MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2000 AT THE COMMISSION OFFICE 6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD PORTAGE, IN

WORK STUDY SESSION - 5:00 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order by Chairman Emerson Delaney

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Recognition of Visitors and Guests

4. Approval of Minutes of April 6, 2000

5. Chairman's Report
   - Notice of Commission appointment
   - Update on GreatKonomic River Restoration project

6. Executive Director's Report
   - Notice of Project Section 902 Post Authorization Change Report
   - Public Hearing re: COE wetland permits
   - Request to Highland Town Council for presentation on May 15th
Standing Committees

A. Land Acquisition/Management Committee -- Chuck Agnew, Chairman
   - Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
   - COE Real Estate meeting held 4/27
   - Other issues

B. Project Engineering Committee -- Bob Huffman, Chairman
   - Recommended actions
   - Burr Street Betterment Levee LCA approved for construction by Washington
     - Bid Opening scheduled for Burr St. P1 is May 9th
   - Pre-Construction meeting scheduled for Stage IV-1S is May 11th
   - COE technical review meeting scheduled for May 10th
   - Other issues

C. Legislative Committee -- George Carlson, Chairman
   - Communication with elected officials re: budget/schedule
   - Other issues

D. Recreational Development Committee -- Curtis Vosti, Chairman
   - Issues

E. Marina Development Committee -- Bill Tanke, Chairman
   - Update on dredging of Burns Waterway
   - Letter from City Attorney re: Public marina control
   - Other issues

F. Finance/Policy Committee -- Arlene Colvin, Chairperson
   - Financial status report
   - Approval of claims for April 2000
   - Other issues

G. Minority Contracting Committee -- Marion Williams, Chairman
   - Other issues

8. Other Business

9. Statements to the Board from the Floor

10. Set date for next meeting
MINUTES OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
HELD AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 2000
AT THE COMMISSION OFFICE
6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD
PORTAGE, INDIANA

Chairman Emerson Delaney called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. Eight (8) Commissioners were present. Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Quorum was declared and guests were recognized.

**Development Commissioners:**

- Emerson Delaney
- Arlene Colvin
- George Carlson
- John Mroczkowski
- Steve Davis
- William Tanke
- Bob Huffman
- Curt Vosti

**Visitors:**

- Kerry Keith - SEH
- Jomary Crary - IDNR
- Jim Flora, R.W.Armstrong Company
- Walter Church – Boy Scouts, Troop 280
- Ray Ortiz – Boy Scouts, Troop 280
- Pete & Mary Jane Zak – South Shore Marina

**Staff:**

- Dan Gardner
- Sandy Mordus
- Lou Casale
- Jim Pokrajac
- Judy Vamos

Mr. George Carlson made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 2nd meeting after a correction was made adding Commissioner Arlene Colvin to the members present and deleting John DeMeo as not being there; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Vosti made a motion for the Board to dispense from the normal order of business to allow representatives from Boy Scout Troop 280 to address the Board; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Vosti then introduced Walter Church, Scoutmaster, to the Board. Mr. Church thanked the Commission for our support at last year’s cleanup/planting at the river near Catalpa and Northcote Avenues and shared some photographs taken at that time. They are planning an event again this year to be held June 2-3-4. Mr. Vosti made a motion that the Commission hereby resolve to support and recognize the efforts of Troop 280 on June 2-3-4 in beautifying areas along the Little Calumet River; motion seconded by Bill Tanke; motion passed unanimously. The Board members supported Judy Vamos in her request to supply pizza again this year for the scouts and accompanying volunteers. Mr. Vosti then made a motion to return to the normal order of business; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously.
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Chairman’s Report – Chairman Emerson Delaney talked about the two meetings that have been held (on March 24th and April 4th) by the Lake Erie Land Company regarding the Great Konomick River Restoration project, which will establish an environmental/recreational area along the Grand Calumet and the Little Calumet River corridors. Discussion ensued in how this project ties in with the Commission. Mr. Gardner explained that he sees this project as complimentary to our project and a real asset and economic benefit to the area. Once LEL has exercised their option with us to develop our lands back to a natural state, it makes sense to further expand those lands to incorporate other vacant lands. Private sector funding will be brought into improving the river corridor.

Executive Director’s Report – Executive Director Dan Gardner stated that he and Attorney Casale have met with Mark Lopez and Mark Savinski of the Congressman’s staff to talk about funding. Their basic message to us from the Congressman was to keep on schedule with the COE and proceed ahead and not delay stages of construction because of funding. He stated that if the Commission runs out of money, he would talk to the Governor himself. Mr. Gardner further stated that the Commission’s top priority is to get into the Governor’s budget for the next biennium.

Mr. Gardner informed the Board meeting that a ‘conference call meeting’ was held on March 13th with the COE and IDNR to discuss mitigation. No construction can begin in the west reach (Cline Avenue westward to the Stateline) until a mitigation plan is accepted by IDNR and a permit is obtained from them. Minutes from that call is contained in the agenda packet. The COE has now made a commitment to submit a final mitigation plan to IDNR by mid-May. Jomary Crary from DNR added that the mitigation plan has to have a schedule so they will be accountable to a time frame. Mr. Gardner thanked Jomary, who initiated the phone call to get everyone together.

Mr. Gardner also stated that he made a presentation to the Merrillville Garden Club on March 14th. The club intends to donate some birdhouses to the Commission for placement along the river.

Land Acquisition Committee – In Committee Chairman Chuck Agnew’s absence, Mr. Vosti gave the report. He informed the Board members that a committee meeting was held on March 28th. Mr. Vosti then proceeded to make a motion to accept the one bid received from Ed and Tim Bult, with staff working out what amount of the land is tillable; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Vosti made a motion granting approval for staff to contract out a demolition contract for the removal of structures on DC793; motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Vosti informed fellow Board members that staff is proceeding to work with River Forest School to develop a plan for handicapped play equipment on school property.

Mr. Vosti stated he had talked with Munster resident Terry Savage in regard to follow-up with what the Board can do in assisting him in floodproofing his home prior to the construction project coming to his particular area.
Staff will talk to the COE about what floodproofing they had planned for his house prior to the decision to just purchase his house, as well as the other three homes in that immediate area. Mr. Gardner added that Jomary Crary from IDNR has brought some information for our use in that regard.

**Project Engineering Committee** – Committee Chairman Bob Huffman gave the engineering report. He referred to Arlene Colvin in regard to the Mayor’s Minority Contractor Breakfast held on March 24th. Arlene informed the Board members that this is an annual event that the Mayor holds for area local contractors to discuss upcoming construction contracts within the city. Imad Samara from the COE attended and passed along information in regard to the Little Cal construction stages coming up. Arlene added that about 150 people were in attendance.

After a lengthy discussion, Mr. Huffman made a motion to increase the maximum amount allowable for survey work from $5000 to $7500 cap for staff to proceed with contracts without prior Board approval; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Tanke asked staff to make cost comparison between the surveyor and title companies in regard to pulling title deeds.

Mr. Huffman proceeded to make a motion to accept the low bid from Two Uncles Construction in the amount of $14,334 for the construction of a new garage on DC 448 to replace the existing garage that must be demolished due to our project; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Huffman reported that Earth Tech has suggested a value engineering item to use sheet pilings in the existing levees in lieu of currently proposed I-walls. Mr. Flora has submitted comments to the COE. A COE technical review meeting is scheduled for April 13th. The COE has now informed us of their intent to re-activate the engineering contract for Stage VIII with SEH. Also, a meeting was held today with the representative who manufactures floodwall formliners. Staff will keep Board informed as we progress. Mr. Huffman also informed the Board that the right-of-entry was signed for Stage IV Phase 1 South (EJ&E RR to Burr Street, south of Norfolk Southern RR) and given to the COE. Mr. Pokrajac added that there were 5 or 6 bidders and it appears that Dyer Construction was the low bidder. The revised Addendum to the LCA for Burr Street Betterment levee was sent to Washington for their approval. The project is on hold until the addendum is signed.

**Legislative Committee** – Committee Chairman George Carlson referred to the letter Mr. Gardner wrote to Imad regarding no additional funding and the close of the legislative session. Mr. Carlson added that he was glad to see the appropriate persons were copied on the letter. He added further that it is good that the Congressman is supporting the Commission moving ahead and not delaying any phases of construction because of state funding. The Congressman has secured $8.8 million Federal dollars for this project this year. Mr. Carlson then referred to the Congressman’s letter to the COE stating that we will meet our financial capability. Mr. Gardner added that he felt if we were in the Governor’s budget in the legislative session, we may not have to work so hard to obtain state dollars. He suggested a Legislative Committee meeting in the near future.
discuss strategy. Chairman Delaney added that he felt we needed more public awareness. Although the media is invited to each monthly meeting, they are seldom present.

Recreational Development Committee — Committee Chairman Curt Vosti reported that signs need to be ordered for posting along the trails. The design and wording of those signs, as well as ordinances and safety concerns, need to be addressed before proceeding. Mr. Vosti suggested that the committee should meet before the next meeting. Discussion was held on the trail connection between Highland and Hammond. That issue has not yet been resolved satisfactorily. Mr. Huffman had a good suggestion in re-locating the trail to place it on the landward side and not the river side. A connection could be made without impact to COE design. Mr. Pokrajac felt that it was a good idea and will pass it along to the COE. Mr. Vosti asked him to please make it an agenda item for the COE technical review meeting coming up on the 13th.

Marina Committee — Committee Chairman Bill Tanke gave an update on the dredging of Burns Waterway. Although the permit is received, dredging has not begun yet. A contract is in place so dredging should begin soon. Mr. Tanke referred to the public hearing notice in the agenda packet regarding the new complex that will be going in at the northeast quadrant of Route 249 and I80/94. He expressed concern as to the impact the two stormwater outfall structures have on the river. He proceeded to make a motion for staff to check with IDNR to look closely at these two 66" diameter culverts to make sure they would be adequate for the anticipated drainage; motion seconded by Curt Vosti; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Tanke also stated that a marina committee meeting needs to be scheduled shortly.

Finance Committee — Committee Chairperson Arlene Colvin presented the claims for approval. Mr. Tanke questioned the amount of money that was labeled as "proceeds from voided checks". It was explained that this was a large amount of money returned from Whiteco. It was in payment for some of their signs that were removed from the project construction area. The check was not cashed because Whiteco was in the process of changing hands. The company is now Lamar and staff has already met with them and another check will be cut shortly once the exact amount is determined. Mr. Tanke also questioned where the LEL money was located on the financial statement. When told it was in a separate CD in the amount of $90,056, he asked that it be broke out separately in a wetlands maintenance account. Arlene Colvin proceeded to make a motion to approve the February claims totaling $154,325.05; motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.

Minority Contracting Committee — Mr. Gardner stated that a committee meeting will be scheduled in the near future.

Other Business — Mr. Vosti inquired about the status of Woodmar Country Club property. Judy Vamos answered that it is in the process of being appraised. An initial inspection will be made on April 17 with the manager and groundsman. She mentioned that we may have to contract with a golf architect. There is a concern in how much we will be damaging the golf course.
Judy Vamos also informed the Board that she accompanied the COE today on a mitigation site review. They visited the proposed mitigation sites at 29th & Handley in Black Oak and Liable & Cline in Highland.

Statements to the Board – Jomary Crary from IDNR informed us of a program whereas Access Indiana would provide the design of a web site for the Commission at no charge. She has checked and found out that the Commission does quality for this service because we are a state agency. Mr. Gardner stated he had checked into this awhile back but the wait was a really long time. Jomary was told that the wait now would only be about 4-6 weeks.

There being no further business, the next regular Commission meeting was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. Thursday, May 4, 2000.

/sjm
April 4, 2000

Mr. Emerson Delaney, Chairman
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Delaney:

This is to advise you that pursuant to Indiana Code 14-13-2-7, I am reappointing Mr. Stephen Davis of my staff as my representative to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission. Mr. Davis has served as the Department's representative since 1990 and it is my hope that his familiarity with both the Commission's activities and those of the Department will be beneficial to the Commission.

I hope that Mr. Davis is proving to be a valuable member of the Commission and I trust that he will continue to promote cooperation between the Commission and the Department.

Sincerely,

Larry D. Macklin
Director
Department of Natural Resources

Pc: Stephen Davis
April 18, 2000

Mr. Dan Gardner  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Road  
Portage, Indiana 46368

RE: Little Calumet River Flood Protection Project

Dear Dan:

As we spoke last week, the Highland Town Council asked me to contact you and set a meeting to discuss the Little Calumet River Flood Protection Project and its impact to the Town of Highland.

The Council meets in study session on the first and third Mondays of each month and would like to meet with you on Monday, May 15th at 8:00 p.m. if you are available. Obviously, they are interested in the project schedule and what they may be able to do to expedite the progress.

I will be unavailable for the next two weeks; however, if this date fits into your schedule, please contact Judy Vaughn (972-5069) in my office to confirm. If this date does not work, please give Judy a list of dates that you would be available.

As always, we appreciate your efforts and willingness to keep us informed on the progress of this very important project.

Sincerely,

John M. Bach  
Director of Public Works

Pc: Highland Town Council Members  
Clerk Treasurer
April 24, 2000

Louis M. Casale
LUCAS, HOLCOMB & MEDREA
Attorneys at Law
300 E. 90th Drive
Merrillville, IN 46410

Re: Our File No. 13,504-48

Dear Lou:

I am writing in follow-up to our phone conversation of April 19, 2000. As we discussed, Mayor Olson would like to transfer control of the Portage Public Marina from the Board of Public Works and Safety to the Portage Port Authority. I have reviewed the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between our clients and do not believe it must be amended in order to permit this transfer of control. If you have other thoughts or comments, please let me know. If I do not hear from you before then, I will advise the Board of Public Works and Safety to approve the transfer of control at its meeting on May 8, 2000.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Gregory A. Skubowski
Portage City Attorney

GAS/waz

cc: Daniel Gardner, Deputy Director
Little Calumet River Basin Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>RETAINER FEE BILLED THROUGH 4/24/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>OTHER LEGAL SERVICES THROUGH 4/24/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>NRPC</td>
<td>8,257.14</td>
<td>SERVICES PERFORMED MARCH 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>UNITED PARCEL SERVICE</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>OVERNIGHT MAIL SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>UNITED PARCEL SERVICE</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>OVERNIGHT MAIL SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>UNITED PARCEL SERVICE</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>OVERNIGHT MAIL SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>MILEAGE 4/5/00-4/25/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>55.11</td>
<td>TO REPAIR COMMISSION TYPEWRITER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823</td>
<td>IN NOTARY ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>NOTARY PUBLIC ERRORS &amp; OMISSIONS POLICY FOR SANDY MORDUS &amp; JUDY VAMOS FOR 8 YEAR TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824</td>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>334.06</td>
<td>BILLING PERIOD 3/15/00-4/14/00(TOTAL BILL 360.65 KRBC 26.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>277.25</td>
<td>BILLING PERIOD 4/1/00-5/16/00(TOTAL BILL 398.20 KRBC 120.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>5,901.48</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/LEGAL SERVICES THROUGH 4/24/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>TONY ZALESKI</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>COURT ORDERED APPRAISAL FOR DC-377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>TONY ZALESKI</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>COURT ORDERED APPRAISAL FOR DC-476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>HAROLD WHEELER</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>COURT ORDERED APPRAISAL FOR DC-377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>HAROLD WHEELER</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>COURT ORDERED APPRAISAL FOR DC-476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>ROBERT METZ</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>COURT ORDERED APPRAISAL FOR DC-377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>ROBERT METZ</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>COURT ORDERED APPRAISAL FOR DC-476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICE FOR DC-616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICE FOR DC-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>4,117.50</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 4/14/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES ENGINEERING</td>
<td>1,545.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR DC-59,DC-69A,DC-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES ENGINEERING</td>
<td>1,125.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WIND TOWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>LAKE COUNTY RECORDER</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>TO RECORD INDDOT EASEMENTS FOR DC-794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JAMES POKRACJ</td>
<td>2,814.00</td>
<td>LAND MANAGEMENT/ENG SERVICES 3/16/00-3/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JAMES POKRACJ</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>MARCH MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JAMES POKRACJ</td>
<td>3,906.00</td>
<td>LAND MANAGEMENT/ENG SERVICES 4/1/00-4/15/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>2,055.00</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 3/16/00-3/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>MARCH MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>2,580.00</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 4/3/00-4/14/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>742.50</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN &amp; LAND ACQUISITION ASSIST 3/19/00-3/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>712.50</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN &amp; LAND ACQUISITION ASSIST 4/1/00-4/15/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>416.50</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 3/16/00-3/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>349.13</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 4/1/00-4/15/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5845</td>
<td>ON-SITE COMPUTERS</td>
<td>2,390.00</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE OF 2 COMPUTERS FOR LAND ACQUISITION PURPOSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5845</td>
<td>FOSTER ELECTRIC CO INC</td>
<td>310.00</td>
<td>COST INCURRED FOR DISCONNECTING ELECTRIC ON COMMISION RENTAL PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5846</td>
<td>SOUTH SHORE MARINA INC</td>
<td>480.00</td>
<td>EXPENSES INCURRED IN POSTING SIGNS IN PROJECT AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>SURVEY SERVICES INCURRED IN EAST REACH REMEDIATION AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>1,610.00</td>
<td>SURVEY SERVICES INCURRED IN EAST REACH REMEDIATION AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>960.00</td>
<td>SURVEY SERVICES INCURRED IN EAST REACH REMEDIATION AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>SURVEY SERVICES INCURRED IN STAGE VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>580.00</td>
<td>SURVEY SERVICES INCURRED IN STAGE V-PHASE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>480.00</td>
<td>SURVEY SERVICES INCURRED IN STAGE IV-PHASE 1 SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>780.00</td>
<td>SURVEYING SERVICES INCURRED FOR DC-707,DC707A, &amp; DC707B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>1,370.00</td>
<td>SURVEYING SERVICES INCURRED FOR TAX CARDS FOR WEST REACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>COLE ASSOCIATES(DLZ)</td>
<td>1,020.00</td>
<td>SURVEYING SERVICES FOR EAST REACH KEY MAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5861</td>
<td>POST TRIBUNE</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>COST INCURRED IN ADVERTISING FARMLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5861</td>
<td>MARIE EWEN</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY RIGHT OF WAY FOR ROAD ACCESS &amp; EASEMENT DC-796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5861</td>
<td>HARRY K.J. EWEN</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY RIGHT OF WAY FOR ROAD ACCESS &amp; EASEMENT DC-816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5861</td>
<td>DAVID L. &amp; JUDITH EWEN</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY RIGHT OF WAY FOR ROAD ACCESS &amp; EASEMENT DC-707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 4/14/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884</td>
<td>TWO UNCLE'S CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>14,334.00</td>
<td>COST INCURRED IN REPLACEMENT OF DEMOLISHED GARAGE ON DC-448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 69,464.58
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
JANUARY 1, 2000 - MARCH 31, 2000

CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2000
CHECKING ACCOUNT
- LAND ACQUISITION 244,197.40
- GENERAL FUND 143,144.40
- TAX FUND 0.00
- INVESTMENTS 1,188,076.15
- ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST 11,729.84
  1,587,147.79

RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2000 - MARCH 31, 2000
- LEASE RENTS 14,366.76
- INTEREST INCOME 27,002.77
- LAND ACQUISITION 381,279.62
- ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST 3,341.37
- MISC. INCOME 116.37
- KRBC REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE 652.91
- PROCEEDS FROM VOIED CHECKS 159,858.60
  586,618.40

DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2000 - MARCH 31, 2000
ADMINISTRATIVE
- 1999 EXPENSES PAID IN 2000 88,437.89
- PER DIEM 5,400.00
- LEGAL SERVICES 1,593.99
- NRPC 35,374.45
- TRAVEL & MILEAGE 877.80
- PRINTING & ADVERTISING 0.00
- BONDS & INSURANCE 0.00
- TELEPHONE EXPENSE 3,629.47
- MEETING EXPENSE 2,074.13
- LAND ACQUISITION
  - LEGAL SERVICES 17,718.02
  - APPRAISAL SERVICES 12,000.00
  - ENGINEERING SERVICES 38,085.92
  - LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL 7,259.00
  - FACILITIES/PROJECT MAINTENANCE SERVICES 5,940.00
  - OPERATIONS SERVICES 0.00
  - LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 43,934.30
  - SURVEYING SERVICES 28,547.72
  - ECONOMIC/MARKETING SOURCES 1,400.00
  - PROPERTY & STRUCTURE COSTS 102,369.32
  - MOVING ALLOCATION 1,050.00
  - TAXES 0.00
  - LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL 0.00
  - PROPERTY & STRUCTURES INSURANCE 464.00
  - UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES 5,290.80
  - LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT 2,107.80
  - STRUCTURAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS 2,995.83
  - ESCROW ACCOUNT NBD BANK 0.00
  - BANK CALUMET(PURCHASE CERTIFICATE W/ELF FUNDS) 90,056.60
  468,169.15

CASH POSITION - MARCH 31, 2000
CHECKING ACCOUNT
- LAND ACQUISITION 442,134.39
- GENERAL FUND 85,290.89
- TAX FUND 0.00
- SAND MONEY 120,766.84
- INVESTMENTS
  - BANK CALUMET 316000.00
  - BANK CALUMET 700000.00
  - BANK ONE 105116.15
  - BANK CALUMET 90056.60
  - BANK ONE 11964.22
  1,223,137.02
- TOTAL INVESTMENTS
  15,071.21

ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST
  1,886,400.35
### Monthly Budget Report, April 2000

#### Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>579.33</td>
<td>379.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,255.32</td>
<td>6,974.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>18,062.13</td>
<td>8,874.12</td>
<td>8,782.12</td>
<td>8,347.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,065.51</td>
<td>80,934.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>39.90</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>13,907.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>55.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117.69</td>
<td>4,882.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>7,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>438.76</td>
<td>216.26</td>
<td>1,827.68</td>
<td>611.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,094.01</td>
<td>3,905.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>729.60</td>
<td>132.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>861.80</td>
<td>7,138.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>5,866.80</td>
<td>5,266.54</td>
<td>8,499.50</td>
<td>5,901.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,534.32</td>
<td>99,465.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>28,441.52</td>
<td>28,955.95</td>
<td>31,571.03</td>
<td>35,876.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124,844.79</td>
<td>375,155.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>807,630.00</td>
<td>147,954.58</td>
<td>66.74</td>
<td>102,565.17</td>
<td>3,015.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>235,602.45</td>
<td>554,027.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>464.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>464.00</td>
<td>24,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>557.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>472.50</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,805.00</td>
<td>198,195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>249,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,995.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,334.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,329.83</td>
<td>7,670.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

| 2,123,630.00 | 203,488.12 | 46,869.79 | 154,325.05 | 69,464.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 474,147.54 | 1,649,482.46 |

#### 12 Month Unallocated Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>15,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,255.32</td>
<td>6,974.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,065.51</td>
<td>80,934.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>13,907.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117.69</td>
<td>4,882.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>7,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,094.01</td>
<td>3,905.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>861.80</td>
<td>7,138.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,534.32</td>
<td>99,465.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124,844.79</td>
<td>375,155.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>807,630.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>235,602.45</td>
<td>554,027.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>464.00</td>
<td>24,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,805.00</td>
<td>198,195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>249,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,329.83</td>
<td>7,670.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

| 2,123,630.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 474,147.54 | 1,649,482.46 |
April 12, 2000

Dear Mr. Gardner,

Please allow me to introduce to you the MAAC Foundation, and to give you a brief history of some of the types of services it provides for our community.

The MAAC (McClendon's Athletes Against Crime) Foundation was founded by Lloyd McClendon. In its eight year history, the foundation has successfully implemented such programs as the "Thanks for Giving Turkey Drive", which provides turkeys during the Thanksgiving holiday to needy families, as well as the "Christmas Cheer Basket" program, which provides hams and sundries for the less fortunate of Northwest Indiana during the Christmas season.

We have recently identified an important need that we are prepared to address to you for our newest project "Food for All Seasons". This proposal requests leasing farm land inside the levy built by the Army Corp of Engineer north of 35th Avenue and Grant Street. (Approximately 100 acres inside the levy, and 60 acres along 35th Avenue outside the levy).

We are seeking your support to expand the MAAC Foundation's food drives for the less fortunate of Northwest Indiana. Our motivated plan includes planting and growing vegetables on this fertile land during the spring, and
Enclosed

Project Coordinator
Bob Morgan

Sincerely

We can help feed the needy in our community. We take our work hard to achieve a goal. The goal of the MAC Foundation is to effectively execute this project. Lloyd McClendon, a former Chicago Cub, and current Pittsburgh Pirate, has the background to understand what it takes to work hard to achieve a goal. The MAC Foundation has the experience and organization vegetables. That we would like to grow.

Enclosed is a list that provides an accurate project plan. Along with the grocery, chain, and a warehouse with coolers for year-round distribution, then to distribute them in conjunction with a meat and poultry company.

April 12, 2000

Mr. Dan Gardner
"Food For All Seasons" Acreage Projection

- 20 Acres: Sweet corn
- 10 Acres: Turnip, mustard greens, spinach
- 5 Acres: Red beets
- 1 Acre: Tomatoes
- 1 Acre: Peppers
- 1 Acre: Egg plant, okra, beans
- 1 Acre: Zucchini, yellow squash
- 134 Acres: Corn for grain

Management, planting and crop care provided by the MAAC Foundation.
The MAAC (McClenendon's Athletes Against Crime) Foundation was founded in the spring of 1992 by Lloyd McClenendon, a professional baseball player, and Bob Morgan, a sports marketing businessman from the Gary area. Lloyd recognized the endless cycle of poor education, crime, drugs, gangs and broken homes which plagues our inner-city youth. He also recognized the need in his community for positive role models and that a few individuals could make a significant difference.

Since its inception, The MAAC Foundation has successfully provided programs focused on inner-city youths and the less fortunate. We would like to continue and expand our current annual programs to reach more Northwest Indiana communities. In addition to the Education through Motivation program, the Thanks for Giving Turkey Drive, the Christmas Cheer Basket program and the MAAC Baseball Clinic we would like to introduce our latest program. The "Hey MAAC Try Reading" Literacy Program is a joint project with the Post Tribune to encourage students to read the newspaper and stay informed about the world around them. Due to the past success of the annual programs, we have every confidence that our latest venture will be more exciting and reach more students than ever before.

Lloyd McClenendon has succeeded in spite of his poor environment. He did not achieve that success without the help of those special people who inspired him and provided him with the additional motivation he needed. He believes that the time has come to give something back to his community. Through the financial assistance of sources, Lloyd can continue to expand the numerous programs currently improving the Northwest Indiana area.
RECREATION REPORT
Thursday, May 4, 2000

GENERAL STATEMENT:
Currently, the joint recreation venture with the Army Corps is completed; 85% of the completed east reach levees have stoned trails completed; the remainder of east reach trails should be completed by the fall of 2001.

RECREATION - PHASE 1. (This contract includes recreational facilities for Lake Etta, Gleason Park, Stage III (trails), and the OxBow area in Hammond.

A. OXBOW (Hammond)
   1. October 28th, 1998 was the date that this facility was turned over to the City of Hammond.

B. GLEASON PARK (Gary Parks & Recreation)
   1. October 28th, 1998 was the date this facility was turned over to the Gary Parks and Recreation Department.

C. LAKE ETTA (Lake County Parks)
   1. October 27th, 1998 was the date that this facility was turned over to the Lake County Parks Department.

D. CHASE STREET TRAIL (City of Gary)
   1. October 27th, 1998 was the date that this facility was turned over to the City of Gary.

RECREATION – GENERAL
A. Lake Station – Handicapped Accessible Park (Refer to Land Management Report)
   1. It has been discussed with the Lake Erie Land Company the possibility of using them to develop this park in return for considerations of land use for wetland banking.
      (Agreement is ongoing and in process of review)
   2. Once the LEL contract has been finalized, a coordination meeting with the Recreation and Land Management Committees will review the money available and develop a scope of work.
   3. Meetings have been held to finalize the location for this park. The proposed location is East of Clay Street and North of Burns Ditch.
      • Staff currently investigating alternate locations in the same general area.

B. We received a letter from the COE on April 12th, 1999 regarding recreational trail re-alignment from the existing levee north of IUN and west of Broadway indicating that they will forward real estate information to us.
   1. LCRBDC will complete new (revised) layout and coordinate with INDOT and the City of Gary to get necessary permits and agreements. (ongoing)
C. The re-direction of the recreation trail around the Gas City Truck Stop East of Grant Street will be coordinated with the COE and City of Gary.
   1. It is intended to do this work, along with other recreational work, in the early summer of 2000.
   2. LCRBDC will coordinate a meeting with the COE and Gas City to finalize the layout and to confirm that we couldn’t use the original layout if we provide fencing, lighting, etc. (ongoing)

D. We received a copy of a press release on July 13th announcing the 1999 Transportation Enhancement grants, which includes $800,000 to complete the Highland/Wicker Park/Erie Lackawanna trail systems.
   1. The Town of Highland, Hammond, and North Township have requested we pull out some of the recreational portions of our V-3 (Woodmar Country Club), and V-2 (Wicker Park) contracts to allow their trail systems to be contiguous.
   2. We received a letter from the COE on April 5th, 2000, in response to our letter of January 14th, 2000, indicating that a 12’ removable closure in the proposed I-wall would cost about $250,000, and would require a high O&M cost.
   3. We wrote a letter to the COE on April 12th, 2000, asking consideration to relocate the trail between the South levee North of Tri-State to Wicker Park on the landside of protection.
   • This would eliminate the need to modify any line of protection.
April 5, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division  
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac  
Agent, Land Acquisition  
Little Calumet River Basin  
Development Commission  
6100 Southport Rd.  
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

In response to your letter of January 14, 2000 concerning connections between the Highland and Hammond trails we have thoroughly investigated your proposal here at the Chicago District and also discussed your recommendation with our Rock Island District engineers. Rock Island District engineers have a very extensive experience in designing of various types of flood protection and recreational projects. The conclusion is that the recommendation is possible to construct but will be very expensive. Providing a removable closure of twelve-foot width and a height corresponding to the height of the I-wall (approximately nine feet) will cost about $250,000. In our opinion compromising the line of protection for a recreational trail is not in the best interest of the project. The project provides connection between these two trails without any additional costs. This connection may not be the shortest way to connect the trails but since it is a recreational trail this should be acceptable. Since the project provides the connection, your request of the gate will be considered a locally preferred plan, hence the locals will bare any additional costs. In addition, this type of closure will be very dependable but will be also connected with a high O&M cost.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara  
Project Manager
April 12, 2000

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

Dear Imad:

Enclosed is a map showing the current recreational trail layout from K-Mart to Hart Ditch. These trails are part of the Stage V Phase 3 and Stage V Stage 2 flood control contracts. Currently, the trail west of Tri-State is proposed to be installed on the river side of the line of protection, which would separate our trail from the Highland trail which is on the landward side of the protection.

Would you please consider relocating our trail to the landward side of the line of protection as you come down from the existing levee north of Tri-State going into the area between Woodmar Country Club and the Wicker Park golf course? Real estate requirements could stay the same and the new line of protection could be installed west of the existing line of protection. This would allow us to provide at least the same level of protection during construction by driving the new sheet piling to the design elevation prior to removing the old sheet piling and concrete blocks. The trail could be separated from the Tri-State parking lot with a fence. By doing this, we would extend the Hammond trail to tie in with our trail, then tie into the Highland trail which comes from the south. All trails would be on the landward side of protection.

By modifying this layout, we could then eliminate any requests for breaking the line of protection and would make all three trail systems contiguous on the same side of the I-wall between Woodmar and Wicker.

Will you respond in writing at your earliest convenience in order that we may share this decision with Hammond, Highland, North Township and our Commission.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

emcl.
cc:  Emmett Clancy
      George Carlson
      Bob Huffman
      Curt Vosti
STATUS (Stage II Phase 1) Harrison to Broadway – North Levee:
   Dyer Construction – Contract price $365,524

STATUS (Stage II Phase II) Grant to Harrison – South Levee:
1. Project completed on December 1, 1993.
   Dyer/Ellas Construction – Contract price $1,220,386

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3A) Georgia to Martin Luther King – South Levee:
   Ramirez & Marsch Construction – Contract price $2,275,023

Landscaping Contract (This contract includes all completed levee segments – installing, planting zones, seeding, and landscaping):
1. Dyer Construction – Final contract cost $1,292,066
   • Overrun (over original bid) $200,016
   Project completed June 11, 1999

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3B) Harrison to Georgia – South Levee:
1. Rausch Construction started on 11/20/95. (Construction is approx. 98% complete)
   • Currently $3,280,112.42 has been spent on this project.
   • Overrun (over original bid) $183,281.60
   • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $197,137.00
2. The operational pump test was held for the Broadway stormwater pumping station was held with Rausch Construction on January 11th, 2000. A punch list will be generated by the COE – The pumps appeared to operate as designed and the Gary Sanitary District verbally seemed satisfied.
3. A final inspection with the LCRBDC and the COE will be scheduled for the entire project, including the pump station, late spring or early summer. (Ongoing)

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3C2) Grant to Harrison: (8A contract)
1. The overall project is 98% complete, and the final scheduled completion is for the end of September 1999.
   • The final inspection was made by the COE on July 15, 1999 and eleven (11) items remain to be completed on the punch list. (The COE has not notified us as to the status.) Ongoing for nine (9) months.
   • Currently, $3,890,000 has been spent on this project.
   • Overrun (over original bid) $463,196
   • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $189,875
2. The operational test for the Grant Street pumping station was held on November 19th, 1998, with LCRBDC, COE, GSD, and the City of Gary.
A. The tests were completed and the pump station was found to be satisfactory as per COE plans and specs with the exception of minor punch list items. (These are currently being completed.) COE to inform us as of its completion – Ongoing now for five (5) months.

**STATUS (Stage II Phase 4) Broadway to MLK Drive – North Levee:**

1. All structural levee work completed. All grading and backfilling have been completed.
   A. Project is approx. 98% completed, was anticipated for overall completion on September of 1999. (All work is completed except for the pump station.)
   - Overrun (over original bid) $1,096,378
   - Balance (to be paid to contractor) $11,070
   B. Current money spent to date is $4,175,000

2. **Ironwood Stormwater Pumping Station**
   A. The operational pump test for the Ironwood Stormwater Pumping Station was held with Rausch Construction on January 11th, 2000. A punch list will be generated by the COE – The pumps appeared to operate as designated and the GSD verbally seemed satisfied. (ongoing) As of April 6th, 2000, have not seen punch list, as requested.

3. A final inspection will be scheduled with the LCRBDC and the COE for this entire project, including the pump station, late spring or early summer.

**STATUS (STAGE III) Chase to Grant Street:**

   Kiewit Construction – Contract price $6,564,520.

2. We received a letter from the COE on March 17th, 1999, including design recommendations, and requesting our comments and review for the STAGE III DRAINAGE REMEDIATION PLAN.
   A. A meeting was held on February 8th, 2000, with Lake Erie Land company, J.F. New & LCRBDC to review impact of drainage to 200 acre parcel by pumping landside drainage into their area. The current COE design had minimal impact & they stated they wouldn't object.

   B. A letter was sent to the COE with comments regarding their design on April 17, 2000.
   - It appears the design capacity for the three (3) proposed pump stations is inadequate.

**STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 - North) Cline to Burr (North of the Norfolk Southern Railroad):**

1. IV-1 (North) The drainage system from Colfax to Burr Street North of the Norfolk Southern RR.
   A. This project was advertised on November 3rd, 1999, scheduled was awarded to Dillon Contractors on November 30th, 1999, and received the notice to proceed on January 14th, 2000.
   - The contractor has 360 days to complete the project from the date of the notice to proceed (January 14th, 2000). This would be January 8th, 2001.
B. The low bidder was Dillon Contractors, Inc. with a total base bid of $2,708,720, which was approximately 80% of the government estimate.
C. Survey work completed for work limits on March 14th, 2000, clearing and grubbing are 90% completed. Demolition of house West of Burr completed, 3120 Gerry St. garage demolished.

