MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1992 AT LAKE ETTA PARK SITE MAINTENANCE BUILDING 4801 WEST 29TH AVENUE, GARY

AGENDA

1. Call to Order by Chairperson Arlene Colvin
2. Recognition of Visitors, Guests
3. Approval of minutes of October 1, 1992
4. Executive Director's Report
   - Wicker Park Manor tieback levee project
     - Construction complete - inspection report
     - Project documentation
   - Erie bridge clearing
   - Conrail culverts/low-flow structure issue
5. Reports of Standing Committees
   A. Finance/Policy Committee - Clyde Baughard, Treasurer
      - Financial status report
      - Approval of claims for October, 1992
      - Corps letter of request for deposit of $650,000 in escrow account
      - Corps letter withdrawing $130,000 from escrow account
      - Commission letter to State Budget Committee requesting release of next $2 million funding (1989/91 Build Indiana Fund)
B. Legislative Committee - George Carlson, Chairman

- 1993/95 biennium request
  - Budget Committee hearing scheduled changed to 1:00 p.m. Thursday, November 19th in Indianapolis
  - Letter to Bart Peterson, aide to Governor Bayh, re: Administration budget support
  - Budget support presentation to area legislators, elected officials

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

- **Joint Committee meeting at 5:30 p.m.**
- Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
- Other issues

D. Project Engineering/Construction Committee

- **Joint Committee meeting at 5:30 p.m.**
- Project construction status
- Utility relocation status
  - Letter to Corps regarding project utility relocation/reconstruction process
- Project construction subcontracting/labor participation
  - Prime contractors good faith effort
- Letter to Arlene for Mayor's use in Grant St. meeting with INDOT
- Support letter from Congressman to Lake County Commissioners on behalf of Lake County Emergency Management/Civil Defense

E. Marina Development Committee - Bill Tanke, Chairman

- Project status report
  - Sandmining status
  - Underground storage tank found
- Portage Board of Public Works action re: Project Engineer
  - Recommend Abonmarche for negotiation
- Other issues

6. Other Business

7. Statements to the Board from the floor

8. Set date for next meeting; adjournment
Chairperson Arlene Colvin's address, Chairman George Carlson called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. Nine (9) Commissioners were present. Quorum was declared and guests were recognized.

Development Commissioners:

Arlene Colvin
George Carlson
Charles Agnew
Dave Springman
Nathaniel Leonard
Steve Davis
Clyde Baughard
William Tanke

Visitors:

Leroy Wells - Lake Co. Highway
Adam Adams - Congressman
Visclosky's Office
Sunita Singh - Congressman
Visclosky's Office
D. Shapiro - Highland
Jim Flora - R.W. Armstrong
Siavash Beik - DNR, Div. Water
Bill Petrites - Highland
Stanley Petrites - Highland
Virgil Meier - Highland
Ola Kennedy - Lake County
Jim Hiddle - Highland
Louis Hiddle - Highland
Mike Vander Heyden - Dyer
Construction Co.
Angela Moore - The Times
John Bach - Town of Highland
Dale Baker - DNR, Div. Water

The minutes of the September 9th, 1992 meeting were approved by a motion from Clyde Baughard; seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.

Executive Director's Report - Mr. Gardner gave an update to the Commission regarding Wicker Park tie back levee project. He informed Commission that Dyer Construction has almost completed the job. Mr. Dale Baker, Dept. of Natural Resources field inspector for Div. of Water, is here to inspect the project. R. W. Armstrong also has been on site to oversee the project. Although the material looks good, all paperwork documentation needs to be in order to allow approval.
Mr. Gardner referred to a letter from INDOT to Mr. Simpson, Director of DNR div. of Water, regarding Indianapolis Blvd. bridge replacement schedule. As presently stated in the letter, no monies are available until either fiscal year 93 or 94. Mr. Gardner has not seen preliminary design of bridge. Although the bridge replacement needs to be done as soon as possible, FEMA would still certify Wicker Park Manor out of the floodplain with the existing bridge in place - as long as the Corps levee is built and an acceptable closure plan is in place, and provided the overall project is 100% funded and 50% constructed.

Finance/Policy Committee - Committee Chairman Clyde Baughard presented the financial status report for September as well as the claims. Mr. Baughard made a motion to approve the pending claims; motion seconded by Chuck Agnew; motion passed unanimously.

Legislative Committee - Mr. Gardner informed the Commissioners that next Thursday, October 8th is the scheduled date for the State Budget hearing. Congressman Viskosky's office, Lane Ralph from Senators' office, Col. Reed and Rich Carlson from the Corps will attend. Ms. Colvin and Mayor Barnes of Gary will already been in attendance for the LMDC. The Commission's request this biennium is $7 million, which is what is needed to stay on construction schedule with the Corps. Mr. Gardner will contact Bart Peterson to see if we are in the Governor's budget.

Land Acquisition Committee - Land Acquisition Chairman Chuck Agnew made a motion to sign an agreement with NIPSCO for the temporary flood protection until the Corps built levee is in place; motion seconded by Clyde Baughard; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Agnew reported that Kewan Western of Illinois received the Stage III contract between Chase & Grant for the north and south levee lines. Approximate cost is $6 million.

