquisition/Management Agent for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total hours... 34 hours

Total payment due... $544

Robert B. Stouffer

APPROVED: Dan Gardner
Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
The President. Mr. President, Mr. President. I regret that it is really necessary to send to the Office of Management and Budget such a strong signal and mandate as this amendment states. For decades in this body, Mr. President, the joint statement of managers and the accompanying conference report has been treated as the law of the land and has been abided by. The alternative to that, Mr. President, is to put everything within the four corners of the bill. We should not have to do that.

So what this amendment does is to point out that these joint statements and conference reports are in fact binding. Now, whether or not this is the best way to send this message and create this mandate, I am not sure. But I do know that the message needs to be sent and we will find a way to do it and make it binding, and I hope we can do it by working with OMB rather than by confrontation.

This amendment certainly sends a message, and I think it sends an appropriate message. Therefore, we should accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McClure).

The amendment (No. 2359) was agreed to.

Mr. McClure. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay that motion on the table. That motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Amendment No. 2361

(Purpose: To deny funds for construction projects that use the services of a contractor or subcontractor of a foreign country that denies fair and equitable access to United States products and services in construction projects in that foreign country)

Mr. Murkowski. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Sec. ____. (a)(1) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or any territory or possession of the United States with any contractor or subcontractor of a foreign country, or any supplier of products of a foreign country, unless in those contracts in which such foreign country is listed by the United States Trade Representative under subsection (c) of this section.

Mr. President, or the head of a Federal agency administering the funds for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or any territory or possession of the United States with any contractor or subcontractor of a foreign country, or any supplier of products of a foreign country, unless in those contracts in which such foreign country is listed by the United States Trade Representative under subsection (c) of this section.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Sec. _____. (a)(1) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or any territory or possession of the United States with any contractor or subcontractor of a foreign country, or any supplier of products of a foreign country, unless in those contracts in which such foreign country is listed by the United States Trade Representative under subsection (c) of this section.

Mr. President, or the head of a Federal agency administering the funds for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or any territory or possession of the United States with any contractor or subcontractor of a foreign country, or any supplier of products of a foreign country, unless in those contracts in which such foreign country is listed by the United States Trade Representative under subsection (c) of this section.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Sec. _____. (a)(1) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or any territory or possession of the United States with any contractor or subcontractor of a foreign country, or any supplier of products of a foreign country, unless in those contracts in which such foreign country is listed by the United States Trade Representative under subsection (c) of this section.
$2 million for region water projects in bill

Some $2 million for water projects in Northwest Indiana remained intact in a bill approved by the House in Washington Thursday after it was amended in the Senate.

The House by a 384-17 vote approved the Conference Committee agreement on changes to the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, said U.S. Rep. Peter Visclosky, D-Merrillville.

The $2 million allocation for Northwest Indiana projects that survived in the final version includes:
- $1,373,000 for continued breakwater repair, dredging and stone bulkworks in Burns Waterway.
- $240,000 for the final study on the Little Calumet River flood control project prior to construction scheduled to begin in 1990.
- $165,000 to monitor beach erosion in Ogden Dunes and along Burns Waterway.
- $87,000 to complete studies on dredging the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal.
- $55,000 to repair the east breakwater at the Michigan City harbor.
- $30,000 for continued revetment repair in Beverly Shores.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will carry out the projects, said Visclosky.

He cited the Little Calumet project as having potentially the greatest economic and environmental impact of any recent public works project in Northwest Indiana.

Congress authorized $76 million for the flood control project.

See Water projects, Page B2
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in the 1986 Water Development Resources Act, but the corps continues to favor a less extensive plan costing about $45 million.

The corps is completing a cost-benefit study of both plans for Robert W. Page, Army undersecretary for civil works, who will determine which plan will be followed, according to a corps spokesman.

Visclosky, meanwhile, has insisted that since Congress appropriated $76 million, the corps should follow the more elaborate plan.

That plan calls for construction of levees to protect property along the Little Calumet River in Gary. The less expensive plan would limit levee construction mostly to the Hammond, Highland, Munster areas west of Gary.
Flood plan being ignored, Visclosky says

By Tom Knightly

Staff writer

U.S. Rep. Peter Visclosky has charged the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is disregarding a $76 million congressional authorization for a Little Calumet River flood control project.