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 – South) (South of the N.S. RR.)
1. IV-1 (South) The remainder of the IV-1 project not included as part of IV-1 (North), primarily all of the construction South of the N.S. RR.
   A. The pre-bid meeting was held on February 23rd, 2000. Bid due date is March 7th, 2000, price range $5 - $10 million – small business set aside
   B. Bid opening was held on March 29th, 2000.
      • Dyer Construction was low bidder at approximately $3.8 million. The COE estimate for this project was $4.2 million.
2. NIPSCO and Ameritech both submitted costs for utility relocation for WIND Radio for review and concurrence.
   A. The estimate for NIPSCO was $20,732.00 and the COE estimate for NIPSCO was $19,100.00.
   B. We received a letter from the COE on April 4th indicating the Ameritech estimate was $18,228.44 and their estimate was $18,650.00.
   C. We wrote a letter to the COE on April 7th questioning what will be creditable & what amount we should use in the agreement.
      • COE responded with clarification on April 10th.
      • Our final response indicated on April 17th that these costs would be creditable based upon T&M.
3. We received a letter from the COE on March 6th, 2000, indicating the cost estimate from NIPSCO to relocate poles West of the E.J. & E. RR in the amount of $6,112.00 was acceptable.
   • The agreement was signed and approved and signed on April 12th.
4. The COE sent a letter to WIND on March 24th providing hydrologic information regarding elevations & frequencies of concurrence.
5. A pre-construction meeting is scheduled to be held at 10:00 on May 11th.

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 2A) Burr to Clark – Lake Etta:
1. Dyer Construction-95% complete.
   A. Currently, $3,174,000 has been spent on this project.
      • Overrun (over original bid) $901,779
      • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $201,090
2. The North Burr Street stormwater pumping station has been completed.
   A. The operational test was held on March 2, 1999. The follow-up inspection was held on March 30, 1999.
   B. A meeting was held on February 8th, 2000, with the COE and GSD to review design and installation of auxiliary power hook-up with a portable generator. This will be a project cost.
• We received documents from the COE for final review & comments on April 24th for emergency power during electrical outages and will coordinate with GSD.

3. A final inspection will be scheduled with the LCRBDC and the COE for this entire project, including the pump station, late spring or early summer.

**STATUS (Stage IV Phase 2B) Clark to Chase**

1. 100% of levee construction has been completed, and the projected overall completion is for the spring of 2000. A final inspection will be held at that time with the LCRBDC prior to turnover.
   - The stoning for that area East to Chase St. for our recreation trail will be completed in the early summer 2000.
   - Bollards and signage to be installed.

2. Project money status:
   - $1,779,158 has been spent.
   - Overrun (over original bid) $288,957
   - Balance (to be paid to contractor) $40,157

**STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 1) E.J. & E. Railroad to, and including Colfax North of the NIPSCO R/W (Drainage from Arbogast to Colfax, South of NIPSCO R/W):**

1. A pre-bid meeting was held on March 1st, 2000.
   - Bid due date – March 16, 2000
   - Price range: $1-$5 million
   - The bid opening is re-scheduled for May 9, 2000.

2. We received a corrected cost estimate from Marathon on January 26th, 2000, in include Colfax, in the amount of $287,000
   A. The COE responded to the Marathon estimate on February 22nd, 2000, indicating that their review for costs should be $153,000 instead of $287,000. This is under review.
   B. Marathon revised their estimate to $255,000 on April 4th. LCRBDC will enter into an agreement on a time and material basis which includes Arbogast, Colfax and Calhoun. Submitted to Attorney Casale on April 26th.

3. NIPSCO submitted a cost estimate for gas facilities adjustments from the EJ&E through Colfax as part of the Phase 1 construction in the amount of $120,107.
   A. The signed agreement was completed on April 12, 2000.
   B. NIPSCO scheduled to start construction on May 1 and complete by end of May.

**STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 2) Colfax to Burr Street, then North NSRR, then East (North of RR R/W) ½ between Burr and Clark, back over the RR, then South approx. 1,400 feet:**

1. Current schedule is to advertise by November, 2000; award contract by August 15th, 2000, and a construction start of September 15th, 2000 – 360 days to complete.

2. Engineering is ongoing. (Anticipated completion by Corps is for September, 2000.

**STATUS Cline to EJ&E RR – Local Project:**
1. Levee completed, including tie-back at Cline Ave., from Cline Ave. East to a point approx. 70' from the West R/W line of the E.J. & E. RR.
2. The levee was completed and inspected on October 21st, 1999.
   • As “as-built” location survey was completed by Great Lakes Engineering on November 10th, 1999, and was sent to the COE on November 11th, 1999, showing the installation to be 18’ further North than the center line of our levee East of the E.J. & E.
3. We are including this work with Burr Street Betterment Phase 1 – Anticipated construction start is August 2000.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 1) Wicker Park Manor:
1. Project completed on September 14, 1995.
   Dyer Construction – Contract price $998,630
2. As per a conversation with Phillips Pipeline on 9/30/96, consideration is being given to do a directional bore or both 8” lines, rather than do 2 “up and overs” for both levees (This has been ongoing with the COE since November of 1996)
   A. The COE indicated in their response for Stage V - Phase 2, that this was not economically feasible. We still contend this should be done as an item of safety. (ongoing)
   B. Flora wrote a letter to the COE on September 29th, 1999, requesting their consideration to credit this cost and to have it by our October 7th, 1999 meeting (We have not received this as of April 6th, 2000).
      • A follow-up letter was written by Flora on December 30th, 1999, indicating that we have not received a response, or that additional costs by Phillips would be creditable for them to gather field information to get a current estimate.
      • This is a completed levee segment with a high pressure petroleum line under the levee (which is not acceptable under COE design standards). Who assumes liability in the event of a levee failure to Wicker Park Manor. No response from the Corps to date.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 2):
1. At the July 23rd, 1998 Real Estate meeting, the current schedule shows a January 1st, 2001 contract award date. (This will be reviewed by the Commission.)
2. The COE agreed at our November 30th, 1999 Real Estate meeting to divide this into two (2) segments. V-2A (Indianapolis Blvd. to Northcote), and V-2B (Indianapolis Blvd. to Kennedy).
   • They changed their minds in February 2000, and did not send us correspondence. They felt it was too expensive to separate the engineering drawings and advertise as two (2) separate contracts.
3. See item “2-B” in Stage V-Phase I regarding the “up & over” of the Phillips Pipe Line.
4. As per a request from the Town of Highland, we submitted a complete set of plans for all construction South of the river from Hart Ditch to Kennedy Ave. to use for their future community planning.
• A meeting will be scheduled with the Town of Highland during the week of May 8-12, 2000, to review all of the flood control impacts to Highland from Hart Ditch to Cline Ave.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 3) Woodmar Country Club:
1. Refer to Land Acquisition report for status of appraisal process and revised schedule.
2. Engineering concerns were brought up by several commissioners at our January 6th, 2000 monthly board meeting and our February 3rd, 2000 board meeting to lessen the impact to the Woodmar Country Club.
3. Appraisal work ongoing (refer to Land Acquisition report).

STATUS Stage VI – Phase 1 (Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to Liable, South of the river.):
1. Had meeting on 1/18/96 with Super 8, Holiday Inn, and Motel 6 with the COE attending regarding levee impact to the properties and how we will proceed.
2. The survey work to field determine project coordinates has been completed and was sent to the COE on August 23rd, 1999.
3. Highland requested drawings for Kennedy to Liable South of the river at the January 26th, 2000 coordination meeting.
• Received drawings from the COE on April 19th, 2000 – gave to Highland on April 20th, 2000.

STATUS Stage VI – Phase 2 (Liable to Cline – South of the river.):
1. Rani Engineering was awarded the A/E contract by the COE in January 2000. (They are out of St. Paul, Minnesota.)
2. We received a request from the COE on April 3rd, 2000, to obtain soil borings South of NIPSCO r/w, West of Cline.
• We submitted the request for ROE on April 19th, 200, to developers in that area.
• An email was submitted internally within the COE to submit a current alignment to the LCRBDC (original submittal was inaccurate).
3. The revised property information was sent to the COE on April 19th, 2000. (The 1979 sidewell information was re-platted for new development).
4. A conference call was held on April 24th, 2000, with the COE & DLZ to review survey points referred to in a letter from the COE on April 17th, 2000. (Refer to General section of this report.

STATUS (Stage VII) Northcote to Columbia:
1. The final contract with Earth Tech to do the A/E work for this stage/phase of construction was signed and submitted by the COE on December 21st, 1999.
2. A pre-design coordination meeting was held with the communities, the COE, LCRBDC, and Earth-Tech on February 29th, 2000, to assure local participation.
• We received minutes of the meetings from the COE on April 13th, 2000. (Refer to handout at Work Study Session.)
3. A value engineering submittal was handed to the LCRBDC after this meeting for review and comments. It proposed to drive sheet piling into the existing levees to eliminate the need for concrete I-walls.
   - Review and comments were submitted to the COE on March 15th, 2000. Also commented that the communities should also be allowed to review. **ongoing**

4. The COE submitted a letter to the LCRBDC on March 24th, 2000, questioning coordinates provided by DLZ, and including a request for (23) additional points for a new total of (50). (Refer to General section, item #2 of this report).

**STATUS (Stage VIII) Columbia to the Illinois State Line):**
1. We received a letter from the COE on March 15th, 1999 requesting our review and comments for their A/E scope of work.
   A. The A/E award was given to S.E.H. (Short, Elliot & Henderson Inc.)
2. It currently appears, due to lack of state funding, that this project will be pushed back in the schedule.
   - The COE notified us on March 22nd, 2000, that SEH is back in business and that the congressman’s office does not want any delays.

**East Reach Remediation Area – North of I-80/94, MLK to I-65:**
1. **Dyer Construction** is the contractor. Construction was started on September 13th, 1999, and is anticipated to be completed by November of 2000.
   Approximately 80% of clay is placed and 20% of topsoil is placed and graded.
3. Removal of pre-load area and gatewell construction will begin in early May.
4. Received COE design concept for review from LCRBDC and GSD on April 15th, 2000 for proposed pump station.

**West Reach Pump Stations – Phase 1A:**
1. The four (4) pump stations that are included in this initial West Reach pump station project are Baring, Walnut, S. Kennedy, and Hohman/Munster.
2. Pump station Government estimate was $2,915,265 – Low bid was $4,638,400 (63% overrun).
   - COE is currently negotiating and as of April 6th, 2000, the attorneys are still reviewing.
   - It appears this project will be delayed until later this year because of cost difference.

**West Reach Pump Stations – Phase 1B:**
1. The current COE schedule, as per our January 26th, 2000 coordination meeting, is to complete design and review by April 24th, 2000, advertise by May 12th, 2000, award the contract by June 15th, 2000 and start construction by early August – 700 days to complete.
2. The 81st St. pump station, (Highland), and SE Hessville pump station (Hammond) are being done by the Chicago Corps. The 5th St. pump station (Highland) is being done by the Pittsburgh Corps.
3. We received the 100% BCOE plans & specs from the COE on April 7th, 2000, with a request to complete review by April 21st, 2000. (Submitted comments on April 28th, 2000.)

**General:**

1. **Alternate Concrete Formliners**
   A. These finishes appear to be approx. 5% less expensive to use than the current “fin-type” of finish. The COE will investigate cost differential, then we can discuss and have a meeting.
   
   B. We submitted a letter to R & J Construction on December 9th, 1999, enclosing plans for the proposed 1500’ length of 9’ high 1-wall that will be installed as part of the Stage V-Phase 2 construction between Wicker Park and Woodmar Country Club.
   - We submitted a letter to the COE on January 24th, 2000, enclosing cost and engineering information for their review and comments. (As of April 6th, 2000, we have received no response.)

2. A meeting was held with the COE on February 10th, 2000, along with Great Lakes Engineering and Cole Associates (DLZ), to review survey coordination and discrepancies that have developed and how this can be resolved.
   A. A letter was sent to the COE on February 17th, 2000, requesting information on a recent field survey done by them to assure us that their points tie in with our project coordinate points.
   
   B. A follow-up letter was sent to the Corps on March 7th, 2000, still requesting response. Our concern has increased because the contractors are using the new Corps points to lay out construction in the field.
   
   C. After almost five (5) weeks of no response, we contracted out DLZ to tie all points in using GPS. On March 17th, 2000, we received information that all points do tie in.
   
   D. The COE wrote a letter on March 24th, 2000, questioning survey data and scope of work for Stage VII. We responded on April 13th, 2000, asking for clarifications and suggesting a revised scope of work and a conference call.
April 17, 2000

Mr. Imad Samara
Programs & Project Management Division
Project Management Branch
Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

Re: Stage III Drainage Remediation

Dear Mr. Samara:

We have reviewed the Corps' Stage III Drainage Remediation Letter Report dated March 1999. The plan outlined in this report identifies the project features needed to address the problem of higher interior water elevations. We however are concerned that the proposed capacities of pump stations no. 2 and 3 may be greatly less than needed to avoid significant landside flooding:

1. Pump Station No. 2

The proposed capacity of this station is 500 gpm. This capacity was determined by the Corps using an arbitrary percentage of the flow from the impacted area for a 1-inch rainfall in a 24-hour period. The report also states the following: "The pump should have a capacity to remove 1-inch of water in 24-hours from the total area drained by the tile system."

Pump Station No. 2 is not involved in drainage of the tile system, which seems to be recognized by the report since it states that the pump "will collect drainage from the area between the levee and Grant Street." This pump station should be viewed as a replacement for the portion of the area now on the landside of the levee which previously flowed to the decommissioned 28,000 gpm pump station at the NIPSCO right-of-way. While the decommissioned pump station served a larger area than the area that will now drain to pump station no. 2, the reduced drainage area would not reduce the capacity needs of the station to 500 gpm. The report indicates that the decommissioned pump station drained 422 acres. Proportionately then the 500 gpm pump station would only drain 7.5 acres. Pump station no. 2 will handle drainage from considerably more than 7.5 acres and the drainage area will contain large areas of impervious surface. We suggest that the appropriate drainage analysis be used to size this pump station.

2. Pump Station No. 3

The proposed capacity of this station is 1,000 gpm. This capacity was determined by the Corps using the same method as pump station no. 2.
Mr. Imad Samara  
Corps of Engineers  
April 17, 2000  
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Pump Station No. 3 is not involved in drainage of the tile system, which seems to be recognized by the report since it states that the pump "collects drainage from the western portion of the area between the levee and 35th Street. This pump station should be design based on the appropriate drainage analysis, since the capacity appears to be too low. Failure to provide adequate pumping capacity will result in the flooding of businesses along 35th Avenue.

3. Pump Station No. 1

The proposed capacity of this station is 2,000 gpm. This capacity was determined by the Corps using the same method as pump station no. 2.

As indicated in the report, pump station no. 1 "drains the existing tile system and most severely impacted field." It is not evident whether this capacity is adequate, and therefore we suggest that either a more indepth analysis be performed or the adequacy of the station evaluated after it is installed.


If possible we request that the five 36-inch by 36-inch box culverts location be shifted so that their location lines up with the new ditch on the west side of the north-south levee.

If you have any questions, please call.

Very truly yours,

R. W. ARMSTRONG & ASSOCIATES, INC.

[Signature]

James J. Flora, Jr., P.E.  
Vice President

JFF:kf  
20002060.10

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC  
    Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
April 4, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

Per your letter of March 22, 2000, we have reviewed the WIND utility relocation cost summary provided by NIPSCO as part of the Little Calumet River, Stage IV-1, South, flood protection project. I find the NIPSCO proposal of $20,732 reasonable. I recommend you ask them to justify their prices in detail before the work and after completion.

We have reviewed the costs provided by NIPSCO and conducted a parallel cost estimate. We used the TRACES MCACES program and the amended project plans to complete our estimate. We included standard mark-ups for contingency and overhead. The costs are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NIPSCO</th>
<th>USACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>$3,897.00</td>
<td>$6,305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$7,852.00</td>
<td>$5,585.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>$8,983.00</td>
<td>$7,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$20,732.00</td>
<td>$19,100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons for the cost variance lie mostly in different methods of estimating. NIPSCO numbers and ours differ in all categories of work. Method, as well as the following reasons, explains the differential. Differences between our price book quotes and their supply costs led to the material cost discrepancy. The difference in the time estimated to perform the relocation (123 man-hours versus 174) produced in the labor cost variance. The mark-up differences used, e.g. vehicle equipment charge, 54%. overhead, 42%, and employee reimbursement, 12%, make up the discrepancies in other costs. The variance between NIPSCO numbers and ours should not impact your ability to award the contract.
If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager
April 4, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

In response to your request of March 13, 2000, we have reviewed the Ameritech relocation cost estimate as part of the LCR IV-1.S flood protection project. I find the Ameritech proposal of $18,224 to be within reason. I recommend you ask them to justify their prices in detail before the work and again after completion.

We have reviewed the costs provided by Ameritech and conducted a parallel cost estimate. We have used the TRACES MCACES program and the amended project plans to complete our estimate. There were details we did not have any reference like the specific type of cables and the exact design of the seepage collar. Assumptions were made based on previous LCR work. We included appropriate mark-ups, including 10% contingency and 5% profit. I summarize the costs below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ameritech</th>
<th>USACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Labor</td>
<td>$381.85</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Cost</td>
<td>$871.38</td>
<td>$1,635.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Labor</td>
<td>$1,768.81</td>
<td>$2,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Cost</td>
<td>$15,208.40</td>
<td>$13,815.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$18,228.44</td>
<td>$18,650.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We were unable to obtain the details necessary to perform a thorough analysis of the Ameritech proposal. Their numbers and ours agree at the final total, but there are differences for all categories of work. It is possible that differences between actual materials and our assumptions led to the material cost discrepancy. These differences should not impact your ability to award the contract.
If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager
April 7, 2000

Mr. Imad Samara  
Programs & Project Management Division  
Project Management Branch  
Corps of Engineers  
111 North Canal Street  
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

Re: Stage IV-1 South  
WIND  
NIPSCO and Ameritech Relocation Estimates

Dear Mr. Samara:

In letters dated April 4, 2000 to Mr. James E. Pokrajac of the LCRBDC, the Corps indicated that the NIPSCO relocation estimate is “reasonable” and that the Ameritech was “within reason”. The letters however go on to make the following statement:

“I recommend you ask them to justify their prices in detail before the work and again after completion.”