Project Engineering/Construction Committee - Mr. Gardner reported that Dyer Construction/Ellas Construction for Stage II Phase II has begun the work from Harrison to Grant. He stated that he, Lou Casale and Jim Flora need to meet with the Corps to discuss the NIPSCO cost estimates for relocation of lines. This is a priority that needs to be addressed.
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Marina/Breakwater Committee - Mr. Gardner gave an update on marina status. Ron Schults from Abonmarche attended the last meeting and gave a detailed update. Mr. Baughard made a motion to ratify the contract with Area Tree Service in the amount of $15,000 for clearing and grubbing on the marina site; motion was seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.

The Marina Committee members received a detailed packet of marina activities. Mr. Gardner informed the Commissioners that the Portage Port Authority recommended Abonmarche to continue as project engineering firm that will perform the final engineering plans. The Commission sent a letter to Portage acknowledging our concurrence of the choice.

Mr. Gardner referred to the letter received from the Corps stating they have not yet received the perpetual easements needed for the operation and maintenance of the Burns Small Boat Harbor. There are three remaining tracts that need to be addressed. Mr. Casale will address in the very near future. Federal money has been set aside to do harbor dredging but it cannot begin until easements are secured. This is a local sponsor responsibility.

Mr. Gardner will meet with Ron Schults and John Hannon to formulate responses to the four letters received on the federal permit application.

Statements to the Board - Citizen Don Shapiro questioned who was working by the overpass on Indianapolis Blvd. He was informed that it is State Highway that is working on the west side. He and Stan Petrites are still concerned about the quantity of water that comes out of Ultra parking lot from the stores. Even when new levee is built, they feel Wicker Park Manor will still be flooded because of water from the stores. Although this is a town problem and must be addressed by the town, the Commission will work with them to the extent possible. John Bach, Public Works Director for Highland, acknowledged that the problem was the town's and the funding to correct the problem is the concern now.

Mr. Bach informed the Commission that debris has built up again at the Erie R.R. bridge. Commission will investigate matter.

There was no other business. The next Commission meeting was scheduled for Thursday, November 5, 1992 at 6:30 p.m.
**LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**MERCANTILE NATIONAL BANK**

**JANUARY 1, 1992 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1992**

### CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECKING ACCOUNT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND ACQUISITION</strong></td>
<td>125,840.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL FUND</strong></td>
<td>68,026.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAX FUND</strong></td>
<td>2,922.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTMENTS</strong></td>
<td>1,279,651.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RECEIPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 1992 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1992</th>
<th>1,476,441.39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEASE RENTS</strong></td>
<td>52,565.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEREST</strong></td>
<td>39,857.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND ACQUISITION</strong></td>
<td>244,238.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS</strong></td>
<td>25,394.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCRBC - INTEREST FROM INVESTMENT</strong></td>
<td>828.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST TO DATE</strong></td>
<td>14,769.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXES</strong></td>
<td>46.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 1992 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1991 EXPENSES PAID IN 1992</th>
<th>22,485.67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER-DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>2,241.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRPC</td>
<td>49,821.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL &amp; MILEAGE</td>
<td>617.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; ADVERTISING</td>
<td>236.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDS AND INSURANCE</td>
<td>5,426.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>1,173.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>20,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICES</td>
<td>5,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES</td>
<td>40,521.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL SERVICES</td>
<td>56,027.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>17,245.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>2,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A REAL ESTATE TAXES</strong></td>
<td>1,000.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A UTILITY RELOCATION</strong></td>
<td>19,858.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A PROPERTY STRUCTURES ACQUISITIONS</strong></td>
<td>39,969.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A LAND CAP IMPROVEMENT</strong></td>
<td>16,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A STRUCTURE CAP IMPROVEMENT</strong></td>
<td>33,020.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L/A PROPERTY STRUCTURE INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>17,944.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCRBC FUNDS RE: CULVERT INSTALLATION</strong></td>
<td>220,479.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSE RE: BID REFUND</strong></td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</strong></td>
<td>576,578.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH POSITION - SEPTEMBER 30, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECKING ACCOUNT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND ACQUISITION</strong></td>
<td>73,409.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL FUND</strong></td>
<td>127,448.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAX FUND</strong></td>
<td>1,935.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTMENTS</strong></td>
<td>1,060,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</strong></td>
<td>14,769.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL** | 1,277,562.58 |
**INVOICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS: DAN GARDNER &amp; SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>$5,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOM RENTAL FOR ADDITIONAL LCRBDC STAFF</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING SERVICES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE: LOCAL SERVICE</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE: BILLABLE CHARGES (ATTACHMENTS)</td>
<td>113.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>105.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPYING CHARGES @ $.07 PER COPY (1,596 COPIES)</td>
<td>111.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAPHICS/PRINTING TIME @ $18.00 PER HOUR (ATTACHMENTS) (6.5 HRS.)</td>
<td>117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF MILEAGE/EXPENSES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CHARGES (ATTACHMENTS)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SEPTEMBER, 1992 COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,312.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTSTANDING PAYMENT DUE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PAYMENT DUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,312.93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 2, 1992

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

We request that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission provide a local cash contribution of $650,000 for the Little Calumet River Flood Protection and Recreation Project in accordance with Articles II and VI of the Local Cooperation Agreement executed on August 16, 1990. Please deposit the funds into the established escrow account as specified in Article VI.6.2 of the Local Cooperation Agreement.