The corps continues to favor a less extensive flood control plan costing about $45 million, $31 million less than Congress authorized, said Visclosky, D-Merrillville.

A spokesman at the corps' Chicago district office said that engineers are completing a study on the economic justification for each of the plans for Robert W. Page, Army undersecretary for civil works, the corps' civilian boss.

The study of the ratio of benefit to cost was requested because of the significant difference in costs of the two plans, said corps spokeswoman Evelyn Schiele.

Page notified Visclosky of the review by letter in September 1987, said Schiele. Page acknowledged in the letter that Congress in 1986 authorized funding for the more expensive plan, but he said because of significant differences in costs, he wanted to have the corps look at the two plans in greater detail to see if any cost adjustments could be made.

Page will decide which plan to follow based on the best cost-to-benefit ratio, Schiele said.

The corps in hearings before Congress prior to passage of the 1986 Water Resources Development Spending Act said the cost-benefit ratio was 1.4 for the $76 million plan ($1.40 projected in flood damage prevented for every $1 in cost) as compared to the cost-benefit ratio of 2.3 ($2.30 in.

damage prevented for each $1 cost) for the $45 million plan.

Construction is scheduled to begin in 1990 on the project.

The plan favored by the corps would allow it to buy several inexpensive homes in the flood plain in the Black Oak section of Gary and relocate the residents rather than build levees to protect the area from flooding.

The area would revert to wetlands to retain flood water, and pumping stations would be built to keep flood water flowing from Hammond from flooding residential areas in Black Oak.

The $45 million plan calls for extensive levees along Interstate 94 through Hammond but none east of Cline Avenue in Gary.

The more elaborate plan provides for levees in Black Oak and elsewhere in Gary east of Chase Street to the Penn Central Railroad tracks.

The entire river channel would be widened to 40 feet and dredged to prevent flooding under both plans.

The corps' Chicago office will complete the cost-benefit review of the two plans in July and will brief Page on the findings at that time, said Schiele.

Visclosky, meanwhile, expressed frustration over the lack of progress on the flood control project authorized by Congress for the 22 miles of Little Calumet River from the Illinois-Indiana state line to the mouth of Burns Ditch at Lake Michigan in Porter County.

At a Subcommittee on Water Resources hearing last week in Washington, Visclosky reminded corps' representative John Doyle-

See Flood plan, Page B2
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HEARING ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WATER RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1986, THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED
WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION, AND PROPOSED
WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS WHICH HAVE RECEIVED A FAVORABLE
REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1988

U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Water Resources
Committee on Public Works and Transportation
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:23 a.m., in
room 2167, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry J.
Nowak [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to note that it has captured my attention that as far as new construction starts, we have not seen any in Indiana. I guess my first question would be can we anticipate any during current fiscal year 1989.

Mr. DOYLE. As I recall, there was no new construction start proposed by the Administration in Indiana. I'll confirm that. There were six projects that were proposed by the Administration, four new start status in 1989. I don't believe any of those was in Indiana. But as I mentioned, at least at this point, none of those projects has been included in the appropriations process which, as you probably know, finished the Senator floor the day before yesterday.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The second question I would have would be general in nature. On the slide in the presentation prior to the designation of new project starts, there was a sheet called project downsizing. Would you care to explain the concept of project downsizing and its authorization as contained in the last Congress' authorization act?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, sir. And that's a fundamental question that really Congressman Petri was addressing in his comments.

One of the predictions that was made as to the effect that
cost-sharing reforms would have been that projects which,
when the Federal Government was paying the entire cost, were
oversized as a result of that financing arrangement, would
be scoped down, would be pared back, would be made more
economical and more environmentally acceptable as a result
of the requirement of non-Federal sponsors to come forward
and share in the cost. That, in effect, has happened.