What does this statement mean? NIPSCO’s and Ameritech’s estimates are “their prices in detail before the work”. Considering this statement, what does the Corps expect the LCRBDC to do? Have NIPSCO’s and Ameritech’s estimates been found acceptable? Can the LCRBDC sign agreements for this work with NIPSCO and Ameritech? Assuming that LCRBDC’s payment to the utility is based on actual costs from the utility and that cost is at or below the utilities’ estimates, are these payments creditable? If unusual conditions are encountered during construction by the utility, how does the Corps want the LCRBDC to handle such cost overruns so that the LCRBDC ensures that these additional costs are creditable?

Please respond to these questions as soon as possible so that the LCRBDC can execute agreements for the relocation work with these utilities and still maintain creditability.
Mr. Imad Samara  
Corps of Engineers  
April 7, 2000  
Page Two

Very truly yours,

R. W. ARMSTRONG & ASSOCIATES, INC.

James J. Flora, Jr., P.E.  
Vice President

JJF:kf  
20002060.10

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC  
✓ Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
April 10, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James J. Flora, Jr., PhD
Vice President, R.W. Armstrong
8300 Broadway
Merrillville, IN 46410

Dear Mr. Flora;

Thank you for the letter of April 7, 2000 concerning the NIPSCO and Ameritech relocation costs estimates. We apologize for the perhaps confusing wording of our letter dated April 4, 2000 on the above subject. NIPSCO and Ameritech submittals were lacking breakdown of cost. It was just a recommendation to review their submittals. In general, though we believe that the variance in cost should not impact your ability to sign the agreements.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Imad Sámanara
Project Manager

CF: Jim Pokrajac /
April 17, 2000

Mr. Imad Samara
Programs & Project Management Division
Project Management Branch
Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

Re: Stage IV-1, South
WIND
NIPSCO and Ameritech Relocation Estimates

Dear Mr. Samara:

We received your letter of April 10, 2000 which clarified your acceptance of the NIPSCO and Ameritech relocation cost estimates for WIND in Stage IV-1, South. It is now our understanding that the cost estimates are acceptable and that the LCRBDC can now process agreements to do this work. We assume that this also means that actual time and material utility relocation costs up to the amount of the accepted utility estimates are creditable. Please notify us immediately if our understanding or assumption is not correct.

Your letter also does not address how to handle cost overruns on these estimates that are the result of unexpected conditions encountered during construction. Please let the LCRBDC know how to handle this situation in order to ensure these additional costs, if they occur, are creditable.

Please call if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

R. W. ARMSTRONG & ASSOCIATES, INC.

James J. Flora, Jr., P.E.
Vice President

JIF:kf
20002060.10

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
TO: Dave Orrison, Norfolk Southern Railway
    Mark Paull, Ken Hay, EJ&E Railway
    Paul Easter, WIND
    Frank Janosi, Brian Woodberry, NIPSCO
    Ruth Van Noort, Ameritech
    Mike McGuire, INDOT, LaPorte District
    Roland Elvambuena, City of Gary

FROM: James E. Pokrajac, Agent
      Land Management/Engineering

DATE: April 27, 2000

SUBJECT: Pre-Construction Meeting for Stage IV Phase 1 South

We have a pre-construction meeting for Stage IV Phase 1 (South),
extending from an area east of Cline Avenue to Burr Street south of the
Norfolk Southern Railway Corporation, scheduled with the Army Corps of
Engineers, Dyer Construction (contractor), and the LCRBDC on Thursday,
May 11th at 10:00 a.m. at the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning
Commission (NIRPC) office located in Portage, IN (see enclosed map for
directions). The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission offices
are located at this location.

It is the intent of this meeting to discuss the project coordination with
all involved contractors, railroads, pipelines, property owners, and utilities.
This meeting will afford the opportunity to discuss any questions regarding
the plans and specifications, scheduling, points of contact, and project review.

Will you please make arrangements to attend this meeting; or if you
are not available at this time, please have a representative of your company
attend. If you have any questions regarding this meeting, please contact me at
the above number in Portage.

/sjm
encl.

cc:  Imad Samara, COE
     Jan Plachta, COE
     Tom Deja, COE
April 24, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

Enclosed find please documents for contract No. DACW23-95-C-0073, Burr St. Pump Station, Little Calumet River, Stage IV, Phase 2A. Please review and coordinate it with the Gary Sanitary District so we can modify the contract. We would like to ask you to complete this review by May 5, 2000 due to the contractor desire to complete this contract.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager

Encl.
CF: Jim Flora, R.W. Armstrong
April 4, 2000

Mr. James J. Flora, Jr., Ph.D., P.E.
Vice President
R.W. Armstrong
8300 Broadway
Merrillville, IN 46410

RE: Marathon Ashland Pipeline LLC 6" Products Pipeline
Little Calumet River, Burr St. Betterment Levee Crossings

Dear Mr. Flora:

In response to the Corps of Engineers letter of 2/22/00, I have reviewed MAPL LLC's most recent estimate, submitted 1/24/00 and the Corps' estimate with their 2/22/00 letter. Enclosed please find a revised estimate in the sum of $255000 for the necessary improvements to MAPL LLC's 6" Hammond, IN to Niles, MI pipeline due to the construction of the Betterment Levee from the EJ&E Railroad to just past Burr Street in Griffith and Gary, IN. As you can see, the largest revision is in the material costs. With further onsite discussions with a qualified contractor, (a contractor that has been consistently one of the lowest bidders on MAPL LLC projects) it has been decided to eliminate the need for the prefabricated hot ends and do some additional excavation to connect the new sections to the existing pipeline. Also, MAPL LLC will be able to purchase the new pipe at a lower cost than previously estimated. However, there is only a slight reduction in the cost of Outside Services (Contract costs). The pipeline contractor has provided us with a more complete estimate of the drilling and installation costs and these are attached. Also, another estimate (see attached), was obtained from Air Products for the purging of the pipeline with nitrogen, which is significantly higher than the Corps' estimate. The previous nitrogen estimate had also included the cost to track the pipeline scrapers that are necessary whenever nitrogen purging is done. The tracking costs have now been listed separately. In addition, the costs for temporary tankage during the nitrogen purge are broken out. In the previous estimate the cost for vacuum trucks during the purging and pipeline drain-up had been included in the temporary tankage costs.

Costs already spent are included as well. This includes the contractor costs to locate and excavate the pipeline for the Corps' surveyors (previously included in Piping Contractor
costs) and Marathon engineering and technician time. To date, I have spent 9 days on this project with meetings and phone calls, pipeline locating, estimating and reviewing the Corps' plans.

The estimate includes the costs for MAPL LLC to replace three pipe sections where new/improved ditches will cause additional exposure of the pipelines and where both Calhoun and Colfax streets are being raised which will cause excessive settlement over the existing cased crossings. Each of the new pipe replacements will be installed by directionally drilling in a new piece of heavier walled 6" pipe and removing the old 6" pipe. The crossing at the ditch near Arbogast Ave. is estimated to be 300' long, the crossing at Colfax Road is estimated to be 350' long and the crossing at the new ditch and Calhoun Street is estimated to be 450', long. When the new sections are installed the pipeline will be taken out of service by purging the liquid product with nitrogen.

The estimate also, includes time for a MAPL LLC technician to periodically inspect the pipeline Right of Way to ensure that the levee contractor has not worked over the pipeline, which could substantially, damage the pipeline. Any time the pipeline must be crossed by any of the levee construction equipment, the equipment must cross at a location where the pipeline has been properly protected, as per the correspondence by Mr. Jan S. Plachta of the Corps of Engineers, dated 4/12/99. Also, included is the technician's time when the pilings are driven for the retaining wall portion of the levee.

It is my understanding that upon receiving this estimate, that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission will begin working with MAPL LLC to develop a Reimbursement Agreement for the estimated $255000. Mr. Steve Woods or Mr. Jeff Donnelly of Marathon Ashland Pipeline LLC's Martinsville, IL District office will handle development of this agreement. They can be reached at 217/382-4911.

If you have any questions about the estimate or MAPL LLC's plans, please contact me. Since there is still a large difference between the Corp's estimate and our estimate, I will be available to meet with you and/or the Corps to resolve the differences.

Sincerely,

David L. Woodsmall, P.E.
Advanced Environmental Engineer

enclosure

cc: J.A. Donnelly
    S.M. Woods
    R.M. Thomson
    J.E. Pokrajac—via fax — w/encl. — Little Calumet River Basin Development Comm.
April 19, 2000

Mr. Chris Kovich
KOMARK, LTD.
131 Ridge Road
Munster, Indiana 46321

Dear Mr. Kovich:

We have been requested by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to obtain a right-of-entry to do soil borings on your property. These soil borings will be required to do further engineering for the upcoming construction that will be done between Liable Road and Cline Avenue as part of the flood control project for the Little Calumet River.

Enclosed please find three (3) copies of a right-of-entry agreement between this Commission and KOMARK, LTD. That grants permission to perform soil borings on the property as indicated on Exhibit “A”.

If you are agreeable to the terms listed therein, would you please sign all 3 copies and return them to this office. I have provided a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. After we obtain the Commission’s Chairman’s signature, we will return a fully executed copy back to you for your files.

If you have any questions regarding this agreement, please call me at the above number. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Engineering/Land Management

/sjm
encl.
cc: Leslie Bush, ACOE
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
Mr. Jim Pokrajac.

We are forwarding the Tim Kroll’s message for your information.

Thanks;

Jan

---Original Message---

Imad (and Eric),

I asked Eric to contact Rani Assoc, to provide the LCRBDC and us with a drawing of the project alignment from Sta. 40+00 to the end at the junction with Cline Avenue. This was done at Jim Pokrajac’s request. Jim was concerned that one of the plates LRC provided to the LCRBDC showing the proposed levee alignment, and the locations where new soil borings are needed was inaccurate.

I reviewed our submittal to the LCRBDC, and this drawing does appear to be slightly inaccurate. It does not show the 90-degree bend eastward to tie-in with Cline Avenue, just south of Sta. 54+00, which was discussed during the Pre-Design Conference. The locations of the soil borings will not need to be changed despite this error in the plate.

Jim was also concerned that the section of levee between Sta. 48+00 and Sta. 52+00 was depicted inaccurately as well. Our submittal does not deviate from the proposed alignment distributed by ED-HH for Rani’s use during the Pre-Design meeting, and I stated this to Jim. However, we both recalled that there had been some discussion about this area during the meeting. The final meeting minutes do not mention anything regarding the levee alignment, however.

To settle this issue, I requested (via Eric) that Rani Assoc. submit to LRC and the LCRBDC a drawing showing the centerline of the proposed levee, from the south side of the NIPSCo ROW to the end of the project. Considering that Rani Assoc. has in its possession hard copies of the INDOT Cline Ave. As-Built drawings, they should be able to most accurately show the proposed levee alignment, and where it ties into Cline Ave.

Please have Rani Assoc. provide this item to Jim (and us) as soon as possible. I do not believe that there is any problem with the locations of the new soil borings that ED-GT requested, but I want to be able to reassure our customer that he is being well cared for by LRC. Imad (or Jan), I do not have Jim Pokrajac’s email address; could one of you please forward this item to him?

Thank you.
April 19, 2000

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

Dear Imad:

Enclosed for your information are three (3) prints of the proposed Sandalwood Subdivision Phase 3 as provided to us by the town of Highland. This development is proposed south of the NIPSCO R/W and west of Cline Avenue and will be in the southern portion of Stage VI Phase 2. This plat is preliminary but is currently being reviewed for approval of construction by the town of Highland. This information contradicts information previously provided by the 1979 Sidwell drawings. You may use this information as necessary and submit this to Rani Engineering in order that they may incorporate this into their ongoing design phase. Please note that the platted area outside the bounds of the plotted lots is designated as wetlands.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
encl.

cc:
Emmett Clancy
Jan Plachta
Tim Kroll
John Bach, town of Highland
April 7, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

I'm writing you in regard of a survey problem we have on the LCR, Stage VI, Phase 2. Rani Engineering, our consultant on Stage VI, Phase 2, is finding that the property lines, pin locations (prepared by Cole Associates) and deed descriptions we obtained from the Lake County Auditor's office in some instances do not match. This is a serious problem. We have been relying upon the accuracy of the data collected in this property line survey. This data was collected by your surveyor. Solving this issue will require our consultant (Rani Engineering) contacting DLZ (formerly Cole Associates) directly, and getting their advice and formal response. I feel that a conference call is needed between us, your office and Rani Engineering.

Additionally I have to inform you that we will be contacting Mr. John Bach, the Town of Highland Public Works Director, concerning proposed eastward shift by 20' of levee alignment along Liable Road to minimize property taking or not to leave some properties divided by the levee.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

Imad Samara
Project Manager
March, 24, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

A survey will be performed by DLZ to obtain the Little Calumet River Project coordinates for property line corners for the areas adjacent to the Stage VII project.

Our Civil Design Section prepared a drawing on 29 NOV 99 to serve as the LCRBDC SOW, indicating the data points to be obtained by DLZ, which would be later used by Earth Tech to develop the project real estate drawings. The intention was that the data points collected would be used to supplement the information presented in the 1979 Sidwell Company property line mapping for this area. Together, these two sources of information would result in an accurate depiction of property line data of sufficient accuracy so that the LCRBDC could initiate efforts to obtain real estate for this project.

On 10 February 00, a survey coordination meeting was held at our Calumet Area Office, and attended by DLZ, Great Lakes Engineering (GLE), the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC), and the Chicago District (LRC). During these discussions, the surveyors noted that the Sidwell property line maps are not always the most accurate source of current real estate property line information, and that dependence upon these documents as a source of data by LRC should be minimized. As a result of this discussion, DLZ sent the above-referenced letter to me to request that LRC review the previously developed SOW. A subsequent telephone conversation with Lisa Dobrowski of DLZ verified the implication that DLZ felt that additional data points would be needed to accurately map the property boundaries in the project area.

Our Civil Design Section has reviewed the SOW, and added 23 additional points to the original SOW. The total number of property line data points is now 50. A copy of this revised document is attached.

Even with the inclusion of these additional data points, the use of the Sidwell mapping will be necessary for Earth Tech to complete the real estate drawings.
This issue has been previously discussed with our Civil Design Section. I believe that the cost and effort required to completely map the property corners for all the affected properties is unnecessary and excessive at this point in project development. The inaccuracies noted previously by our office regarding the Sidwell mapping are not sufficiently severe to discard the use of these documents completely. In addition to the survey information acquired via this SOW, the final real estate property descriptions will be acquired by the LCRBDC as well. It is important that all parties understand that using Sidwell information with a limited amount of survey data may result in some minor, yet unavoidable inaccuracies. While this level of detail should be sufficient to complete the design and real estate drawings, additional survey effort will be required to complete the final real estate acquisition. Therefore, if the LCRBDC decides that the effort and expense necessary to develop the property line information should be expended earlier in the project development, then LRC will comply with this decision and revise the survey SOW accordingly. However, I recommend that this effort be undertaken by the LCRBDC after the completion of the design of the project features.

In the initial letter, DLZ also included details pertaining to which monuments would be used for survey control. Stations LRC 603, 703, 704, 705, LAK 8, and GPS 707 were identified for use. DLZ sought to verify the coordinates for GPS 707 and Station 703. DLZ possessed incomplete data for stations LCR 603, and LAK 8. Also, LCR 603, 704, and 705 were noted as either potentially missing or buried. Our Civil Design Section recommends that the surveyor obtain a metal detector for the use of the survey crew, when searching for these monuments. Copies of the current data sheets for all of the points listed have been attached.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager

Encl.
April 25, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Subject: Little Calumet River, Indiana
  East Reach Remediation
  Pump Station Concept Design

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

Enclosed is the subject concept design provided for your information and use. These drawings represent possible configuration for the requested pump station. This design was previously developed for our North Libertyville project pump station. No hard engineering has been done to date. Hydraulic configuration and elevations, structural sections and foundations design, pumps and mechanical design, are still required if this pump station is going to be incorporated into the subject project.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager

Encl.
CF: Jim Flora, R.W. Armstrong
    Paul J. Vogel, Greeley and Hansen
Mr. James Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition/
    Management/Engineering
LCRBDC
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

Enclosed are the 100% Biddability, Constructability,
Operability, and Environmental (BCOE) review plans and
specifications for Little Calumet River Flood Control, Pump
Station 1B Contract. Please review with your previous
comments along with your comments for the materials not
available at the 50% Review. Please submit your written
comments to the Chicago District by April 21, 2000. Thank
you for your help in making this project get completed 'on
schedule'.

Imad Samara
Project Manager
April 13, 2000

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

Dear Imad:

In response to your letter sent to me dated March 24, 2000, several questions, concerns, and clarifications should be pointed out and addressed. Enclosed is a copy of that letter with the paragraphs numbered for reference. Following are several items we need to resolve and clarify:

**Item #1 (Paragraph 1)**
A. The scope of work requested from DLZ was to provide points, through the use of GPS, as indicated to us by the Corps. The Corps indicated a number of points that would not necessarily tie in all property line corners.

**Item #2 (Paragraph 2)**
A. Refer to Item #1A for scope of work
B. The intention of getting these points was to supplement the 1979 sidewell drawings.
   1. As discussed not only in our survey coordination meeting of February 10th, but also in our first coordination meeting several years ago, we presented to the Corps the inaccuracies of using sidewells for anything other than lot, block, and right-of-way locations and that they should not be taken literally.
   2. Consequently, these (2) sources would not result in an accurate depiction of property line data to allow us to do legals for each property owner, particularly when we will be working in their backyards.
   3. Does the Corps feel these 50 points will be sufficient to give us accurate project coordinates on the real estate drawings that we would not have to re-survey before we do our legals?
Item #3 (Paragraph 3)
A. Refer to Item #2-B1 regarding sidwell accuracy. It was also mentioned that sidwells should not be the only basis for doing legals or laying out real estate mapping.
B. We also refer to the DLZ letter dated 2/18/00 referring to their scope of work and asking the Corps if additional information would be needed to provide necessary data to give us accurate real estate drawings with project coordinates.
   1. Our understanding is that it is a Corps responsibility to provide the decision for this scope of work.

Item #4 (Paragraph 4)
A. The additional (23) points requested by the Corps would provide a new total of (50) points.
   1. The original schedule from DLZ indicated the 27 points would be located and sent to the Corps by mid-March. With the additional (23) points provided by the Corps in late March, the revised completion date would now be late April.