The requested contribution represents the commission's obligation to contribute in cash 5 percent of the costs estimated to be incurred (related to structural flood control measures) through the end of the Federal Government's fiscal year ending on September 30, 1993.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Carlson
Richard E. Carlson, P.E.
Deputy District Engineer
Project Management
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
111 NORTH CANAL STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606-7206

OCT 27 1992

Project Management

Mr. James H. Luken
Senior Vice President
INB National Bank, NW.
651 East Commercial Avenue
P.O. Box 8
Lowell, Indiana 46356

Subject: Little Calumet River Project Construction Fund Escrow Account Number 02-444-747

Dear Mr. Luken:

The Department of the Army hereby issues a written demand for withdrawal of $130,000 from the referenced escrow account in accordance with the escrow agreement entered into on August 16, 1990.

Please provide the amount requested above in the form of a bank draft payable to "FAO, U. S. Army Engineer Division, North Central." Please mail or otherwise deliver to this address to the attention of Ms. Patricia A. Lawlor, CENCC-PP-PO, within 10 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
David M. Reed
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army
District Engineer

Copy Furnished:

Mr. Dan Gardner
Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
8149 Kennedy Avenue
Highland, Indiana 46322
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Previous Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Current Date &amp; Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Insurance</td>
<td>Nov. 18, 8:15A</td>
<td>Nov. 18, 8:30A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Memorials Comm.</td>
<td>Nov. 18, 8:30A</td>
<td>Nov. 18, 8:50A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Calumet</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 8:15A</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 1:00P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Michigan Marina</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 8:30A</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 1:15P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 1:00P</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 1:30P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revision #7
October 22, 1992
Mr. Bart Peterson  
Governor Bayh's Office  
State House  
Indianapolis, Indiana  46204

Dear Mr. Peterson:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission is writing you to enlist the support of the Bayh administration for the $7 million capital request before the State Budget Committee for the 1993/95 biennium. This is the most critical state budget for this project due to the start and rapid acceleration of the federal construction. To meet non-federal commitments; to allow over $52 million in federal construction improvements to be let on schedule (covering the federal fiscal years); and to actually bring real flood relief and property value increases to over 9,500 structures along the Little Calumet River - the Development Commission needs state legislature support in the amount of $7 million.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss in detail the justification of this $7 million request with you or others of the Governor's staff to assure you of the critical nature of this session. We have worked closely with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, the local communities and area elected officials/legislators to maintain project support.

I have enclosed some additional information citing some of the project's benefits, costs and details. I will be contacting you to discuss any questions and future discussion.

We sincerely appreciate the support the Bayh administration has given to this project and will work to justify the support needed at this critical time.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner  
Executive Director

/sjm
October 12, 1992

Mr. Richard Carlson
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
111 N. Canal Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7206

Re: Project Utility Relocation/Reconstruction Process

Dear Mr. Carlson:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission is prepared to proceed immediately to finalize and approve work orders with the Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO) relative to required utility reconstructions/relocations for coordination with the federal flood control construction schedule. To best facilitate this coordination of the construction approval and costing among the Corps of Engineers, the Development Commission, and NIPSCO, I am forwarding procedures we recommend to enable the work to proceed in an orderly and timely manner.

1. Utility Design Approval. The Development Commission recommends that each proposed NIPSCO utility design and cost estimate be reviewed and formally approved by Corps staff engineers, with assistance and input from the Development Commission's project engineer, Jim Flora. Corps lead in this approval process would assure: (1) design compatibility with the flood control needs and a determination of reasonableness of the cost estimate; (2) determination and assurance the design proposed is not a "project betterment" before work is authorized; and (3) Corps documentation to allow clear guidance in the approval of "credits" to the Development Commission for the contracted work.
2. Work Order Approval. Once the design and cost estimates are approved by the Corps of Engineers and the Development Commission's project engineer, a Utility Relocation Agreement will be presented to the Commission for its approval. The form and substance of the agreement needs to be reviewed and approved by NIPSCO to allow work to proceed and to allow for auditing/crediting purposes.

3. Final Cost Determination Eligible for Payment/Credit. The Development Commission recommends the work be authorized on a materials/time basis for determination of final cost. Procedures to monitor/approve any cost deviations from the project estimate would be put in place to insure Corps and Commission concurrence for payment and crediting purposes.

The Development Commission believes these recommendations will facilitate coordination among the three entities and produce quality and timely results. Please call me to discuss this proposal so as to expedite the utility reconstruction/relocation process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

/sjm
cc: Lou Casale, Attorney
    Jim Flora, R.W. Armstrong
Dear Mr. Gardner:

Mr. Roy Pratt, city of Gary Councilman-at-Large, furnished to this office a copy of his June 22d letter to you concerning minority hiring in connection with the Little Calumet River, Indiana flood control project. In response to Mr. Pratt's letter, I have outlined the various actions the Chicago District has taken to encourage and ensure minority participation in the construction of this project in the following paragraphs.