That downsizing chart that you have illustrates four or
five examples of where that process has been seen: a couple
of navigation projects involving reduction in scope of the
channels that were originally envisioned, a couple of flood
control projects involving downsizing of the reservoirs, and
an actual reduction in one case of the number of reservoirs
as a direct result of the cost-sharing reforms in Public Law
99-662.

So, to go back to Mr. Petri's point, we think we truly are
getting the better bang for the buck for the American people
that was predicted and that you all gave us as a result of
99-662.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. So, the downsizing would occur because the
local sponsors would either be unable or unwilling to make
their appropriate contribution to the project, and so
modifications might be made based on that financing
available at the local level.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't think it's so much an inability as it
is a greater scrutiny that's being applied to the project selection process and the project scoping process as additional players have a more direct financial stake in the product that is being constructed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. But it would be by and large the initiative of the locals who would want to change the scope because when they now have to put additional monies on the line, they give reconsideration to the scope of the project.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, it's very much a motivation of us and the Department of the Army as well to try and make sure that we don't go forward with a project that's oversized, that attempts to do more than is economically in the best interest of the country. So, it's a partnership in every sense of the word.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would like to touch upon that, and obviously from a very parochial standpoint, a project in my district, and that is the Little Calumet River project. The public clause states that: "In accordance with plan 3A contained in the report of Chief of Engineers dated July 2, 1984, provided that all of the features of plan 3A, as recommended and described in the report of the district engineer, are included." In Secretary Page's letter of April 7, 1988, the phrase is contained: "For this reason, the Army Corps of Engineers was requested to review, revise as warranted, and compare both plan 3B and plan 3A."
My first question is who requested the review?

Mr. DOYLE. As I recall the facts, I did.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Can I ask why?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, sir. It's my recollection—and please help me if I get this wrong—that the plan that was recommended by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of the Army was plan 3B. That plan 3B was the plan which, according to our principles and guidelines, which are the rules and regulations establishing how we formulate projects in the national interest, was the plan that maximized what we call net economic development benefits for the Nation.

Plan 3A, as I recall, was a more costly plan, a less economic plan, from the perspective of any benefits, but it was a more strongly supported plan by some of the people at the local level.

In order to help us sort out the question of which of the two efforts the Administration would best be in a position to be able to support, we made a decision to take both plans forward at least through the GDM stage so that we could then in the meantime attempt to see if there was any compromise that might be able to be worked out between the two that everyone could support. And that was the essence of the decision, and in any event, then to be in a position at the end of the GDM for the Administration to decide which plan it wanted to support continuing with, if any.
Mr. VISCOSKY. Well, reading this statute that I have in front of me passed by the Congress and signed by the President of the United States, there is no mention of plan 3B. And further, to repeat the language contained in the statute, it says: "Provided that all of features of plan 3A as recommended by and described in the report of the district engineer are included."

Mr. DOYLE. I understand.

Mr. VISCOSKY. And so the reference in the statute talks about elements in 3A as recommended.

Mr. DOYLE. Absolutely. And there is no question that that language defines a project which, if it's built, will have to be adhered to or changed in some acceptable fashion.

The question I was addressing went more to the issue how can we go forward as far as we can under the circumstances that we find ourselves currently with budgetary constraints, more projects that we would like to build than we have funds to build, and at the same time be in a position down the road to either go in the direction that you have described or come back and try and persuade you, the Congress, that we need to change those words before the Administration would be able to support building the project.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I realize you have been very generous with your time. If I could just make a concluding comment, and then I will yield back my time.
I would note for the record that the local sponsors and people involved with the project—and some of them have literally worked on it for 10 to 20 years—have tried to work with the district staff as far as a modification of plan 3A. And I would certainly want to very strenuously note for the record that if there is to be a modification, it should be agreed to by all of the parties. It should be a modification of plan 3A that is acceptable, and again to note that plan 3B stopped short west of the City of Gary, Indiana, and under its original description would essentially flood out a number of residents of the city. And I must state again for the record that I am adamantly opposed to consideration of 3B, and I feel that it is not authorized.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back my time.