Item #5 (Paragraph 5)
A. Refer to Item #2-B1 for comments regarding the use of sidwell mapping.
   1. Earth TECH could use the sidwells to complete the real estate drawings, but the sidwell overlays would, in our opinions, change at a later date to include more accurately obtained information from deed records or field survey work.

Item #6 (Paragraph 6)
A. The letter indicated that the cost and effort required to completely map all of the property corners is unnecessary and excessive at this point.
   1. Referring to the scope of work for Stage VII on Appendix A-3, it indicates that the A/E shall include all the field located property boundaries and that the Corps shall provide these boundaries within 60 days of NTP.
      • If it is the responsibility of the COR to provide this to the A/E, why are we contracting this out locally as a local (creditable) cost? Is this a duplication of work previously done by the Corps as a project cost?
   2. It is the intent of the Commission that we will do location survey at a later date to accurately determine the impact to each owner.
   3. We concur with your statement that using sidwells will result in unavoidable accuracies.
   4. What level of accuracy is intended when you give us your real estate drawings? If we need to follow up on these with our own survey work, why even include project coordinates if we cannot use them.
      • If we are required to do additional survey work, and/or deed research, to get accurate coordinates, the clock for acquisition should not start until that time when the survey is completed and project coordinates are provided to the local sponsor.
5. Our feeling is that all effort and money should be expended during this design process to give us a finished project that would be useable in doing legal descriptions. Again, would you clarify the responsibility of the Corps, and their A/E, in providing this information to the local sponsor as per the A/E scope of work?

Item #7 (Paragraph 7)
A. Referring to the DLZ letter of 2/1/00, it was indicated that only monuments GPS707 (Northcote), and 703 (Calumet Avenue) were used in their survey. Also, that they would pick up and tie in section corners to assure accuracy.

In summary, we have authorized DLZ to complete their scope of work to give you all 50 points, but question if the A/E is completing all of their scope of work that they are being paid for. We have defined property owners, did all field survey work, and provided the project coordinates as exist in the field. In addition, in the FIELD WORK section of their scope of work, it requires the A/E to verify the location of all utilities, and other site features (fences, structures, etc). Does this mean they have the responsibility to do the actual location surveys of each lot affected? (Refer to Item #6 (Paragraph 6) Point #2 of this letter).

When we received the request for an additional 23 points from the Corps around the end of March, our surveyor has revised their schedule of completion to the end of April. the schedule required this to be done by April 4th in their scope of work. Please advise us as to the new schedule.

We would like to discuss this with you at your earliest convenience in order to assure we are all working together to meet the dates of your new schedule.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
encl.
cc; DLZ
Jan Plachta
Emmett Clancy
Tim Kroll
March, 24, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

A survey will be performed by DLZ to obtain the Little Calumet River Project coordinates for property line corners for the areas adjacent to the Stage VII project.

Our Civil Design Section prepared a drawing on 29 NOV 99 to serve as the LCRBDC SOW, indicating the data points to be obtained by DLZ, which would be later used by Earth Tech to develop the project real estate drawings. The intention was that the data points collected would be used to supplement the information presented in the 1979 Sidwell Company property line mapping for this area. Together, these two sources of information would result in an accurate depiction of property line data of sufficient accuracy so that the LCRBDC could initiate efforts to obtain real estate for this project.

On 10 February 00, a survey coordination meeting was held at our Calumet Area Office, and attended by DLZ, Great Lakes Engineering (GLE), the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC), and the Chicago District (LRC). During these discussions, the surveyors noted that the Sidwell property line maps are not always the most accurate source of current real estate property line information, and that dependence upon these documents as a source of data by LRC should be minimized. As a result of this discussion, DLZ sent the above-referenced letter to me to request that LRC review the previously developed SOW. A subsequent telephone conversation with Lisa Dobrowski of DLZ verified the implication that DLZ felt that additional data points would be needed to accurately map the property boundaries in the project area.

Our Civil Design Section has reviewed the SOW, and added 23 additional points to the original SOW. The total number of property line data points is now 50. A copy of this revised document is attached.

Even with the inclusion of these additional data points, the use of the Sidwell mapping will be necessary for Earth Tech to complete the real estate drawings.
This issue has been previously discussed with our Civil Design Section. I believe that the cost and effort required to completely map the property corners for all the affected properties is unnecessary and excessive at this point in project development. The inaccuracies noted previously by our office regarding the Sidwell mapping are not sufficiently severe to discard the use of these documents completely. In addition to the survey information acquired via this SOW, the final real estate property descriptions will be acquired by the LCRBDC as well. It is important that all parties understand that using Sidwell information with a limited amount of survey data may result in some minor, yet unavoidable inaccuracies. While this level of detail should be sufficient to complete the design and real estate drawings, additional survey effort will be required to complete the final real estate acquisition. Therefore, if the LCRBDC decides that the effort and expense necessary to develop the property line information should be expended earlier in the project development, then LRC will comply with this decision and revise the survey SOW accordingly. However, I recommend that this effort be undertaken by the LCRBDC after the completion of the design of the project features.

In the initial letter, DLZ also included details pertaining to which monuments would be used for survey control. Stations LRC 603, 703, 704, 705, LAK 8, and GPS 707 were identified for use. DLZ sought to verify the coordinates for GPS 707 and Station 703. DLZ possessed incomplete data for stations LCR 603, and LAK 8. Also, LCR 603, 704, and 705 were noted as either potentially missing or buried. Our Civil Design Section recommends that the surveyor obtain a metal detector for the use of the survey crew, when searching for these monuments. Copies of the current data sheets for all of the points listed have been attached.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager

Encl.
WORK STUDY SESSION
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE
MAY 4, 2000
Bob Huffman, Committee Chairman

1. Technical review meeting scheduled with the COE in Chicago on May 10th to review new and ongoing project and design concerns.
2. Pre-construction meeting scheduled on May 11th for Stage IV Phase 1 South (EJ&E RR to Burr Street south of the N.S. RR) to establish points of contact, schedules, and potential problems (Refer to Page 11 in the attachments of the engineering report).
3. Bid opening scheduled for May 9th for Betterment Levee Phase 1 (EJ&E RR to Colfax along the NIPSCO R/W).
4. A letter was sent to the Corps on April 13th (See pages 23-27 in the attachments of the Engineering Report) to clarify surveying procedures and how that information would be used in the Corps real estate drawings.
5. A final inspection is scheduled with the Corps on May 16th for Stage II Phase 3C (Grant to Harrison). If accepted, the LCRBDC will be requested to start assuming O&M responsibility.
WORK STUDY SESSION

4 MAY 2000

LAND ACQUISITION / MANAGEMENT REPORT

CHUCK AGNEW, CHAIRMAN

1.) There are no increased offers or condemnations

2.) On 2 May Chuck Agnew, Don Ewoldt of LEL, and staff visited the River Forest School complex in Lake Station, site of the proposed handicapped-accessible park. They toured the grounds with Assistant School Superintendent Robert Marszalek and school staff. The following are important points:

   a. The River Forest School P.T.A. has already ordered items of playground equipment to replace the present unsafe equipment. LCRBDC would have a base to build on.

   b. The school is one block from the Lake Station Police Department. The school is extensively used by the entire community, including the Hobart School District, even on week-ends (Little League, Pop Warner football, tennis courts). Security is not a problem.

   c. The River Forest School complex including, middle and high school, is also host to other handicapped students program, i.e. the NW IN Cerebral Palsy Center.

   d. The school complex has 40 more acres suitable for trails, nature walks, etc. The school complex is also adjacent to acreage owned by the DNR. Possibilities?

3.) Staff has researched the comparison between surveying companies providing property identification and title companies providing deeds/easements for correct property identification. The following companies will provide deeds/easements:

   Lawyers’ Title = $1 a copy for each deed/easement agreement (LCRBDC orders 3 sets, one to LCRBDC, one to Lou, one to Army Corps)

   Ticor Title = $5 a copy for each deed/easement agreement (LCRBDC orders 3 sets)

   Maxi-Milian Title = $1 a copy for each deed/easement agreement (LCRBDC orders 3 sets)

4.) Staff has prepared a short – term budget covering the next 5 months to show the crisis precipitated by state budget exclusion. (Attached to this report)

5.) Point to remember: Our association with Lake Erie Land Company is essentially an environment restoration project – The Great Konomick River Restoration Project.

6.) Need for Commissioners Retreat to discuss critical issues?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>ADMIN. &amp; CONTRACTUAL</th>
<th>UTILITY RELOCATIONS</th>
<th>LAND ACQUISITION</th>
<th>FUNDS NEEDED</th>
<th>FUNDS REMAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td>$120,107.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$229,467.00</td>
<td>$1,170,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td>$150,769.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$240,129.00</td>
<td>$930,404.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td>$283,215.00</td>
<td>$87,000.00</td>
<td>$424,575.00</td>
<td>$505,829.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$144,360.00</td>
<td>$361,469.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$278,000.00</td>
<td>$332,360.00</td>
<td>$29,109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-00</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-01</td>
<td>$54,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May-00 utility relo = NIPSCo $120,107: Land acq = DC 578 $35,000 + Taborski garage $20,000
Jun-00 utility relo = NIPSCo $6,112 + EJ&E $99,657 + NIPSCo/Marathon $45,000
  land acq = Woodmar appraisal $20,000 + Wicker appraisal $15,000
Jul-00 utility relo = EJ&E $10,215 + Marathon $255,000 + Ameritech $18,000
  land acq = DC 69 $40,000 + DC 576 $40,000 + Mansards fence $7,000
Aug-00 utility relo = $0: land acq = DC 616 $90,000
Sept-00 utility relo = $0: land acq = DC 617 $210,000 + DC 816 $31,000 + ERR properties $37,000.

Admin. & Contractual = Administrative, Engineering, Land acq., Survey, etc. services
Above figures are based on actual costs, excluding easement offer to Woodmar. Appraisal completion expected in 60 days.

JV 5/3/00
## Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission Attendance Roster

**Name of Meeting:** LCRBCDC  
**Date:** 5-4-00

**Location:** 6100 Southport Rd, Portage  
**Chairman:** 

### Please Sign In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Organization, Address, Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Ewoldt</td>
<td>LEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Hodges</td>
<td>Portage Port Authority...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Flora</td>
<td>R.W. Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jomary Crary</td>
<td>DNR-Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**FINANCIAL STATEMENT**  
**JANUARY 1, 2000 - MARCH 31, 2000**

### CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking Account</td>
<td>244,197.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>143,144.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>143,144.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Fund</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>1,188,076.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest</td>
<td>11,729.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,587,147.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2000 - MARCH 31, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease Rents</td>
<td>14,366.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income (Checking Acct &amp; Mercantile Certif Int)</td>
<td>27,002.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>381,279.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest</td>
<td>3,341.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income Willam Tanke</td>
<td>55.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICOR</td>
<td>50.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRCR Reimbursement Re: Telephone Charge</td>
<td>652.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Voided Checks</td>
<td>159,858.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #6034 124,825.00 Whiteco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #6505 33.60 John Mraczkowski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #6509 35,000.00 Robert Stoffregen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>586,618.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2000 - MARCH 31, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative 1999 Expenses Paid in 2000</td>
<td>88,437.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>1,593.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRPC</td>
<td>35,374.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>877.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Advertising</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Expense</td>
<td>3,629.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expense</td>
<td>2,074.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>17,718.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Services</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td>38,085.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase Contractual</td>
<td>7,259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Project Maintenance Services</td>
<td>5,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management Services</td>
<td>43,934.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying Services</td>
<td>28,547.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Marketing Sources</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Structure Costs</td>
<td>102,369.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Allocation</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase Contractual</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Structures Insurance</td>
<td>464.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation Services</td>
<td>5,290.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capital Improvement</td>
<td>2,107.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Capital Improvements</td>
<td>2,995.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account NBD Bank</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Calumet (Purchase Certificate Wilel Funds)</td>
<td>50,056.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>408,169.15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH POSITION - MARCH 31, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking Account</td>
<td>442,134.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>85,290.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Fund</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Money</td>
<td>120,766.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Calumet 31,6000.00</td>
<td>02/02/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Calumet 700000.00</td>
<td>02/02/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank One 105116.15</td>
<td>10/04/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Calumet 90056.60</td>
<td>01/02/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank One 11964.22</td>
<td>07/01/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,223,137.02</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest</td>
<td>15,071.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,886,400.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 13, 2000

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

Mr. James E. Pokrajac
Agent, Land Acquisition,
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac,

Enclosed find please minutes of the meeting held on February 29, 2000 with the City of Hammond and the Town of Munster. As requested in your letter of March 23, 2000, your minutes have been reviewed and revised in accordance with our records and meeting attendees from Earth Tech.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Jan S. Plachta of this office at (312) 353-6400, extension 1801.

Sincerely,

Imad Samara
Project Manager

Encl.
Little Calumet River Flood Control Project, Stage VII (construction from Northcote to Columbia Avenue) meeting was held on February 29, 2000, at 14:00 a.m., at the Munster Civic Center.

Attendees:

Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
Bob Huffman, LCRBDC
Emmett Clancy, USACE
Jan Plachta, USACE
Tim Kroll, USACE
James Knesek, Town of Munster
Mark Knesek, Munster Water/Sewer
James Mandon, Town of Munster
Helen Brown, Munster Town Council
Melcy Pond, Earth Tech
Dave Kendall, Earth Tech

Dan Gardner, Executive Director of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC), the project Local Sponsor, described different features of the project. 40 to 45% of project is already completed. The West Reach is the next stage. Construction of Stage VII is expected in about four to five years depending on the funding, acquisition of lands and easements and utility relocations. Dan Gardner described financing problems. The Commission is out of money this year; this is the first time that this situation has occurred. Six million dollars were requested, but only million and a half was received. Federal money is here. Project will give full protection to Munster. At completion of construction, residents will no longer need to purchase flood insurance. It is expected that this improvement will increase property values.

Jim Mandon (Town Engineer) discussed the new bypass line for storm drainage that would be installed from the Baring pump station to an area west of Northcote. Drawings will be provided to the USACE by the Town of Munster. Existing sewer lines in and adjacent to the levee near Castle Drive may be abandoned - Munster will inform USACE.

The majority of the properties along the river are single family residences. Most of the line of protection will be the concrete I-wall. The I-wall has been proposed because there is not enough land to construct a levee. Residents are concerned about aesthetic appearance. Judy Vamos from LCRBDC, and Emmett Clancy from USACE Chicago District, will be dealing with residents on real estate issues. Permanent easement for inspection and flood fighting access will be taken for the I-wall, 10 to 15 feet at most. Temporary easement will be needed for the maintenance of the wall, minimum 10 feet on either side. Town of Munster suggested that the grading plan should provide sheet drainage from the area adjacent to the I-walls toward the front of the lots to avoid standing water.

Both the Water Department and the Sanitary District for the Town of Munster said they would provide all pertinent information to the USACE showing location and design of existing lines and structures.

Earth Tech wanted to assure that they would get as much input as possible from the communities which would be included before their 50% submittal. Upon completion of this stage, the plans will be distributed to the LCRBDC and to the communities for their input. A public meeting will be held with Town of Munster as well as local residents to inform on the proposal for design as well as real estate impacts and scheduling for this stage of construction.
It was also agreed that the Stage V, Phase 2 (Hartsdale Ditch to Northcote) project will also be discussed at the public meeting for Stage VII. Munster suggested preparation of graphic drawings to demonstrate the design concept to the public. The 50% design is scheduled to be completed in June and the public meeting will be held shortly thereafter.

The appraisal value of trees that will be offered to property owners will be determined by species, and is usually about $500-600. A 16-foot easement may cost less than $1000.

Public meeting will be scheduled to present the project to the community and to incorporate community concerns. Residents will have some input on what type of trees and bushes are included in the landscaping. For sandbag closures, it has been recommended to stockpile material in vicinity. Alternative ways of closures were briefly discussed, such as a rubber tube that will be filled with water during the flood event.

During construction, residents will be able to discuss their concerns with the Corps field office in Griffith. There is a proposal to use an optional form-liner for the concrete I-wall sections, instead of the standard fin surfaces. This type of liner may provide more aesthetically pleasing appearance. Jim Pokrajac is recommending a meeting on 05 April 00 to discuss the form-liners texture and color. The Town of Munster and LCRBDC expressed desire that graffiti protection should be provided to all I-wall construction. The driving of steel sheet piles may cause structural problems, such as cracks in foundation walls. The contractor will be responsible for any damage.

Town of Munster requested information on what was being proposed for landscaping, and requested that this information be reviewed prior to design. This activity can also be completed during the 50% BCOE review process. The town also questioned if seeding, sodding, or hydro-seeding would be done after the construction was completed.

Next discussed was construction traffic, haul routes. Heavy, construction equipment on the roads. Damage to the pavements. This problem will be addressed in the project specifications and also during the pre-construction meeting. Inspection will be performed before and after construction. Haul routes will be selected carefully to limit damage to the pavements. As per the FDM 5 the fill material will be obtained from the Hartsdale Pond (Kennedy Ave. borrow site) and that Ridge Road could be used from Indianapolis Blvd., then north along Columbia Ave., White Oak Avenue, Oakwood Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue.

Jim Mandon suggested that full truckloads of clay or concrete should use Hawthorne Avenue, because it has a heavy concrete base. The Contractor will be responsible for maintaining the road in the same condition it was before the hauling operation started. Columbia Ave. and Calumet Ave. should be spared because they experience heavy traffic and are currently in very good condition. Hawthorne and Manor Ave. should be emphasized as hauling routes. Use of smaller trucks should also be considered.

It has been proposed to have a public meeting before the 50% completion of plans and specifications, approximately in July 2000.
Jim Mandon expressed concern with the site lines along Columbia Ave. and stated that any changes made to the project to address this problem may require the incorporation of guardrails for safety.

What will happen in the backyards? The Town requests information regarding the height of the wall, with color renderings showing how the wall will look. Wall finish will be important as a mitigating effect. Public input will be taken into consideration.

The Feature Design Memorandum #5, completed in 1993 is used as a guideline in the design. Some conditions have changed in the interim, and deviation from the original plan may be necessary.
Little Calumet River Flood Control Project, Stage VII, construction from Northcote to Columbia Ave., meeting with City of Hammond was held on February 29, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., at the Hammond Civic Center.