We have participated in three contractor seminars. The first meeting, held on October 29, 1990 in the Indiana University Library Conference Center, was sponsored by Congressman Peter J. Visclosky, the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC), Partners in Contracting, Inc. and the Corps of Engineers. The second and third meetings were held on January 11, 1991, and February 13, 1992 in the offices of the Urban League of Northwest Indiana. The purpose of these sessions was to provide contractors, particularly local small and small disadvantaged businesses, with an overview of the Corps of Engineers' contracting procedures, including advertising and bidding methods, contractor qualifications and bonding requirements. Also provided was an overview of the scope and schedule of the flood control project, types of contracts expected to be awarded and the range of contract costs. The procedures used to qualify contractors under the Section 8(a) Set Aside program administered by the Small Business Administration (SBA) were also discussed. We also attended a special meeting of the Gary City Council on February 10, 1992 to discuss the Little Calumet River project and Corps of Engineers' contracting procedures.
The Chicago District has already designated three contracts for small business minority firms under the Section 8(a) Set Aside program. These include two demolition contracts in the Black Oak area set aside to Ramirez and Marsch, Inc., a Hispanic owned Gary firm. The first contract, totalling $83,200, has been completed. The second contract is presently in the prenegotiation phase. We are now in the process of setting aside a third contract under the Section 8(a) program. This contract, which will consist of constructing the south levee between Georgia Street and Martin Luther King Drive, will have a value estimated between $1.0 and $2.0 million. The Black owned firm Murdock and Sons Construction, Inc., South Bend, Indiana has been identified by the SBA as being capable of accomplishing this contract.

All competitively bid contracts for this project will contain a goal for minority participation, expressed in terms for the contractor’s aggregate workforce in each trade on all construction work. This goal is presently 20.9 percent as established by the U.S. Department of Labor. The contractor must make a good faith effort to employ minorities in view of this goal. In addition, all construction contracts of $1 million or more awarded to large business firms must have a plan approved by the Contracting Officer which contains goals for subcontracting with small and small disadvantaged business firms prior to the award of the contracts. Again, the contractor must make a good faith effort in implementing the plan.

To date, we have awarded two competitively bid contracts. The initial contract for $12,500 was awarded to the Reagins Construction Company, a Black owned Gary firm, for demolition of structures in the Black Oak area. The award was based upon a request for quotations. The second contract was awarded to the Dyer Construction Company to complete construction of the first levee segment between Harrison and Broadway at a cost of $358,159. There were four firms which submitted bids in connection with this second contract work, none of which was a minority firm. We have reviewed the payroll records of Dyer Construction Company and its two subcontractors, one of which was the Ellas Construction Company, a Gary firm. This review indicated that the three firms logged 2,687 hours of work effort. Of this total, 1,155 hours, or 43 percent, were worked by minorities, consisting of 6 percent Hispanic American, 18 percent Black American,
and 19 percent Asian-Pacific American. Based on our review, we believe that the Dyer Construction Company made a good faith effort to employ minorities.

On July 28th, we opened bids on the third competitively bid contract for construction of the second levee segment between Grant and Harrison north of the river. There were three firms which submitted bids on this work, none of which was a minority firm. The apparent low bid was submitted as a joint venture between the Dyer and Ellas Companies. The Chicago District held a pre-bid conference on May 18, 1992 to discuss the proposed work in this contract with potential contractors. This meeting also provided the opportunity for sub-contractors and independents to meet potential prime contractors. To the best of our knowledge representatives from only one, possibly two, minority firms attended the meeting. At two different times during the meeting, Lieutenant Colonel Randall R. Inouye, Chicago District Engineer, strongly encouraged potential contractors to support affirmative action and get the local Gary contractors and labor force involved in the construction of this project.

The Corps of Engineers must execute its contracting procedures in strict accordance with all applicable Federal acquisition and procurement regulations. In order to further promote local hiring, we could submit a formal request for a deviation from such regulations to permit a clause to be placed in future contracts providing for a given level of local labor preference. We could initiate a request following receipt of a letter from the LCRBDC requesting a deviation and identifying the extent of local labor preference desired and the basis and justification for the request. The request would be processed through the Office, Chief of Engineers, and the Office, Secretary of the Army to the Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Washington, D.C. The process is difficult and there is no assurance that a deviation would be granted.

One way for Gary contractors to become more competitive for work in the Little Calumet River region would be for them to become certified under the SBA Section 8(a) program. Ramirez and Marsch, Inc. is the only Gary firm participating in this program. Therefore, we strongly suggest that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission continue to encourage Gary contractors to work toward certification immediately.
We will continue to work closely with the LCRBDC, the local communities and our contractors to promote affirmative action and minority participation in the construction of the Little Calumet River project. However, our contracting work must be executed in accordance with the established Federal procurement and acquisition regulations.

Sincerely,

David M. Reed
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army
District Engineer
MEMORANDUM

TO: Arlene Colvin for Mayor Thomas Barnes

FROM: Dan Gardner, Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission

SUBJECT: Grant Street bridge project

DATE: October 22, 1992

ISSUE - There is a critical need to request a meeting as soon as possible with INDOT Commissioner John Dillion and key INDOT staff to seek INDOT commitment and funding for Grant Street bridge raising over the Little Calumet River in Gary.