Mr. NOWAK. I thank the gentleman. And might I suggest that without getting into more detail at this general hearing that, Mr. Doyle, you make some of your staff people available to the Congressman so that they can perhaps go over this in some detail looking at all the options that were described here and perhaps the meeting of the minds could be brought together. But it seems that, as in many projects, there are some variances of opinion done at that district level and where they're going to go. So, we would appreciate your giving the time and the staff to Mr.
Viscosky.

Mr. DOYLE. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. We will clearly do that. And clearly, his leadership on this issue is recognized by all. We are very much aware that he intends to continue to manifest that leadership. And we'll do everything we can to work with him to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. NOWAK. Thank you.

Let me now turn to Guy Molinari from New York.

Mr. MOLINARI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good to see you again, John.

Mr. DOYLE. Good to be here, sir.

Mr. MOLINARI. I kind of had the feeling that it was nicer to have you behind us rather than in front of us, guiding us rather than answering questions. At the same time I know you are doing a valuable service.

I'm looking at the Senate bill, Senate 2100, and section 305 talks about wetlands. It says the Secretary is authorized as part of the existing wetland research program to conduct wetland research and restoration activities. The first question I have is what today does the Corps do with respect to wetland research. What does that program entail?

Mr. DOYLE. We have a program called the dredge material research program which looks at how we can beneficially use the material that we dredge for the benefit of the Nation.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
219 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604-1797

30 JUN 1988

Mr. Dan Gardner
Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
8149 Kennedy Avenue
Highland, Indiana 46322

Dear Mr. Gardner:

In accordance with Section 104 of the 1986 Water Resources Development Act, you requested by letter dated March 24, 1987 that credit be given to the Commission by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) for work that had been accomplished by local interests on the Little Calumet River, Indiana project. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), based upon the recommendation of the Office of Chief of Engineers, has granted a credit of $1,667,200. The creditable work meets the criteria established in ER 1165-2-29 (33 CFR 240) as being compatible integral work. The creditable work consists of the following features:

a. Excavation, under COE permit, of the channel between the Conrail Railroad and Chase Street for the amount of $270,000;
b. Dredging between Indianapolis Boulevard and Indianapolis Boulevard bridge for the amount of $64,800;
c. Reconstruction of the existing levee system between the State line and Hohman Avenue for the amount of $334,200; and,
d. Construction of a pumping station to replace the one at 173rd Street for the amount of $997,600.

You requested credit for items of lands purchased by the State of Indiana prior to project authorization, and recreation facilities. These items are not creditable under Section 104, but may be eligible for credit as items of local cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. David Hunter at (312) 353-6513.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
JESS J. FRANCO Jr.
LTC Corps of Engineers
District Engineer
June 6, 1988

The Honorable Chester F. Dobis
Indiana State Representative
Gainer Bank Center
8585 Broadway
Merrillville, IN 46410

Dear Representative Dobis:

Enclosed for your information and your use in formulating support for State budget priorities is a brief status report of progress toward construction of the long awaited Little Calumet River flood control and recreation project. In the report is an analysis of future funding required to see this project through completion by 1996.

In the fall of 1986 Congress passed the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, which authorized Federal construction of this long anticipated project. President Reagan signed into law on November 17, 1986 this bill, and for the first time, the Federal government (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers) was authorized to construct with some $60 million of Federal funds this needed flood protection, recreation and economic development project in northwest Indiana. Detailed engineering plans are being prepared and initial construction is anticipated to start in 1990.

Your past support of the Little Calumet River Project with continuous State funding in six consecutive biennium budgets is much appreciated and is responsible for bringing this project to the brink of this long awaited Federal construction start. Your continued support through the next several State biennium budgets will see this dream become a physical reality - benefiting directly those residents who live in the 9,500 structures currently subject to threats of flooding from the Little Calumet River. Also, the project has been designed to develop a regional recreation system through the heart of the Calumet Region and provide opportunities for significant private and public economic development/redevelopment along the Borman corridor.
June 6, 1988
Page 2

Board and staff members of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission have maintained close coordination with State agency staff personnel, especially at the State Budget Agency to ensure their understanding and support of our budgetary needs for the project. A major coordination meeting was held April 28 in Indianapolis to brief State Budget Agency, D.N.R., Highways, Attorney General's Office and Governor's Office staff. Col. Jess Franco, Chicago District Engineer, C.O.E. was present to show Federal commitment to the project. Senators Lugar and Quayle's offices and Congressman Visclosky's Office have been strongly supportive and have aided in moving Federal construction to readiness.