Attendees:

Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
Curtis Vosti, Hammond Parks/LCRBDC
Bob Huffman, LCRBDC
George Carlson, LCRBDC
Emmett Clancy, COE
Jon Plachta, COE

Tim Kroll, COE
Stan Dostatni, Hammond City Eng.
Allen Kress, Hammond Planning Dept.
John Devine, Hammond Sanitary Dist.
Stan Zatorski, Hammond Water Dept.
Dave Kendall, Earth Tech
Melcy Pond, Earth Tech

Dan Gardner, Executive Director of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, the project Local Sponsor, described different features of the project. Mr. Gardner discussed project funding availability, stated his appreciation for the interaction with the City of Hammond, and thanked Mr. Curt Vosti for facilitating this meeting. Construction is expected in about three to four years.

The first item discussed was the condition of the existing bridges. These are maintained by the county or state. Columbia Ave. bridge is relatively new. Sandbagging may be required on the bridges during flood events, and north-south roads will be blocked during these periods.

Stan Dostatni had a concern regarding reduction of surface area south of River Drive. He requested that Earth Tech investigate the possibility of installing catch basins that would tie into the Walnut Pump Station to remove surface water. Earth Tech stated that interior drainage features for the areas adjacent to the line-of-protection are a part of the project scope of work, and that drainage for this area would be included. The storm and sanitary sewer systems are separated.

Land is primarily owned by the city. Both the Water Department and the Hammond Sanitary District stated that there were no utility lines crossing through this area, nor were there any major concerns at this point in time. The project real estate requirements were also discussed. The information to be used in the design by the consultant - Earth Tech, is several years old. This will have to be updated. Earth Tech wanted to assure Hammond that they would get as much input as possible from the community, and this input would be included in the design prior to the completion of the 50% Plans and Specs. Upon completion of the design at this stage, the design package will be distributed for comments to the Development Commission, as well as to the communities for their input and review. After completion of the 50% plans and specs, a public meeting will be conducted in the City of Hammond for the local residents to inform them about the design, real estate impacts, and schedule for this project.

George Carlson expressed concerns regarding the decision to construct levees on the Hammond site, while I-walls will be constructed on the Munster side. It was explained by the COE that this was being done due to economic considerations. Earthen levee will be constructed where real estate is available and can be obtained.
I-walls will be used only where the necessary real estate will not be available, such is the case on the Munster side where the project will be going through people's backyards.

The work limits as currently proposed would not encroach onto the River Drive right-of-way. I-wall will be installed from approximately the east right-of-way of Columbia Ave. past the Riley School. From that point, earthen levee will be constructed to the west right-of-way line of Northcote.

The LCRBDC expressed concern that the I-wall in this area will be highly visible, and that an optional formliner installation should be used. This type of liner may provide more aesthetically pleasing appearance. Earth Tech has subsequently submitted a value engineering study that provides installation of sheet piling into the existing levee. This will eliminate the necessity for installation of a concrete I-wall across from Riley School. This proposal is currently being reviewed by the USACE and the LCRBDC.

Next discussed was construction traffic, and haul routes. As proposed in the FDM 5, the fill material will be obtained from the Hartsdale Pond (Kennedy Ave. borrow site). The haul route would then be Ridge Ave. (from Indianapolis Blvd.), then north along Columbia Ave., White Oak Ave., Oakwood Ave. and Hawthorne Avenue to get access to the Hammond portion of the levee. Stan Dostatni was concerned that heavy construction equipment would damage River Drive, and requested the USACE to minimize the use of River Drive for track loads of clay and/or concrete. Mr. Dostatni also stated that Hammond would like Columbia Avenue to be used, because it was anticipated that Northcote Avenue will be newly paved at the time of construction. Mr. Dostatni was also concerned with the load limits on the Northcote bridge, and asked to have the acceptability of this route verified for the use of loaded dump trailers prior to use. This issue will be addressed in the project specifications, and also during the pre-construction meeting. Inspection of the haul routes will be performed before and after construction. Haul routes will be selected carefully to limit damage to the pavements. The Contractor will be responsible for restoring the roadways to the same condition they were before the hauling operation started.

Consideration will be given to the proximity of Riley School to the project. At certain times of the day, there is heavy traffic with parents picking up children. Arrangements would have to be considered where the automobile traffic patterns overlap with project construction traffic.

In addressing local concerns regarding landscaping, the City of Hammond and the LCRBDC requested that rather than using "cookie cutter" format for landscaping, a more varied "park environment" be designed. Curt Vosti, the Chief Administrator for the Hammond Parks Department stated that he could provide input regarding the desirable landscaping plans. It was also suggested that the toe of the levee landscaping overbuild section be modified to allow a more irregular appearance rather than having a smooth uniform line at the toe of the levee.

City of Hammond and the LCRBDC requested that graffiti protection should be provided to all I-wall construction.
Stan Dostatni expressed safety concerns with visibility along Columbia Ave. The possibility of installing guardrails and modifying the alignment of the I-walls will be reviewed.

The City requested to have the project remove trees and existing deadfalls or debris between the levees along the Little Calumet River. The contractor will remove dead trees and debris from the area between the levees including the banks but not the river. Clean up of the river is outside of the scope.

Jim Pokrajac suggested that both sand bag closures at Northcote and Columbia Avenue be addressed by providing a stockpile of closure materials adjacent to the locations of both closures.

Emmett Clancy discussed the appraisal process based upon the fair market value, how the offers will be made and stated that it was hopeful that the City of Hammond could donate property to this project.

Stan Dostatni requested that the contractor would need to be appropriately bonded to do construction in this area.

City of Hammond requested that after completion of construction, some acknowledgement be given that the Boy Scouts have made landscaping contributions to the community. Signage would be sufficient for this purpose.
LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT
Thursday, May 4, 2000

NON-PROJECT LAND MANAGEMENT

A. Handicapped-Accessible Park
   1. Land Acquisition Committee met on March 28, 2000, and discussed River Forest Elementary School as park site. LCRBDC would work with Lake Erie Land and Lake Station School City.

B. Chase Street to Grant Street land management issues
   1. We received a letter from the COE on March 17, 1999 requesting local review for drainage remediation.
      • A coordination meeting was held with the COE, GSD, and the LCRBDC on February 16th, 2000 to review ongoing drainage concerns.
      • Comments were sent to the COE on April 17th, 2000 indicated that their design appeared to have inadequate pumping capacity (refer to Engineering Report).
   2. One (1) bid was received from Ed & Tim Bult for $62.50 per tillable acreage only.

PROJECT RELATED LAND MANAGEMENT

A. O&M (Project manual review/accepting completed segments)
   1. The COE has requested since August 28, 1997 that we complete our project manual review and then start to accept completed levee segments (distributed condensed O&M Manual) (ongoing)
   2. We will schedule a meeting with a committee of commissioners to review the current COE O & M and make comparisons with what Richmond has in place. (ongoing)

B. Gary Sanitary District pump agreements
   1. The LCRBDC has agreed with the GSD that the four (4) east reach pump stations will hereby be referred to as follows:
      • Ironwood stormwater pumping station – (Stage II-4)
      • Broadway stormwater pumping station – (Stage II-3B)
      • Grant St. stormwater pumping station – (Stage II-3C-2)
      • North Burr St. stormwater pumping station – (Stage IV-2A)
   2. Refer to each stage/phase of these stations for current status in the Engineering Report.

C. Mitigation (entire project area)
   1. LCRBDC has had concerns about the official mitigation plan procedure to acquire property in the Hobart Marsh area. At the February 28th COE Real Estate meeting,
COE verbally stated that sole source acquisition will not be used. A RFP will be prepared with LCRBDC input and advertised.

2. A conference call was held with the COE, DNR, IDEM, and the LCRBDC on March 13th, 2000, to discuss and review the COE mitigation plan and West Reach permit to Construct.
   - The COE stated they would have an initial “final” plan to review by the DNR by May 15th, 2000.

D. Emergency Management
   1. The COE submitted to LCRBDC mapping for comments on May 24th, 1999, showing locations of all closures, sluice gates, sandbagging, etc.
      - We will break this down by community, showing how each community would respond during a flood event. (Ongoing)

E. Landscaping
   1. A letter was sent to the COE on June 3rd, 1999, accepting the landscaping project as per plans and specs, but re-stating the ongoing problem with the finished condition of the landscaping (needs more time to establish).
      - At our Technical Review meeting with the COE on November 9th, 1999, Greg Moore said he was finalizing specification changes for future projects as well as modifying procedures for the O & M. No response as yet.

F. Gary Parks & Recreation – Driving Range
   1. A meeting was held with the Gary Parks & Rec Dept. on May 18th, 1999 to coordinate the current status and inform the following contractors that their proposals for Martin Design, Porter Lakes Engineering, and J.F. New were approved by the Board on May 6th, 1999.
   2. We received a letter from J.F. New to the South Bend Army Corps dated December 10th, 1999, requesting their review of the wetland delineation report and suggesting an upcoming meeting to discuss. (ongoing)
      - We were made aware during a phone call on March 16th, 2000, that the DNR does not want a driving range in this area.
      - The Gary Parks and Recreation Department are investigating the possibility of building North of 30th Ave. instead of South.

G. Lake Erie Land Company – Wetland banking
   1. Lake Erie Land Company Outreach Committee met at the LCRBDC office on Tuesday, 4/25 to discuss marketing the “Great Konomick River Restoration” project. The Committee will take its recommendations and Dan and Judy will give an informative presentation to the full membership on 5/10/00.

H. A meeting was held with Lamar Advertising Company (formerly Whiteco) on January 28th, 2000, to review & update current leases.
   1. A new balance will be calculated (formerly $124,825) for removal of Whiteco signs for our project and we will pay this off as per a previous motion by the commissioners.
- We are awaiting updated balance from Lamar to pay off as of March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2000.
- A letter was sent to Lamar on March 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2000, requesting this information in order that we can close out this ongoing issue. \textit{(This was give to Attorney Casale on April 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2000.) (ongoing)}
LAND ACQUISITION REPORT  
Thursday, May 4, 2000

STATUS (Stage II Phase I) – Harrison to Broadway – North Levee:
   Dyer Construction – Contract price $365,524

STATUS (Stage II Phase II) – Grant to Harrison – North Levee:
1. Project completed December 1, 1993
   Dyer/Ellas Construction – Contract price $1,220,386

STATUS (Stage II, Phase 3A (8A) – Georgia to Martin Luther King – South Levee:
   Ramirez & Marsch Construction – Contract price $2,275,023

STATUS (Stage II, Phase 3B) – Harrison to Georgia – South Levee:
1. Project currently 98% complete.
2. Additional land will be required to extend a recreation trail off of the existing levee north of IUN to allow recreation trail users. (Refer to Recreation Report.)

STATUS (Stage II, Phase 3C2) – Grant to Harrison:
1. The re-location of the recreation trail due to the crossing at Grant St. would require agreements with the Steel City Truck Stop and the city of Gary to be able to cross Grant St. at the light at 32nd Ave.
   • We are considering moving the trail further east (nearer Gilroy Stadium) and coming south off the existing levee to 32nd Avenue. (A field meeting will be scheduled with the COE to agree to a new location.) (ongoing)

STATUS (Stage II, Phase 4) – Broadway to MLK Drive – North Levee:
1. A letter was sent to the Norfolk Southern Corporation on February 22nd, 1999, enclosing the easement agreements and the offer for these easements.

STATUS (Stage III) – Chase to Grant:
   Kiewit Construction – Contract price $6,564,520

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 1-North) – Cline to Burr (North of the Norfolk Southern RR):
1. The garage for DC448 (Mr. David Taborski) will be demolished after May 15th, 2000 per the contract specs and a new one built for the owners by the LCRBDC in the spring of 2000.
2. Two Uncles Construction was awarded the contract in the amount of $14,334.00 as per Commissioners approval for submitting the low bid at our April 6th, 2000 public meeting.
   • Construction started on April 13th, 2000.
   • Construction anticipated to be completed by May 5th, 2000.
STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 1-South) – Cline to Burr (South of the Norfolk Southern RR):
1. The most recent schedule with the COE for Stage IV Phase 1 (South) would be to complete
   acquisition by March 28th, 2000; April 14th, 2000 is the scheduled bid opening date; award
   contract on April 24, 2000; and have a construction start by May 21, 2000 with a one year
   scheduled completion. We submitted Right of Entry to COE on March 29th, 2000.

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 2A) – Lake Etta – Burr to Clark:
1. All construction is currently completed. Pump test is scheduled for mid-April. (Refer to
   Engineering Report)

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 2B) – Clark to Chase:
1. Construction currently 95% complete. Projected completion in late fall, 1999. (Refer to
   Engineering Report)

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 1) – Wicker Park Manor:
1. Project completed September 14, 1995
   Dyer Construction – Contract price $998,630

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 2) – Indianapolis to Kennedy – North Levee:
1. COE has verbally committed to not dividing Sv-2 into two sections. Congressman
   Viscosky’s office has requested “no more split contracts” due to LCRBDC funding
   crisis and COE costs for re-engineering.

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 3) – Northcote to Indianapolis – (Woodmar Country Club):
1. Appraisal with Dale Kleszynski is ongoing.

STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 1) – Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to
   Liable – South of the River:
1. At our April 27th, 2000 Real Estate meeting with the COE, they indicated “full-speed”
   on everything from Cline Ave. to Northcote.

STATUS (Stage VI – Phase 2) Liable to Cline – South of the River:
1. A letter was sent to the COE from the Town of Highland requesting re-consideration for
   alignment at the North end of Liable on Highland Park Department property with potential
   for recreation development.
   • All of the flood control impacts to the Town of Highland will be addressed by the
     LCRBDC & COE at a meeting scheduled for May 15, 2000.
2. We requested ROE to do soil borings West of Cline and South of the NIPSCO r/w on

STATUS (Stage VII) – Northcote to Columbia:
1. DLZ completed property identification has been completed for Munster and Hammond and
   submitted it to Earth Tech for their use on March 14th, 2000.

STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 1) E.J. & E. Railroad to, and including, Colfax North
   of the NIPSCO R/W – Ditch is South of NIPSCO R/W from Arbogast to Colfax.
1. A pre-bid meeting was held on March 2nd, 2000.
   - The new, revised schedule indicates the bid opening on May 9th, 2000, award May 31st, 2000, pre-construction meeting on June 15th, 2000, and construction start in mid-July.
   - As per a discussion with Imad and LCRBDC on February 4th, 2000, it was agreed that with money available, we will contribute to upcoming projects on a priority basis. (LCRBDC participates at 53% on this segment.)

2. Utility Re-Locates: (See Engineering Report)
   - NIPSCO starting re-locate on May 1st, 2000, anticipate completion by May 26th, 2000.
   - Attorney Casale requested to complete Marathon agreement on April 27th, 2000. (See Engineering Report.)

STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 2) Colfax to Burr Street, then North N.S. RR, then East (North of RR R/2) ½ between Burr and Clark, back over the RR, then South approx. 1,400 feet:
1. Current schedule is to advertise by October 15th, 2000, award contract by December 15th, 2000, and a construction start of February, 2001 – 360 days to complete.
2. LCRBDC is waiting on COE to finish Norfolk Southern RR engineering maps for an appraisal to be completed and an offer made.

EAST REACH REMEDIATION AREA – (NORTH OF I-80/94, MLK TO I-65):
1. The construction start was September 1999, with an anticipated one-year completion.
2. Additional ownership identification was completed by DLZ on March 13th, 2000.
3. Temporary ROE for road access was completed as of April 26th, 2000 – work will now begin for the I-65 closure structure at the contractor’s discretion.

WEST REACH PUMP STATIONS – PHASE 1A
1. These stations include Baring, Hohman-Munster, Walnut and South Kennedy.
2. We sent out the easement agreements for the 4 owners to approve – INDOT, North Township, Town of Munster and City of Hammond on November 8th, 1999
   - ROE was signed and approved based upon approved resolution dated January 6th, 2000.
3. This project is currently on hold due to the bid being 63% over the COE estimate.

WEST REACH PUMP STATIONS – PHASE 1B
1. These stations include S.E. Hessville (HSD), and (3) Highland Stations – 81st Street, and the 5th Ave. pump station (N. and S. sides)
2. The current COE scheduled as per our January 26th, 2000 coordination meeting is to complete design and review by April 24th, 2000, advertise by May 12th, 2000, award the contract by June 15th, 2000, and start construction by early August – 700 days to complete.
3. We received a request for R.O.E. from the Corps on March 8th, 2000, for three (3) parcels of real estate.
   - It is anticipated to have the signed agreements with Hammond and Highland during the week of May 1 – 5, 2000.
MITIGATION
1. COE real estate has verbally agreed to bid via a RFP for Hobart Marsh acquisitions instead of sole-source as the original mitigation plan called for.

GENERAL
1. The town of Highland received additional information for Kennedy to Liable (Stage VI – Phase 1) and for Liable to Cline (Stage VI – Phase 2) to consider future community planning.
   • This information was sent to Highland on April 20th, 2000, for their review & comments that will be discussed in a meeting scheduled for May 15, 2000.
2. A letter was sent to the COE on April 27th, 2000, requesting that the COE send us a letter with attached prints highlighting any changes in real estate that need to be obtained that vary from their final real estate drawings already submitted to us.
April 19, 2000

Mr. Garry Mang  
President  
TWO UNCLE CONSTRUCTION  
120 South Broad Street  
Griffith, Indiana 46319

Dear Garry:

Enclosed please find a copy of the fully executed agreement between TWO UNCLE CONSTRUCTION and the Development Commission for construction of a garage at 3036 Calhoun Street in Gary, Indiana. As per your proposal, the total cost to complete this work will be in the lump sum of $14,334.00.

Upon receiving this signed copy, please consider this as your notice to proceed. If you have any questions, please call me at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent  
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm  
encl.
April 17, 2000

Mr. David Orrison  
Norfolk Southern Railway Company  
99 Spring Street, S.W.  
Room 801  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. Orrison:

Enclosed please find one fully executed original copy of the agreement between the Norfolk Southern Railway and the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission for right of entry for construction, operation and maintenance of a levee system in the area known as Stage IV Phase 1 South.