SUGGESTED MEETING ATTENDEES:

- INDOT (Commissioner Dillion, key policy/development staff)
- Mayor's Office, engineer - Gary
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Col. Reed, Rich Carlson)
- Congressman Visclosky staff (Adam Adams)
- Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (Dan Gardner)

SITUATION

With the Federal Corps of Engineers Flood Control/Recreation project currently contracting flood protection construction (levee system) in the Grant Street area, the Grant Street bridge crossing of the river needs improvement to coordinate with the flood control project.
SITUATION (Cont'd)

The Federal project will protect the urban developments along Grant Street and Interstate 80/94 up to a 200 year level of flood protection. This is being accomplished principally by the construction of a levee system parallel to the Little Calumet River in Gary, with the levee heights being approximately 603' feet. The current Grant Street bridge crossing needs to be raised some 7' to 8' to tie into the new levee system to enable Grant Street to remain open to traffic during all flooding events. Failure to raise the bridge will force the construction of "closure gates" in time of flooding to maintain flood protection. This option was in the original plan, but was deleted at the urging of the city of Gary and the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (local sponsor for the Federal project) as being unacceptable. Clearly preferable to all is to maintain traffic use at all times. This requires a bridge raising project tied to the interchange configuration and the flood protection levee system.

CURRENT PROBLEM - INDOT has not accepted responsibility or scheduled a project to meet the need of raising this bridge in coordination with the Federal flood control project schedule. INDOT has stated that the project and cost should be a "local cost" (Gary cost) for the project. Our contention is the existing bridge elevation was set as part of the I-80/94 interchange with Grant Street by INDOT in the original construction of I-80/94 and the Grant Street interchange; and as such INDOT should bear the responsibility for the reconstruction cost for the project. INDOT stated at the time of I-80/94 construction that the inadequate culverts on Grant Street over the Little Calumet River were "temporary" and would be addressed when the flood control project was at hand. Now is that time!

CRISIS SITUATION - The long awaited Federal construction has begun with over $52 million in Federal construction contracts scheduled for the next three federal fiscal years. This construction schedule and the protection afforded by this construction is at risk of stopping if a construction project at the Grant Street bridge over the Little Calumet River is not committed to. This stoppage is clearly unacceptable to all parties, as is closing Grant Street in flood situations.
DESIGN SOLUTION - The Corps of Engineers has prepared a preliminary design of the solution needed to keep Grant Street open and provide connection with the levee system. The preliminary cost estimates are relatively small for the benefits achieved (cost estimate is under $1 million). This cost is comparable to the closure gates, with the principal benefit of keeping Grant Street open to traffic at all times. Additionally, the manpower needed to effect the flood gate closure and the potential for mechanical or human failure is eliminated.

The solution is clear; all that is needed now is for INDOT to stand up and take the appropriate responsibility!

/sjm
Mr. Robert F. Crossk  
President  
Lake County Council  
2293 North Main Street  
Crown Point, Indiana 46307

Dear Bob:

I write on behalf of the Lake County Emergency Management Agency (LC EMA).

Due to a recent County Council motion, funding for the LC EMA has been substantially reduced. The reduction of funding will have a significant impact on LC EMA’s ability to execute the instrumental programs which are vital to Northwest Indiana. LC EMA plays a fundamental role in implementing and managing the emergency response programs for the towns, cities and unincorporated areas within the county. The LC EMA is also responsible for addressing the coordination of scene emergencies and resources, as well as providing early warning and support in communications to reporting agencies at the local, state and federal level.

In addition, the LC EMA has taken the initiative in writing, developing, and updating the necessary flood protection plans which the Army Corps of Engineers has mandated of each community that borders the Little Calumet River. The plans are instrumental devices which protect the communities from the ravages of potential Little Calumet flooding. I have worked diligently to secure funding for the Little Calumet River Project and without the flood protection plans, the project stands a chance of being prolonged.

Furthermore, the cutting of the budgeted utility costs and related accounts would in effect create the inability of the LC EMA to operate/function at its present level at the site. Thus, the budget cut will force the LC EMA to move to the Lake County Government Complex. The LC EMA provides many additional programs which are essential to the Lake County communities. The reduction of funding would have a substantial impact as well as eliminate many of its programs including Community warning, outreach/follow-up programs mandated by the Superfund Amendment Reauthorization Acts Title III, and storage of materials used to combat natural disasters.
Once again, I would like to emphasize the importance of the Lake County Emergency Management Agency. I am hopeful that you will give consideration to the organization's request for additional funding. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your attention and cooperation with this matter. I would appreciate being kept informed of the status of this request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Peter J. Visclosky
Member of Congress

PJV/ss
October 23, 1992

Daniel Gardner, Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
8149 Kennedy
Highland, IN 46322

Re: LCRBDC/City of Portage Municipal Marina
Underground Storage Tank

Dear Dan:

This letter will confirm our conversation of today with John Hannon regarding the referenced subject as follows:

1. On October 22, John Hannon and Ron Schults found an approximately 7 foot diameter x 10 foot long (2,500 gallon) underground storage tank located approximately 50 feet south of the U.S. 12 right-of-way and 100 feet east of the east edge of Burns Waterway. The tank was buried in approximately four feet of sand at an elevation approximately 20 feet above the river water elevation.