The Board and staff of the Development Commission are vitally interested in retaining your support for continued State funding to see this project to fruition. Please call if you have questions or need additional information.

The Development Commission will schedule a major project briefing for the area legislators/media this fall prior to start of the 1989 General Assembly Session.

Again, thank you for your interest and support and we look forward to working with you closely for the betterment of northwest Indiana.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

George Carlson
Chairman, Legislative Committee

/sjm
encl.
June 14, 1988

Mr. Dan Gardner  
Executive Director  
Little Calumet River Basin  
8149 Kennedy  
Highland, IN 46322

Dear Mr. Gardner:

At the most recent meeting of the Legislative Subcommittee of Governmental Affairs, subcommittee assignments were made on particular issues. Several people assigned as members of these subcommittees were assigned because of his/her knowledge or expertise in that particular area.

You may or may not presently be a member of the Legislative Subcommittee. This letter is to ask you to refer to the enclosed minutes for the committee you have been recommended for and advise if it would be possible to serve on that issue subcommittee. The next meeting is scheduled for June 28 (see enclosed); please advise this office in writing or by telephone whether you will be able to serve on this committee no later than June 23, 1988.

As you can see by the enclosed minutes, the issues are diverse and many. It is for this reason each issue has been assigned to a subcommittee to determine which of these issues will be presented to our area legislators for support during the next General Assembly.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

NORTHWEST INDIANA FORUM, INC.

Richard H. Griessl  
President and C.E.O.

RHG/df  
Encl.  
Cc: Quentin Blachly  
Jane Scholz
June 9, 1988

Mr. Dan Gardner  
Little Calumet River Basin  
Development Commission  
8149 Kennedy Avenue  
Highland, IN 46322

Dear Dan:

Pursuant to Town Board reaction to the proposed park site on 77th Avenue west of U.S. 41, the following is submitted:

* The Schererville Town Board of Trustees endorses the proposed purchase of this property by the Little Calumet River Basin Commission.

* Should there be a need of Schererville intervention in this effort, our support will be available in terms of Eminent Domain.

* Our Town Board further endorses the road bed, crushed stone, and a binder course of asphalt on the full length of this avenue from U.S. 41 to St. John Road.

* A final site plan will be worked out in conjunction with, and approved by, the Town Board of Trustees.

* Upon the purchase of this property, we understand that a procedure of ownership will be created that could allow for our park planning in terms of D.N.R. and/or D.O.R. assistance.

We look forward to working with all parties in this effort.

Respectfully,

JOHN H. FLAELAND, President  
Town Board of Trustees
June 24, 1988

Mr. David Hunter  
Plan Formulation Branch  
Department of the Army  
Chicago District Corps of Engineers  
219 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois, 60604-1797

Re: County Bridge #235, Chase Street over Little Calumet River

Dear Mr. Hunter,

The existing Bridge at this location consists of 3 - 6 foot diameter metal culverts each 100 feet long.

Prior to this time we had planned on having a new bridge constructed at this site to be underway or completed by 1995.

Now, at the request of the Little Calumet River Basin Commissione, we are considering replacing the 3 - 6 foot diameter culverts with 3 - new 6 foot diameter culverts.

In a letter received, from Mr. Richard E. Carlson Chief, Planning Division of your office, dated June 3, 1987, it was stated, that for design purposes a discharge of 610 cfts to pass the crossing with out creating a head loss of greater than 0.1 feet would be required and that the existing crossing adheres to that criteria provided that the roadway elevation not be raised.

I assume, therefore, that replacing the culverts with the same size would meet with your approval. However, if the channel is to be modified the new pipes should be set at an elevation to conform to the channel modification which according to high water profiles plate E - 13 would be approximately at elevation 686.4 MSL.
I would appreciate any detailed information you may have available as to the proposed final grade of the river bed so that we could properly design the proposed culverts.