We sincerely thank you for your time and effort in expediting the approval and signature of this agreement. We realize that you, indeed, made an extreme effort in helping us to meet the Corps deadline for this acquisition and we sincerely appreciate that effort.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner  
Executive Director

/sjm  
encl.

cc: Jim Pokrajac  
Judy Vamos  
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
April 17, 2000

Mr. Rick Mays
Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company
1141 Maple Road
Joliet, Illinois 60432

Dear Rick:

Enclosed please find one fully executed original copy of the agreement between EJ&E Railway and the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission for right of entry for construction, operation and maintenance of a levee system in the areas known as Stage IV Phase 1 South and the Burr Street Betterment Levee.

We sincerely thank you for your time and effort in expediting the approval and signature of this agreement. We realize that you, indeed, made an extreme effort in helping us to meet the Corps deadline for this acquisition and we sincerely appreciate that effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner
Executive Director

/sjm
encl.

cc: Mark Paul
Jim Pokrajac
Judy Vamos
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
April 17, 2000

Mr. Paul Easter
WIND Radio Station
625 N. Michigan Avenue
Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mr. Easter:

Enclosed please find one fully executed original copy of the agreement between the WIND Radio Station and the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission for right of entry for construction, operation and maintenance of a levee system in the area known as Stage IV Phase I South.

We sincerely thank you for your time and effort in expediting the approval and signature of this agreement. We realize that you and your legal staff made an extreme effort in helping us to meet the Corps deadline for this acquisition and we sincerely appreciate that effort.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

/sjm
encl.

cc: Kathleen Lucas
    Melinda Shapiro
    Jim Pokrajac
    Judy Vamos
    Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
April 19, 2000

Mr. John Bach
Director, Public Works Dept.
Town of Highland
3333 Ridge Road
Highland, Indiana 46322

Dear John:

As per your request, I am enclosing five (5) copies of the Army Corps of Engineers plans and specifications for construction of the flood control project south of the Little Calumet River from Kennedy Avenue to Liable Road in Highland.

Please distribute these to representatives of your community that you feel should have input into our future requests for real estate and for plan review. It is our intent to schedule a coordination meeting with Highland and the Army Corps of Engineers during the week of May 8 – 12 to discuss concerns previously expressed regarding property owned by your community and how it would affect your future development.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact me at the above number.

Sincerely,

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
encl.
cc: Imad Samara, COE
    Emmett Clancy, COE
    Jan Plachta, COE
April 18, 2000

Mr. Dan Gardner
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

RE: Little Calumet River Flood Protection Project

Dear Dan:

As we spoke last week, the Highland Town Council asked me to contact you and set a meeting to discuss the Little Calumet River Flood Protection Project and its impact to the Town of Highland.

The Council meets in study session on the first and third Mondays of each month and would like to meet with you on Monday, May 15th at 8:00 p.m. if you are available. Obviously, they are interested in the project schedule and what they may be able to do to expedite the progress.

I will be unavailable for the next two weeks; however, if this date fits into your schedule, please contact Judy Vaughn (972-5069) in my office to confirm. If this date does not work, please give Judy a list of dates that you would be available.

As always, we appreciate your efforts and willingness to keep us informed on the progress of this very important project.

Sincerely,

John M. Bach
Director of Public Works

Cc: Highland Town Council Members
Clerk Treasurer
April 27, 2000

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

Dear Bill:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission requests that to clarify the status of real estate changes, in the future, modifications or revisions to previously-submitted real estate drawings should be brought to our attention with a letter and appropriate attached prints indicating what changes have been made along with instructions of how to proceed.

In the past, we have obtained real estate requests from the FINAL real estate drawings and had appraisal work, title work, and acquisition completed based upon those drawings. Revisions have been made upon occasion due to design changes that caused modifications to work limits or types of easements and were not brought to our attention. These revisions caused additional title work, surveys, and appraisals to be needed, but we were not always aware of these changes to act in an expedited manner.

We are aware of the need to obtain the necessary lands and rights-of-way in a timely manner and feel that by following this request, we could eliminate any confusions or omissions prior to obtaining the necessary right-of-entries.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner  
Executive Director

/sjm
cc:  Imad Samara  
Emmett Clancy  
Tim Kroll  
Lou Casale  
Jim Pokrajac
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-0071</td>
<td>STA. II-PHS 3B</td>
<td>RAUSCH</td>
<td>$3,293,968.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559776</td>
<td>(GARCES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,477,249.66</td>
<td>05 DEC 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KARWATKA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,477,249.66</td>
<td>05 DEC 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TURNER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,280,112.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
CO-S and Contractor met on 3 FEB to discuss all outstanding items. Established the following schedule.

a. 20 MAR – Contractor address outstanding submittals, paperwork, and physical punchlist items that can be completed during winter.
b. 1 MAY – Contractor complete all physical punchlist items.
c. 5 May – CO-S and Contractor perform field inspection to verify ready for final inspection.
d. 22 MAY – Final inspection with District and Local Sponsor.

Awaiting PP-PM/ED-D responses to following issues: None at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-0073</td>
<td>STA. IV-PHS 2A</td>
<td>DYER</td>
<td>$2,473,311.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7179328</td>
<td>(GARCES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,367,842.64</td>
<td>06 OCT 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RUNDZAITS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,367,842.64</td>
<td>06 OCT 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TURNER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,192,046.22</td>
<td>19 NOV 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Received draft design. CO-S to discuss questions/comments with Rock Island week of 17 April 2000.

Awaiting PP-PM/ED-D responses to following:
A. Coordination of draft design of Generator input at pump station with Local Sponsor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CURRENT OBLIGATED AMOUNT</th>
<th>EARNED AMOUNT</th>
<th>FINAL W/O D. COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-0076</td>
<td>STA. II-PHS 4</td>
<td>RAUSCH</td>
<td>$3,066,892.00</td>
<td>$4,186,070.75</td>
<td>$4,182,688.98</td>
<td>22 SEP 98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71608714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,175,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
CO-S and Contractor met on 3 FEB 2000 to discuss all outstanding items. Established the following schedule.

a. 20 MAR – Contractor address outstanding submittals, paperwork, and physical punchlist items that can be completed during winter.
b. 1 MAY – Contractor complete all physical punchlist items.
c. 8 May – CO-S and Contractor perform field inspection to verify ready for final inspection.
d. 22 MAY – Final Inspection with District and Local Sponsor.

Awaiting final cross-sections from Contractor. Contractor received preliminary calculations from A/E. Expecting final quantities by 01 APR 2000.

CITY OF HOBART ROAD REPAIR – Contractor yet to resolve with City.

Contractor request for landscaping Laborer Classification forwarded to CELRC-OC for coordination with Department of Labor.

FC-76.XX - LEVEE QUANTITY OVERRUN EXCEEDING 115% - Awaiting final quantities.

FC-76.XX - Contractor requesting additional cost due to wet material from Deep River Borrow Site. CO-S has completed review, and presented results of review to Contractor. Contractor reviewing CO-S information.

Awaiting PP-PMED-D Responses to the Following Issues: None At This Time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CURRENT OBLIGATED AMOUNT</th>
<th>EARNED AMOUNT</th>
<th>FINAL W/O D. COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-0028</td>
<td>STAGE II-3C2</td>
<td>SBA/WEBB</td>
<td>$3,616,679.22</td>
<td>$3,915,170.36</td>
<td>$3,915,170.36</td>
<td>30 JUN 99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71919859</td>
<td>(DEJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,915,170.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LEE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,915,170.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TURNER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
CO-S planning to schedule joint Area/District Office/Sponsor Final inspection in May.

CO-S preparing Closeout file.

Awaiting PP-PMED-D responses to following: None at this time.
| CONT. NO. | DESCRIPTION | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| 97-0028   | IV-28       | Dyer Constr. | $1,530,357.50   | $1,819,314.65  | $1,819,314.65   | $1,782,377.50 | 100          | *16 Nov 98   |                |                |                |               | 100          |             |
| 7175638   |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Garcès)  |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Karwatka)|             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Turner)  |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |

**COMMENTS:**

*Required completion date will be extended to accomplish gatewell repair.*


Awaiting PP-PMED Responses to the following issues: None at this time.

Awaiting Ayres Responses to the following issues:

A. None at this time.

| CONT. NO. | DESCRIPTION | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| 98-C-0050 | Beverly     | American     | $1,139,575.00   |                |                |               | 100          |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| 80047629  | Shores      | Marine Const. | $1,157,152.37   | $1,157,152.37  | $1,157,152.37  | $1,157,152.37 | 100          |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Deja)    |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Newell)  |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Smith)   |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |

**COMMENTS:**

Reinspected dune grass 22 March. Found to be acceptable.

Preparing contract closeout.

As Built Drawings completed by ED-DT. Awaiting signed copies from CO-G.

| CONT. NO. | DESCRIPTION | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE | CONTRACT NO. | ORIGINAL AMOUNT | CURRENT AMOUNT | OBLIGATED AMOUNT | EARNED AMOUNT |  \% COMPLETE |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| 99-C-0040 | East Reach  | Dyer Constr. | $1,657,913.00   | $1,731,295.75  | $1,731,295.75   | $1,731,295.75 | 62.9         |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| 9355539   | Remediation | Const. Co.   | $1,731,295.75   |                |                |               | 62.9         |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Stebens) |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Lee)     |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |
| (Turner)  |             |              |                 |                |                |               |              |             |                |                |                |               |             |             |               |                |                |               |

**COMMENTS:**

Shut down for winter. Continuing to monitor settlement gauge at gatewell pre-load. ED-DT indicating they anticipate keeping pre-load on for entire six (6) months allowed, i.e. approximately 1 May.

Awaiting PP-PMED-D responses to the following:

a. Attainment of real estate for optional work NLT 30 Apr.
MEMORANDUM THRU

Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division,
Great Lakes Regional Office, ATTN:
CELRCM(GL)(L. Hiipakka), 111 North Canal
Street, Chicago, IL 60606

For Commander, HQ, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Office of
Chief of Engineers, ATTN: CECW-BE (Mark W. Mugler)
20 Massachusetts Avenue, DC, 20314

SUBJECT: Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation
Project, Section 902 Post Authorization Change Report

1. Attached is the Section 902 Post Authorization Change
   Report addressing the cost increase since authorization
   for the subject project. The increases exceed the maximum
   project section 902 cost limit of $138,235,000.

2. Request approval of this report so that the project cost
   conforms with the Section 902 limit.

3. The POC is Mr. Imad Samara at 312-353-6400 ext. 1809.

FOR THE COMANDAR:

JOHN E. SIRLES, III, P.E.
Deputy for Project Management

Encl
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA
LOCAL FLOOD CONTROL
AND RECREATION PROJECT
POST AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
111 NORTH CANAL STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606-7206

MARCH 2000
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POST AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORT
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

PURPOSE

This Post Authorization Change Report (PAC) addresses the cost increase in the Little Calumet River, Indiana Local Flood Control and Recreation Project since its authorization in the 1986 Water Resources Development Act (1986 WRDA). The increases exceed the maximum project cost limit legislated by Section 902 of the 1986 WRDA. The Section 902 maximum project cost limit is current estimated at $138,235,000. This report has been developed to notify the Congress of the cost increases and to recommend that the project's authorization be modified to complete construction of the project at the current estimated.

AUTHORIZED PROJECT

DESCRIPTION

The project will provide a 200-year level of flood protection. The authorized project consists of replacing and expanding existing levees and floodwalls, rehabilitation of existing pump stations, a flow control structure, nonstructural floodproofing, and a flood warning system for flood damage reduction and recreation features. The Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) with the non-Federal sponsor, the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC), was executed on August 16, 1990. Funds to initiate construction were appropriated in Fiscal Year 1990. As of January 2000, project construction was 45 percent complete. Attachment 1 includes an overall project map.

LOCAL COOPERATION

The items of local cooperation identified in the feasibility phase were contained in the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated 14 November 1983, as follows:

a. Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including borrow areas and disposal areas for excavated material determined suitable by the Chief of Engineers and necessary for implementation and maintenance;

1
b. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and subsequent operation and maintenance of the project, not including damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors;

c. Operate and maintain without cost to the United States all project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army;

d. Accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations or removal of buildings, transportation facilities, storm drains, utilities, and other structures and improvements made necessary by the construction, excluding railroad bridges and approaches thereto and facilities necessary for the normal interception and disposal of local interior drainage at the line of protection;

e. Prior to initiation of construction, prescribe and enforce regulations to prevent obstruction or encroachment which would reduce the project's flood-carrying capacity or hinder maintenance and operation, and control development in the project area to prevent undue increases in the flood damage potential;

f. Prior to initiation of construction, prescribe and enforce regulations to prevent modifications, which would increase flows through existing bridges and culverts;

g. Publicize floodplain information in the areas concerned and provide this information to zoning and other regulatory agencies for their guidance and leadership in preventing unwise future development in the floodplain and in adopting such regulations as may be necessary to insure compatibility between future development and protection levels provided by the project;

h. Implement, operate, and maintain facilities required for the flood-warning plan in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of the Army;

i. Operate, maintain, and replace without cost to the United States all recreation and wildlife mitigation facilities of the recommended project;

j. Provide a cash or in-kind contribution for recreation facilities sufficient to bring the non-Federal share of total recreation development costs to 50 percent; and
k. Share in the cost of mitigation features in the same ratio as the non-Federal share of costs for the flood control feature.

These items were modified during project authorization by the requirement in the 1986 WRDA including 25 percent cost-sharing of flood control features by a non-Federal sponsor, including a minimum 5 percent cash contribution.

CURRENT STATUS

The project is currently in the construction phase. Approximately 45 percent of the total project is physically complete. The project is divided into two sections. The east reach, which is mainly in Gary, Ind., extends from Cline Avenue to I-65. The west reach covers the area from the Illinois/Indiana state line to Cline Avenue. Construction of the project is divided into eight geographical stages, totaling 28 construction contracts. To date, 11 of the contracts have been completed, including four contracts for demolition of structures, five levee contracts, a recreation contract on the East Reach and one landscaping contract. Four construction contracts are currently underway, providing levee construction of the south levees Harrison to Georgia and north levees Burr to Clark, Broadway to King, Grant to Harrison and Clark to Chase.

Four other construction contracts will be awarded in FY 2000, these contracts will include the installation of a new drainage collection system north of the Northfolk and Southern Railroad, levee work south of the Northfolk and Southern Railroad, a betterment levee from Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad to Burr Street and rehabilitating pump stations in Hammond and Munster. The district is also preparing plans and specifications for construction contracts to be awarded in 2001.

The Local sponsor continues to provide land for the project. A total of 1,049 tracts are required 503 tracts have been acquired. In addition 27 displaced resident relocations have been completed.

AUTHORIZATION

The Congress authorized the Little Calumet River project in the 1986 Water Resources Development Act. The project was authorized"...In accordance with plan 3A contained in the Report of the District Engineer, dated July 2, 1984."
FUNDING HISTORY

The table below summarizes the history of federal funding of this project, by fiscal year, since authorization.

TABLE 1-Funding History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>APPROPRIATION CATEGORY</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR ALLOCATION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>$ 367,700</td>
<td>$ 367,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>655,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>1,005,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>1,342,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>2,366,000</td>
<td>3,708,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>2,703,000</td>
<td>6,411,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>3,013,000</td>
<td>9,424,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>10,146,000</td>
<td>19,570,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>13,842,700</td>
<td>33,413,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>1,569,600</td>
<td>34,983,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>3,848,000</td>
<td>38,831,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>9,639,000</td>
<td>48,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>8,378,000</td>
<td>56,848,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>5,657,000</td>
<td>62,505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>8,061,000</td>
<td>70,566,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHANGES FROM AUTHORIZED PROJECT

PROJECT SCOPE

EAST REACH MITIGATION: As authorized, the project's eastern limit is at the intersection of the Little Calumet River and the Norfolk Southern Railroad embankment. The Chicago District office prepared a Post Authorization Change Report (PAC) that was approved by HQUSACE in May 1999. The PAC was approved to include building the Marshalltown levee and relocations. The addition of this area has resulted in a cost increase in the amount of $3,279,000. The inclusion of the Marshalltown Levee in the East Reach Mitigation area added structural and non-structural flood control measures to the project. The structural measures include construction of 4,000 feet of levee around the west, south, and east sides of the Marshalltown Subdivision in Gary. Non-structural components include acquiring structures, relocating residents and demolishing 2 trailers and 5 structures.
PROJECT PURPOSES

The authorized project purposes of the Little Calumet River, Indiana Flood Control and Recreation Project are flood control and recreation. There has been no change in project purpose since authorization.

LOCAL COOPERATION

There have been no significant changes in the required items of local cooperation which have effected the total cost of the project. Amendment 1 to the LCA was developed to include the East Reach Mitigation scope change mentioned above.

LOCATION

The East Reach Mitigation PAC Report was approved to extend the project’s limit to include the Marshalltown area.

DESIGN CHANGES

Design changes since authorization include:
- Levee/floodwall alignment shifts.
- Constructed road raises to create closure structures in the freeboard zone.
- Significant sections of levees replaced with floodwalls because of real estate availability and the necessity to provide continuous protection during construction to those areas presently protected by spoilbank levees.
- Pump station outfalls have been modified to incorporate redundant closures or to carry them over the line of protection.
- Existing pumps require replacement or rehabilitation due to under capacity or condition, while the pumping stations require modifications to meet OSHA standards.
- An increase in the number of utility relocations.
- An increase in the number of interior flood control structures.
- Modifications to the design levee crest heights based on unsteady flow hydraulic modeling.
- The control structure at Hart Ditch has been changed from a gated structure to an uncontrolled weir structure.
- The major non-structural flood control component south of the river at Burr Street in Gary, IN has been replaced with a locally funded structural levee.
- The project limits have been extended eastward to provide social justice mitigation for induced flooding in Marshalltown at the confluence of Deep River with the Little Calumet River.
- Reanalysis of wetland impacts has required increased environmental mitigation.