   Site observations indicated no odors from the tank or on the ground near the tank. Additionally, there were no visible signs of soil discoloration or contamination above or along the side of the tank.

2. We checked our environmental study records (per report dated, July 16) and industry standard regulations for registration requirements for a tank. Our research verified that there are no records available identifying any tanks on the property. Apparently this tank was located on the site and is not in compliance with Porter County, State of Indiana or federal registration requirements. Due to federal regulations in 1982, all tanks in service at that time were required to be registered with the State Fire Marshal’s office.

3. If the current sand removal operation continues on the schedule of the last several weeks, the tank should be removed within approximately two to three weeks to keep from hindering the sand removal operation.

4. Tank removal requirements are as follows:

   A. Porter County – Porter County requires a twenty day notice to remove tanks, in addition to a $100 permit fee.

   B. State of Indiana – The State of Indiana has a thirty day notice period prior to removing a tank.
Essentially the requirements for notification of tank removal include identification of procedures for removal, which include removing the tank, taking a minimum of three soil samples beneath the tank, and filing of appropriate paperwork to document a contamination problem (or lack of) during removal operation. Tank removal will include cleaning the existing tank and cutting and disposing of it properly. To remove, a tank a contractor must be a state certified removal contractor.

In the event of an on-going construction operation (such as the sand removal operation), it is possible to obtain a variance of the twenty and thirty day notice periods and obtain an immediate verbal approval to remove the tank.

4. LCRBDC/City of Portage has authorized Abonmarche Environmental Sciences, Inc. (AESI) to perform the following:

A. Prepare paperwork to obtain variances for immediate tank removal.

B. Obtain bids from tank removal contractors for award of contract by LCRBDC.

C. Coordinate removal, obtain soil samples during removal, and close out the file after removal is complete.

As discussed, we will begin work immediately and notify you of all significant developments during the removal operation.

5. **COST OF SERVICES**

We estimate the cost of the services outlined in Section 4 above to range from $1,000 to $1,500, assuming the absence of significant contamination on-site.

Unless we hear otherwise, we will proceed as stated. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Marc D. Florian or the undersigned.

Sincerely,

ABONMARCHE CONSULTANTS, INC.

Ronald E. Schulte, P.E.
President

RES/f

cc: John Hannon, P.E., City of Portage Engineer
Michael Burns, AESI
Marc D. Florian, C.P.G., AESI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (please print)</th>
<th>Organization and/or Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siavash Beik</td>
<td>IDNR - Division of Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Zad</td>
<td>South Shore Marin Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mary Jane Zad       |加州科技
| M, Vander Heyden    | Dyer Coop, Inc.             |
| James Flora         | R.W. Armstrong              |
| Dominic Vasile      | 2405 River Dr               |
| Ray Youn            | A. Flowers Inc. CARY, IN    |
| Ben Thomas          | Air-Rid Air Hy. Inc.        |
| Doc Miller, Sr.     | Lake County Parks           |
| A. Kennedy          |                             |

Chairman: Location:
Randall R. Inouye  
LTC, Corps of Engineers  
Chicago District  
111 N. Canal Street  
Chicago, Illinois  
60606-7206

Dear Col. Inouye:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission formally requests the geographic project area for the authorized flood control/recreation project along the Little Calumet River in Indiana be designated Lake County. We believe this to most fairly represent the catchment area for application of labor and constructing regulations and minority participation goals. The entire project is physically located in Lake County as support for this request.

Also, the designation of the city of Gary as a "Labor Surplus Area" by the U.S. Department of Labor should be factored into the Corps of Engineers calculations for participation goal setting.

If you need additional information, please feel free to contact me. We look forward to your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Arlene Colvin  
Chairperson

Dan Gardner  
Executive Director
October 5, 1992

Mr. Mike Vander Heyden  
DYER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC.  
1716 Sheffield Avenue  
Dyer, Indiana 46311

Dear Mr. Vander Heyden:

Enclosed following this letter are the excerpts from the project specifications that must be responded to in writing with backup documentation where necessary to allow the Indiana Department of Natural Resources review and approve the work performed by Dyer Construction on the Highland tie back levee project. It is critical that this be done as completely and quickly as is possible to obtain this DNR approval. The DNR is the "approving agency" for this project to certify to the Federal Emergency Management Agency that this project meets their criteria, so DNR approval is crucial to the Development Commission's acceptance and payment of the project.

On a separate manner, your proposal quote of $4,500.00 to provide 3" topsoil coverage on the upper 12' to 15' of westerly slope and on the 10' trackbed is accepted. You are authorized to proceed. Jim Flora, the project engineer, will handle the cost revision on a change order basis. I must also remind you that this topsoil project addition must also have documentation as to the suitability of the material for topsoil and to the approvability of the site from which it is obtained, similar to the approvals needed for the borrow site.