If you would prefer I would be happy to meet with you so that we could coordinate our planning with yours.

Very Truly Yours,

Ray T. Tappan, P.E.
Lake County Highway Engineer

RTT/cp

cc: Board of Commissioners of the County of Lake

Frank C. DeRisi Superintendent, Lake County Highway Department

Mr. Dan Gardner, LCRBC
Man given a reprieve in fill furor

By Robin Fornoff
Staff writer

GARY — Today was to be the day.
The day Frank Halcarz, 70, of Gary was under orders to dig up 1,240 cubic yards of fill from his property on Burr Street near the Little Calumet River. Do that, or face the wrath of the federal government.

Dirt, clay, concrete block, asphalt, sand, splintered wooden timbers — it's all here, packed and leveled and high and dry. That is why Halcarz dumped the fill here to begin with. To stop the flooding.

Halcarz says his home and property were flooded twice a year, every year for 20 years. Water ankle-deep in his backyard, pouring through the basement windows, says Halcarz. He brandishes eight-by-ten color glossy photographs to prove it.

Halcarz stopped the flooding by adding the fill. An estimated 62 truck loads between 1973 and 1985.

Now, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers says Halcarz must dig it up and cart it away. And the corps wants it done by today.

"I can't possibly remove it," says Halcarz. "I don't have the money."

Halcarz says it is a typical case of government bureaucracy picking on the little guy. The corps says it has no choice. And Terry McCloskey — the president of the Indiana Izak Walton League on whose complaint all this started — says Halcarz is hardly a victim.

"He's buried barrels in there," said McCloskey. "He's not as clean as he says he is and neither is that fill."

Halcarz denies there are barrels of any kind in the fill; He admits there is scrap steel, wood and some roofing shingles, as noted in a March 10 inspection by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management.

None of the items are permitted for use as fill under state law and city ordinance, according to McCloskey. Halcarz says he is willing to remove the offending scrap.

McCloskey and the corps contend Halcarz filled in a wetland. Even though Halcarz owns the property, federal law forbids filling, according to Gary R. Manestro, chief of the corps' regulatory function branch in Detroit.

McCloskey says he witnessed barrels being buried on the Halcarz property about two years ago and reported it to the state. He also says he has similar reports from what he called "my little old lady brigade on that street."

Halcarz was specifically cited for violating a section of The Clean Water Act. The law requires Halcarz to obtain a permit from the state before any filling could be allowed.

Halcarz applied to the state for an after-the-fact permit. He was turned down.

"So we really don't have a choice," said Wally Gauthier, project manager for the corps. "Without a state water quality permit, we must insist he remove the fill."

Gauthier said the corps was working on a settlement. He said he had contacted the state department of environmental management Thursday and urged a compromise, allowing Halcarz to remove a portion of the fill and letting the rest remain in place.

The state granted Halcarz a reprieve.

"Until July 12," said Halcarz, "when they can get up here and mark what they want taken out. They said it would be just a small area, like a ditch is all. So it looks good."

At least for today.
## Marina Development Commission Grant Fund Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>LCRBC</th>
<th>GTE</th>
<th>Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Treatment System Removal</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Extension</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Telephone Cable Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Steel Bridge Removal</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Waterway North of U.S. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals: $932,000.**

**Midwest | 286,000 | LCRBC | 113,000 | GTE  | 70,000 | Grant  | 463,000**

**NOTE:**

This project will remove all significant obstructions to the Portage-Burns Waterway, thereby opening inland marina sites to larger boats. Without the larger boats, the various Portage marina developments would not be financially feasible. The GTE cable relocation will open the LCRBC site for marina development. Landscaping along the waterway will improve the appearance of the channel (a marketing tool), and stabilize the steep shoreline (preventing erosion).

* These funds may be provided through the Portage Port Authority or the Little Calumet River Basin Commission.

---

**NOTE:** This chart was prepared by the city of Portage
By SANDRA GUY
Times Staff Writer

HAMMOND — Chances are very good the Indiana General Assembly will vote during its upcoming session to change the way boats are taxed, Barbara Waxman, project director for the Lake Michigan Marina Development Commission, said on Tuesday.