Please contact me if you need additional clarification of this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner  
Executive Director

cc: Siavash Biek, DNR  
Jim Flora, R.W. Armstrong  
Lou Casale, LCRBDC Attorney
1. **Pg. C-0211C-4**

3.6 QUALITY CONTROL

3.6.1 The Contractor shall establish and maintain a quality control system for the work under this section to ensure compliance with the contract requirements; and maintain records of his quality control for all construction operations including, but not limited to the following:

(1) Clearing,
(2) Grubbing, and
(3) Disposal of materials.

3.6.2 A copy of these records as well as the records of corrective actions taken, shall be furnished to the Government as directed by the Contracting Officer.

2. **Pg. C-02202-2**

1.3.2 Impervious Materials for Cohesive fill alternative.

Satisfactory impervious materials shall consist of any materials classified by, ASTM D 2487 as CL, CL-CH, CH, or SC with not less than 35 percent by weight passing a No. 200 sieve.

1.3.4 Degree of Compaction

Degree of compaction for levee embankments and levee subgrades will be evaluated relative to the standard Proctor Compaction test.

3. **Pg. C-02202-3**

1.4 PLAN OF OPERATION

The Contractor shall submit a Plan of Operation to the Contracting Officer for approval. The Plan of Operation should cover the time table for construction, the sequence in which the construction will take place, and all subcontractor information including schedules and sequencing.
1.6 TESTING

1.6.1 Testing shall be performed at the expense of the Contractor by an approved commercial testing laboratory. The Contractor shall submit for approval the name and qualifications of the laboratory to be used. The Contracting Officer reserves the right to direct the location, and select the material for samples to be tested. Field moisture and density tests shall be performed when and where directed. Field in-place density shall be determined in accordance with ASTM D 1556 or D 2922. Field in-place moisture shall be determined in accordance with ASTM D 2216 or D 3017. Laboratory moisture and density tests shall be determined in accordance with ASTM D 698. The calibration checks of both the density and moisture gages shall be made at the beginning of a job, on each different type of material encountered, or at intervals as directed by the Contracting Officer. Copies of calibration curves, results of calibration tests, and field and laboratory density tests shall be furnished to the Contracting Officer within 24 hours of conclusion of the tests. When test results indicate, as determined by the Contracting Officer, that compaction is not as specified, the material shall be removed, replaced and recompacted to meet specification requirements, at no additional expense to the Government. Tests on recompacted areas shall be performed to determine conformance with specification requirements. All inspections and test results shall be certified by a registered professional civil engineer. These certifications shall state that the tests and observations were performed by or under the direct supervision of the engineer; and that the results are representative of the materials or conditions being certified by the tests. The following number of tests, if performed at the appropriate times, will be the minimum acceptable for each type operation and if, in the opinion of the Contracting Officer, compacted fill of an acceptable quality is not being obtained, increased testing rates will be required at no cost to the Government. Tests of materials which do not meet the specified requirements will not be counted as part of the tests required.

3.3 SELECTION OF BORROW MATERIAL

Borrow material shall be selected to meet the requirements and conditions for the fill for which it is to be used. Borrow material shall be obtained from an approved Borrow Site. The Contractor shall bear all expense of developing the source, including rights-of-way for hauling.

3.16 QUALITY CONTROL

3.16.1 The Contractor shall establish and maintain quality control for work under this section to assure compliance with contract requirements; and maintain records of his quality control for all construction operations including, but not limited to the following:

1. Foundation materials;
2. Foundation preparation;
3. Layer thickness;
4. Moisture control;
5. Compaction;
6. Lines, grades, and tolerances; and
7. Tests results.

3.16.2 A copy of the records of inspections and tests, as well as the records of corrective actions taken, shall be furnished to the Government as directed by the Contracting Officer.
## LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
### MONTHLY BUDGET REPORT
### OCTOBER 31, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</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>5119</td>
<td>PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
<td>13,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$13,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5311</td>
<td>LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>2,807.31</td>
<td>4,692.69</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>4,409.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5312</td>
<td>NIPRC SERVICES</td>
<td>94,000.00</td>
<td>56,054.41</td>
<td>37,945.59</td>
<td>6,312.93</td>
<td>31,632.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5323</td>
<td>TRAVEL &amp; MILEAGE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>3,171.90</td>
<td>4,328.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,328.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5331</td>
<td>PRINTING &amp; ADVERTISING</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>250.17</td>
<td>1,749.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,749.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5341</td>
<td>BONDS &amp; INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>5,476.50</td>
<td>2,023.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1,973.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5361</td>
<td>EMERGENCY MAINTENANCE COSTS</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5399</td>
<td>MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>1,173.48</td>
<td>1,326.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,326.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410</td>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>28,347.58</td>
<td>21,652.42</td>
<td>4,128.45</td>
<td>17,523.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5420</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>128,423.24</td>
<td>121,576.76</td>
<td>19,774.77</td>
<td>101,799.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5430</td>
<td>PROJECT LAND PURCHASE COSTS</td>
<td>3,902,705.00</td>
<td>40,778.78</td>
<td>3,861,926.22</td>
<td>556.71</td>
<td>3,861,369.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5440</td>
<td>PROPERTY/STRUCTURES INSURANCE</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>17,944.88</td>
<td>7,055.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,055.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5450</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION COSTS</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>19,857.60</td>
<td>80,142.40</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td>77,442.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5460</td>
<td>PROJECT LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>22,119.00</td>
<td>127,881.00</td>
<td>37,615.00</td>
<td>90,266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5470</td>
<td>STRUCTURES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>33,020.45</td>
<td>6,979.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,979.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5480</td>
<td>BURNS WATERWAY BREAKWATER</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5490</td>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT</td>
<td>908,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>908,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>908,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