The switch would replace Indiana's current personal property tax levy on boats — a much heftier fee than surrounding states' — with an excise tax based on the size of the boat.

A bill introduced in the 1988 General Assembly by Rep. Chester Dobis, D-Merrillville, proposed a $150 excise tax in place of the current $1,000 personal property tax on a 25-foot boat in Lake County.

The marina commission and the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission have said the personal property tax would restrict development of the marine industry in Lake, Porter and LaPorte counties.

Proponents of a change in the boat tax also point to the neighboring states of Michigan, Illinois and Ohio, which impose only minimal registration fees. The owner of the 25-foot boat who would owe $1,000 in Indiana could register and store the same boat in Michigan for about $60.

The tax replacement idea has been introduced in the General Assembly for at least the past 12 years, Waxman said.

But the session that begins in January seems to have all the right ingredients for passage, she said.

"I think there's really a will on the part of a number of individuals" to change the tax, Waxman told the commission during a meeting in Mayor Thomas McDermott's office. Among the legislators involved in the effort are Dobis, Rep. Paul Hric, D-Hammond; Rep. Ralph Ayres, R-Chesterton; and Sen. John Bushemi, D-Gary. Hric and Ayres attended Tuesday's meeting.

The personal property tax on boats could be phased out by 1990 if a bill implementing the excise tax by that date passes, Waxman said.

The legislation would close a loophole in the current law that allows many Hoosiers to store their boats out of state, taking substantial storage and winter repair fees and jobs away from Indiana, said Waxman.

"We're also seeing a lot of out-of-state boaters bringing new dollars into the state, but there is an exodus as soon as boating season ends," she said.

But Hric — a member of the House Ways and Means Committee — said he opposes the excise tax because he believes it would scare off boaters, and because some boaters who had paid the tax would end up on waiting lists for slips.

There are plenty of other taxes that could provide the needed revenue to operate marinas planned along the Lake Michigan shoreline, he said, citing as one example a tax on food and beverages sold in restaurants.

Hric also called on city officials to provide free boat ramp launching services at their marinas, since the facilities are partly funded by state and local taxpayers' dollars.

But McDermott disagreed with the free launching idea, noting that the revenues from minimal fees are needed for maintenance.

Whihala Beach County Park, run by the Lake County Parks and Recreation Department, has a $5 fee per launch, as well as season tickets. Both Michigan City and East Chicago charge launching fees at their marinas, Waxman noted.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DATE: June 16, 1988

CONTACT: Rudy Murrieta, Press Assistant: 202/225-2461

----------------------------------------

VIASCLOSKY UPSET OVER DELAY OF LITTLE CALUMET RIVER PROJECT

U.S. Rep. Pete Visclosky, D-Merrillville, Thursday expressed his frustration over the Army Corp of Engineers' sluggishness in beginning construction on the Little Calumet River flood control project.

At a Subcommittee on Water Resources hearing, Visclosky reminded Corp representative John Doyle that the Water Resources Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662) directed the Corp to pursue this project by following the guidelines of a plan which would extend the program through Lake and Porter Counties to Lake Michigan and provide thorough protection for the Black Oak neighborhood in Gary, Indiana.

Unfortunately, the Corp has continued to study a plan which would not provide flood control protection for areas east of
CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL
OF
CONSTRUCTION IN A FLOODWAY

This certificate is issued to Lake County Board of Commissioners
in accordance with an application dated April 18, 1988
filed by Congdon Engineering Associates, Inc.
for Northcote Avenue Bridge over The Little Calumet River at the north side of Munster, Lake County in the SW¼, SW½, Section 17, T. 36 N., R. 9 W., UTMN=601550,
UTME=459500

upon the finding by the Commission that the proposed work will not in the reasonably foreseeable future interfere with flood control in the State, or adversely affect the efficiency of nor unduly restrict the capacity of the floodway or constitute an unreasonable hazard to the safety of life or property, nor result in an unreasonable detrimental effect upon fish, wildlife or botanical resources. The Commission approves the proposed work, subject to the limitations and conditions stipulated below, provided the project is constructed and maintained in accordance with the plans, specifications and other data submitted with the application. There shall be no deviation from said plans unless the proposed change in plans shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the State of Indiana acting by and through its Natural Resources Commission.

LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

This approval granted with the conditions that: (1) no felled trees, brush or other debris be left in the floodway of the stream, (2) all disturbed areas be
(over)

Further limitations and conditions are that notice shall be given the Commission five days prior to the beginning of construction. This approval shall become void if construction of the project has not been started within 12 months of the date of this Certificate. The approval by the Commission does not relieve the person making application of the responsibility to obtain all other permits, easements or approvals nor of liability for the effects of his project upon the safety of life and property of others.

Recommended approval
by the Council:

June 16, 1988

Council Chairman

Deputy Director

Docket No. B-10,590
## LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
### MONTHLY BUDGET REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET CODE</th>
<th>BUDGET CATEGORY</th>
<th>BUDGET AMOUNT</th>
<th>AMOUNT PAID PREVIOUSLY</th>
<th>UNPAID BALANCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT READY FOR PAYMENT</th>
<th>PROJECTED BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16000.00</td>
<td>212.00</td>
<td>15788.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15788.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>7500.00</td>
<td>2017.98</td>
<td>5482.02</td>
<td>331.33</td>
<td>5150.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>NIPSCO SERVICES</td>
<td>94000.00</td>
<td>27660.52</td>
<td>66339.48</td>
<td>3934.72</td>
<td>62404.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>TRAVEL MILEAGE</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
<td>174.08</td>
<td>5825.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5825.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>PRINTING ADVERTISING</td>
<td>2500.00</td>
<td>251.08</td>
<td>2248.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2248.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>BONDS INSURANCE</td>
<td>7500.00</td>
<td>1104.95</td>
<td>6395.05</td>
<td>5385.50</td>
<td>1099.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>EMERGENCY MAINTENANCE COST</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
<td>377.03</td>
<td>2622.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2622.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES - ACQUISITION</td>
<td>50000.00</td>
<td>10191.00</td>
<td>39809.00</td>
<td>1303.00</td>
<td>38506.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>100000.00</td>
<td>40216.95</td>
<td>59783.05</td>
<td>3816.14</td>
<td>55966.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>LAND PURCHASE COSTS</td>
<td>3945519.00</td>
<td>65648.08</td>
<td>3879870.92</td>
<td>5433.56</td>
<td>3874437.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>150000.00</td>
<td>4540.00</td>
<td>145460.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>145460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>BURNS BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2128.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2128.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>STRUCT. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>40000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>PROPERTY/STRUCTURES INSURANCE</td>
<td>25000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4452647.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>152393.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>4300253.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>35071.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>4265181.85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CLAIMS READY FOR PAYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET CODE</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>LOUIS M. CASALE</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>LOUIS M. CASALE</td>
<td>283.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>NIPSCO</td>
<td>3934.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>DON POWERS AGENCY</td>
<td>5385.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>LOUIS M. CASALE</td>
<td>1303.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>ROBERT B. STOUFFER</td>
<td>560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>NIPSCO</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>ROBERT B. STOUFFER</td>
<td>544.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>NIPSCO</td>
<td>665.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>ROBERT B. STOUFFER</td>
<td>1810.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>ESTER SMITH</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>AVA FOSTER</td>
<td>1433.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>ALLANSON INSURANCE CO</td>
<td>13890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>DON POWERS AGENCY, INC.</td>
<td>977.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>35071.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPLANATION OF CLAIM

- ADDITIONAL ATTORNEY FEES FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 1988
- ATTORNEY RETAINER FEE FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 1988
- DIRECTORS & OFFICERS LIABILITY INSURANCE RENEWAL
- LAND ACQUISITION LEGAL SERVICE RENDERED DURING JUNE 1988
- TITLE WORK INCURRED RE: ERIE RAILROAD BRIDGE
- LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES RENDERED MAY 23-27, 1988
- UTILITY EXPENSE INCURRED RE: PURCHASE PRICE OF PROPERTY DC 87 5.0 ACRES
- REIMBURSEMENT RE: MOVING EXPENSES AS PER CONTRACT