$5,609,705.00  $362,227.30  $5,247,477.70  $71,421.19  $5,176,056.51

---

### CLAIMS READY FOR PAYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5311</td>
<td>LOUIS M. CASALE</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>RETAINER BILLING FOR OCTOBER, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5312</td>
<td>NIPRC</td>
<td>6,312.93</td>
<td>FOR SERVICES PERFORMED DURING SEPTEMBER, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5341</td>
<td>INDIANA DEPT. NATURAL RESOURCE</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>PERMIT APPLICATION FEE FOR CONSTRUCTION ON FLOODWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410</td>
<td>LOUIS M. CASALE</td>
<td>4,128.45</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION LEGAL SERVICES (9/26 - 10/29/92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5421</td>
<td>VERNON E. LEE</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL COST INCURRED ON SCHERERVILLE BORROW SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5422</td>
<td>ABONMARCHE</td>
<td>8,849.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES THROUGH 9/15/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5423</td>
<td>NIPSCO</td>
<td>170.40</td>
<td>UTILITY BILL FOR PUMPING EXPENSES 8/13 - 10/14/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5423</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>8,382.88</td>
<td>COST INCURRED RE: GENERAL SERVICES/TEMPORARY SETBACK LEVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5424</td>
<td>ROBERT B. STOFFER</td>
<td>991.37</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES RENDERED 9/30 - 10/16/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5424</td>
<td>ROBERT B. STOFFER</td>
<td>1,181.12</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES RENDERED 10/19 - 11/4/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5431</td>
<td>ROSEMARY ROBINSON</td>
<td>556.71</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE OF PROPERTY DC 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5450</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td>COST INCURRED RE: SERVICES/UTILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5460</td>
<td>DYER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>TOP SOIL ON TIE-BACK LEVEE PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5460</td>
<td>DYER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>32,800.00</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF TIE-BACK LEVEE CONTRACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5460</td>
<td>DYER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td>SAFETY BARRICADE EXPENSE TO SECURE SOUTH END OF TIE BACK LEVEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71,421.19
This chart tells several things. First, since the Murdock is not finalized, it is said no Black firms have received contracts under 8(a) program.

Second, under competitively bids only one of the four contracts have gone to a Black firm. The others have gone to White firms.

Third, of the $8,153,859 awarded in contracts and sub-contracts, only $12,500 went to a Black firm.

Fourth, the largest contract ($6.5 million) went to a White firm - Kiewit Western Construction firm from the Chicago area and it awarded its first sub-contract to a Hispanic firm from Chicago.

Fifth, while there may appear to be a minor token gesture to include Black firms, in reality Black firms are omitted from the process.
**FIGURE 2.** Gary Population (1990 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3.** Distribution of Work in Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, it is noted that the percentages in figure 2 represent work hours. Further investigation is needed to determine the actual number of persons who worked on this project.

Second, in comparing figure 1 with figure 2, it is noted that while Blacks are 80.6% of the Gary population, 82% of the labor went to any/all who are not Black.

Third, while figure 3 shows that 18% of work hours went to Blacks, further investigation is needed to determine what percentage of the 18% Blacks were actually from Gary.
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER PROJECT

The following information is submitted in support of a "Request for deviation" - Little Calumet River Basin flood project. Such request is needed to promote local hiring (Blacks) on this project.

The present regulation identifies 20.9 percent ration as a goal for hiring minorities. The regulation is to bring about a "good faith effort to employ minorities." A review of the facts shows that while Gary has a Black population of 80.6 percent, 82 percent of the work has gone to Whites and other non-black groups. In reality Black have been excluded from the process.

The 20.9 percent rule does not serve the Gary community even though most of the Little Calumet River Project is located in the city of Gary. This 20.9 percent minority inclusion is based on county statistics. The use of county statistics in this case is not fair. All things are not equal. Other Lake County communities do not share in the high unemployment rate as does Gary. The unemployment rate for Gary is 12.2 percent and for Hammond it is 7.3 percent and for the state of Indiana it is 5.9 percent. In addition Gary has been designated by the U.S. Department of Labor as a "Labor Surplus Area." This identification has not been placed on the surrounding communities. Gary has been targeted in two bills to become and "Urban Enterprise Zone" - a title which other Lake County communities are not slated to share (with exception to Hammond). The other surrounding communities do not share in the high levels of poverty and crime as displayed in Gary. These astute problems along with the information extracted from figures 1, 2 and 3 (attached) present a clear need for a deviation from the normal rules and regulations pertaining to this issue.

L. A. FLOWERS, INC.
GARY, IN

11/2/92