**COST CHANGES**

The project's cost estimate has increased from the authorized cost of $87,100,000, which equates $120,815,000 at current price levels, to $180,000,000. Table 2 provides a comparison of the authorized project, costs updated to current price levels, the cost of the project last presented to Congress, and the current recommended cost estimate. The reasons for the cost changes are itemized in the following paragraphs.
Table 2
Comparison of Recommended Project Cost Estimate with Previous Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lands and Damages</td>
<td>$11,725,000</td>
<td>$16,623,000</td>
<td>$22,362,000</td>
<td>$19,982,000</td>
<td>$5,739,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocations</td>
<td>$8,620,000</td>
<td>$11,915,000</td>
<td>$17,786,000</td>
<td>$17,867,000</td>
<td>$5,871,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$359,000</td>
<td>$4,011,000</td>
<td>$3,903,000</td>
<td>$3,652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels &amp; Canals</td>
<td>$4,040,000</td>
<td>$5,585,000</td>
<td>$591,000</td>
<td>$591,000</td>
<td>-4,994,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levees &amp; Floodwalls</td>
<td>$39,955,000</td>
<td>$55,231,000</td>
<td>$72,769,000</td>
<td>$69,891,000</td>
<td>$17,538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumping Plants</td>
<td>$8,420,000</td>
<td>$11,639,000</td>
<td>$16,420,000</td>
<td>$16,411,000</td>
<td>$4,781,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,456,000</td>
<td>$3,360,000</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>-$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion Structures</td>
<td>$1,770,000</td>
<td>$2,447,000</td>
<td>$3,387,000</td>
<td>$543,000</td>
<td>-$1,904,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Operating Equip</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$683,000</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Design</td>
<td>$5,870,000</td>
<td>$8,114,000</td>
<td>$33,012,000</td>
<td>$33,013,000</td>
<td>$24,898,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$3,920,000</td>
<td>$5,419,000</td>
<td>$8,463,000</td>
<td>$8,463,000</td>
<td>$3,044,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td>$87,100,000</td>
<td>$120,815,000</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>$177,000,000</td>
<td>$59,185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lands and Damages ($5,739,000)

Land Payments: There has been an increase of $2,028,000 in the land payments for the following reasons:

- Flowage easements were estimated at 25% of Fee, appraisals for flowage easements to date have resulted in compensations exceeding 60% of Fee.
- Numerous small tracts with uneconomic remnants or little remaining utility were compensated in full.
- Administrative settlements to expedite acquisition were approved in order to avoid the higher cost of condemnation.
Relocation Assistance: The cost of relocation assistance, in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, PL 91-646, was added to land costs (+$1,169,000).

Real Estate Administrative Costs: The initial cost estimate used in the project authorization document was prepared prior to the initiation of crediting for cost-shared projects in accordance with PL99-662. The process of submitting, reviewing and approving the non-Federal LERRD credits has resulted in an increase in both Federal and Non-Federal real estate administrative costs by a total $1,005,000. Additional real estate administrative costs of $804,000 result from extensive negotiations with local elements concerning public lands, re-work associated with additional construction segmenting and design modifications, internal technical review requirements, additional acquisition to satisfy mitigation requirements, and extensive negotiations with railroads and other utilities.

East Reach Mitigation Land: The inclusion of the Marshalltown Levee in the East Reach Mitigation area as approved added more structural and non-structural flood control measures to the project. The additional area has resulted in a cost increase in lands and damages (+$565,000) and relocation assistance (+$168,000).

Relocations ($5,871,000)

Roads and Bridges: The authorized plan included the removal and replacement of the existing bridge at Columbia Avenue. The current plan eliminated this relocation since it was determined that with the revised elevation of the deck, the design water surface elevation is below low steel resulting in a decrease of $1,823,000 to this feature.

In the Feature Design Memorandum 2, the new culverts under Interstate 80/94 were changed from 2 barrel box culvert to 4 barrel, pressure tight joint precast reinforced concrete box culverts. The soil under the pipe was very poor; the contractor was required to excavate 7 to 12 feet under the pipes. In addition, 4 gate-well structures had to be added to maintain adequate interior drainage at I80/94. I-80/94 is one of the most traveled roads in Indiana. The contractor was required to install the pipe in an open trench while the road stayed open to vehicles. This resulted in an increase of cost in the amount of $2,468,000. Other miscellaneous road relocation changes have resulted in a decrease of $234,000.
Utilities: During the design phase, a significant increase in utilities to be relocated were identified. The line of protection (levees/floodwall) had to cross a large number of gas and petroleum pressure pipes. Pressure pipes were rerouted up and over the levees. (+$4,311,000).

Non-Structural Flood Control Relocations: The authorized project included non-structural flood control measures for 55 structures. In the Black Oak area between Burr Street and Chase Street on the north bank, the levee realignment was adjusted from the Riverside Avenue dedicated right-of-way to the north edge of 31st Street. This change necessitated the relocation of 24 structures that would remain within the unprotected floodplain resulting in an increased cost of $558,000 for demolition. The cost estimate presented in the Phase I GDM was based on generic non-structural component costs and Federal flood plain regulations. Application of specific designs to each structure and new guidance to comply with local flood plain regulations resulted in an increase of $1,484,000 for the non-structural measures. The non-structural measures for ring levee and low concrete floodwalls was transferred to the levee feature (-$987,000).

East Reach Mitigation Non-structural Relocations: East Reach mitigation added demolishing 2 trailers and 5 structures at an estimated cost of $94,000.

Fish and Wildlife ($3,652,000)

The authorizing document indicated impacts to 40 acres of wetland. However, subsequent investigations and detailed analysis determined that 156 acres of wetland will be impacted. This increase in impacted areas in conjunction with the increased technical knowledge concerning sustainable mitigation has resulted in a cost increase of $3,652,000.

Channels & Canals (-$4,994,000)

The authorized project included the construction of a disposal facility to be constructed at Chase Street and 35th Street for dredged and excavated materials. In the Phase II General Design Memorandum (GDM), it was determined that the use of existing disposal facilities were more economical than the construction of a new one, eliminating the need for construction of a new facility. (-$3,953,000). The non-Federal sponsor completed the channel modification in the East Reach in 1987 and received Section 104 credit for this work. There has been a cost reduction of $1,041,000 due to the reduction in quantities and unit prices.
Levees & Floodwalls ($17,538,000)

Structural Levees and Floodwalls: In the Phase II GDM, the redesign of the emergency overflow sections, based on revised criteria and guidance, resulted in an increase of $1,427,000. In the east reach, the Feature Design Memorandum (FDM) 2 revised the design to add toe drains, and revised the design of the closure structures. The quantities also increased due to anticipated settlement and an increase in levee height due to an overall increase in the water surface profiles due to updated hydraulic model (+$2,797,000). Post contract award and modifications due to unforeseen site conditions have resulted in an increase of $1,351,000 in the east reach. In FDM 5 for the west reach, the requirement to maintain flood protection during construction, presently provided by spoilbank levees, increased the use of floodwalls rather than levees from that proposed in the authorization document. The requirement also increased the cost of the construction of earthen levees by requiring contractors to stage the construction of the levees. The revised interior flood control plan presented in FDM 6 increased the number of gatewell structures. The restricted right-of-way available in the west reach has also increased the amount of floodwalls substituting for levees. These changes presented in FDM 5 and 6 result in an increase of $6,239,000.

Reach IV Protecting the Black Oak Region in Gary: The original design for Reach IV, assumed that interior drainage would connect into the Gary storm sewers that were programmed to be built by City of Gary. The City of Gary, due to lack of funding, canceled the installation of the storm sewers. As a result, a collection ditch and pipe were added at the levee toe, along with an additional pumping station and ponding area. The addition of interior drainage facilities resulted in an increase in cost of $2,844,000.

Non-Structural Ring Levee and Floodwalls: The non-structural measures for ring levee and low concrete floodwalls was transferred from relocations feature (+$987,000).

East Reach Mitigation Levee: The inclusion of the Marshalltown Levee in the East Reach Mitigation has resulted in a cost increase of $1,893,000 in the levee and floodwall feature.

Pumping Plants ($4,781,000)

The cost estimate for the authorization document assumed that the existing pump stations could be used with minimum modifications. Subsequent investigations and diagnostic tests for 10
the existing pump stations revealed that existing mechanical equipment needed to be rehabilitated or replaced. The Chicago District determined that replacing the existing pumps is less expensive than reconditioning them. In addition, coordination with higher headquarters and the new requirement for redundant closures resulted in the development of pump station discharge improvement alternatives that were not considered in the Phase I GDM. These design changes resulted in an increase of $2,348,000. More detailed investigations indicated modifications to four additional existing pumping stations were required (+$2,433,000).

Recreation (-$96,000)

A value engineering study was conducted of the recreational features. The recommendation eliminated Recreation Area 3 resulting in a decrease of $123,000. Post contract award and other estimating adjustment has resulted in an increase of $27,000 in recreation features.

Floodway Control and Diversion Structures (-$1,904,000)

The control structure at Hart Ditch has been changed from a gated structure to an uncontrolled weir structure resulting in a decrease of $1,904,000.

Permanent Operating Equipment ($655,000)

The technology and sophistication of flood warning systems has increased significantly since completion of the authorization report in 1983, as have the Corps of Engineers guidance and criteria for floodwarning/flood preparedness systems for flood control project providing less than an SPF level of protection. The present system was designed in accordance with the requirements in EM 1110-2-1419, 31 Jan 1995, and ETL 1110-2-540, 30 Sept 1996, and incrementally installed within the basin. The system includes automatic reading and reporting precipitation and river stage gages and computerized stage prediction software. The continued advancement in computer technology and the Y2K problem has already required replacement of much of the originally purchased and installed equipment, along with software updating. This has resulted in an increase of $655,000 for the flood warning system.

Engineering and Design ($24,898,000)
Engineering and Design costs were originally estimated at nine percent of the construction costs and has increased $24,898,000 (excluding cost escalation) due to the following:

- The Phase II GDM included two plans due to differing support by the Administration and Congress. Ultimately, the final plan was resolved through a Special Decision Document at the direction of the ASA(CW).

- The Hydraulics and Hydrology required extensive revisions to incorporate the impacts of subsequent project authorizations including the USACE Cady Marsh Ditch project, the NCRS Thorn Creek and Thornton Reservoir projects in Illinois.

- Additional design and reformulation required by changes to local and Federal policies and design criteria, including the need to prepare an MCACES estimate, revised guidance on application of local Flood Plain regulations to non-structural flood control implementation, increased emphasis on environmental mitigation, conversion to digital data, design and drafting procedures, and changes to funding procedures for value engineering studies.

- Conversion from freeboard to risk analysis type of H & H and Economic analysis, and the requirement for a significantly more sophisticated flood warning plan with subsequent development of unsteady state modeling and economic reanalyzes.

- Product reviews (Independent Technical Reviews), previously performed by higher headquarter employees charging against the General Expense appropriation, are now charged against the project appropriations.

- Increased analysis of interior drainage in the eastern segment at the request of the sponsor and changes to local drainage plans requiring modifications to interior drainage plans.

- Extensive reanalysis of the west reach protection to maintain existing levels of flood protection provided by spoil bank levees during construction of the permanent structures.

- An additional DM was added to implement the advance construction of the Wicker Park segment in the west reach, an area that suffered significant flooding and residential damages in 1990.

- Extensive redesigns were required due to coordination with the many railroads, and the reconstruction of I-80/94.

- Changed field conditions, changes in borrow sites, extremely poor soil conditions in the project area, local redirections, and discoveries of extensive undocumented dump sites required significant increases in soils investigations, structural analyses, and archeological and NEPA documentation.

- Reformulation and redesign of recreational features at the request of the local sponsor.

- An increase in projected construction contracts from 14 to over 28 due to direction to maximize the use of 8(a) set-asides
and real estate acquisition problems. There was also a substantial increase in the use of A-E contractors for Design and Engineering During Construction (EDDC) activities with the added contract administrative costs, and significantly increased coordination with local agencies in regards to technical issues.

- The addition of the East Reach Mitigation to the project.
- Substantial increase in HTRW investigation due to discoveries of major undocumented and non-permitted dump sites within the project area.
- An increase in the number and complexity of utility relocations, with subsequent increases in formulation and design of relocations.
- Existing pump station as-buils were incomplete or nonexistent requiring reconstruction of as-built documentation. In addition, unscheduled diagnostic testing was required to determine the condition of existing equipment, followed by the determination that existing pump stations and discharge outfalls required modifications more significant than originally estimated to function as a component of the Federal project.
- Extensive increase in environmental mitigation requirements with subsequent increases in mitigation design effort.
- EDDC support to construction and field changes during construction increased substantially due to extremely poor soil conditions, discovery of unidentified dumping areas, and other changed field conditions.
- The need to increase the scope and complexity of Operation and Maintenance Manuals to incorporate the local sponsors proposed method of operation and accomplish the required maintenance. This required preparation of separate appendices for each community within the project area.
- Addition of FIRM studies.
- Increases in labor costs due to locality pay, effective rates and other factors.

Construction Management ($3,044,000)

Construction Management costs have increased $1,474,000 due to the increase in construction scope and costs. In addition, there has been an increase in the number of contacts needed to complete construction. The construction has been divided into smaller segments in order to award contracts to 5A contractors. These additional contracts have resulted in an increase of $1,418,000 in construction management costs.

East Reach Mitigation Levee: The addition of the Marshalltown Levee in the East Reach Mitigation has resulted in a cost increase of $152,000 in construction management cost.
PROJECT BENEFITS

The authorized project benefit categories were flood damage reduction and recreation. The Phase II GDM economic analysis added the benefit category land enhancement and expanded flood damage reduction benefits to include transportation impacts. In the latest reevaluation report, prepared for the East Reach Mitigation PAC, the benefit categories were not changed. Except for price level and interest rate adjustments, there have been no material changes in the project that would alter the benefit analysis.

BENEFIT-COST RATIO

The benefit-cost ratio of the project as authorized in the Phase I GDM was 1.4 in 1981 price levels and an interest rate of 7-5/8 percent. The latest economic reevaluation prepared in support of the East Reach Mitigation included a reevaluation of the Phase II GDM economics, and concluded in a benefit cost ratio of 1.87 in 1995 price levels and an interest rate of 7-5/8 percent for the project. The benefit cost ratio of the current project is 1.66 based on October 1999 price levels and the current interest rate of 6-5/8 percent.

COST ALLOCATION

There have been no changes in cost allocation since project authorization. The current project purposes are still flood control and recreation.

COST APPORTIONMENT

A comparison of the apportionment of costs between Federal and non-Federal interests for the authorized project and the recommended project, both at current price levels, is given in Table 4. The increase in the non-Federal percentage is the result of increases in costs for lands, easements, rights-of-ways, relocations and disposals (LERRD) which are the non-Federal responsibility.
Table 3 - Apportionment of Costs for the Authorized and the Recommended Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorized Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$117,941,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational (50/50)</td>
<td>$89,178,000</td>
<td>$28,763,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Authorized Project</td>
<td>$90,615,000</td>
<td>$30,200,000</td>
<td>$120,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>$175,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational (50/50)</td>
<td>$128,725,000</td>
<td>$46,725,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Project</td>
<td>$131,000,000</td>
<td>$49,000,000</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 1999 price levels

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A Record of Decision (ROD) for the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the authorized project was signed on 13 July 1990. Due to changes, mainly in levee alignment, a supplement to that EIS was written. The ROD for this supplemental EIS was signed on 23 June 1995.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The land appraisals, project design changes, change in the eastern project's limits and construction issues that have caused the increased project costs have been coordinated and discussed with the Local Sponsor, the City of Gary and the area's residents, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management through correspondence, telephone conversations, meetings, and field visits. Local interests are furnishing all lands, easements, and rights-of-way and have sufficient local funding to complete the project based on the current cost estimate and schedule.

HISTORY

A brief history of the Little Calumet River project, subsequent to authorization, is given in the table below.
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TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Event</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCA Executed</td>
<td>Aug 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Started</td>
<td>Sep 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA Amendment 1</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that this Post Authorization Change Report be approved and the authorized project cost estimate be modified as described herein.

Peter J. Rowan
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army
District Engineer
Little Calumet River, Levee, East Reach Remediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>BY TRADE</td>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>BY TRADE</td>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>BY TRADE</td>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>BY TRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>THIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Engineers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,112.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>476.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>646.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,112.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>562.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamsters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Finishers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL TOTAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,886.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>476.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,148.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTRACT GOALS

- 49.00%
- 6.90%
Dyer Construction Company, Inc.
1716 SHEFFIELD AVENUE - DYER, INDIANA 46311
PHONES: (219) 865-2961, (773) 731-7868, (708) 895-3339 - FAX: (219) 865-2963

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD PROJECT - LEVEE CONSTRUCTION EAST REACH
FEBRUARY 2000 MINORITY UTILIZATION UPDATE

2. MATERIAL, SUPPLIES, & MISCELLANEOUS PURCHASES STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURCHASES</th>
<th>PURCHASED WITHIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAKE CO., INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS TOTAL</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTH TO DATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$167,233.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. SUBCONTRACTS STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURCHASED WITHIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAKE CO., INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTH TO DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBCONTRACTS (AT ANY TIER) AWARDED UNDER THIS CONTRACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LARGE</th>
<th>SMALL</th>
<th>SMALL</th>
<th>SMALL</th>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homer Tree Service, Inc.</td>
<td>3400 S. Archer Avenue, Lockport, Ill. 60441</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K &amp; S Testing &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>9715 Kennedy Avenue, Highland, IN 46322</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$9,834.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Wick Drain, Inc.</td>
<td>8869 King Road, Leland, N.C. 28451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,678.30</td>
<td>$26,678.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Little Calumet River, Levee, East Reach Remediation
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD PROJECT - LEVEE CONSTRUCTION EAST REACH
FEBRUARY 2000 MINORITY UTILIZATION UPDATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCONTRACTING PLAN COMPARISON:</th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>ACTUAL TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUBCONTRACTING</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>27.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE BUSINESS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL BUSINESS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ACTION TAKEN TO PROMOTE MINORITY PARTICIPATION (WORKFORCE AND SUBCONTRACTING):

Dyer Construction Company, Inc. has in force Affirmative action Plans for hiring minority employees utilizing but not limited to the Sixteen (16) steps as listed in the Specifications. Dyer Construction participates in the "School to Work Program". Dyer Construction Company, Inc is a member of the "Indiana Plan". Dyer also participates in local school job fairs such as Ivy Tech.

I declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 1746, that the foregoing is true and Correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

[Signature]

DATE: May 04, 2000
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SUBCONTRACTING PLAN COMPARISON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>ACTUAL TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUBCONTRACTING</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$114,178.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE BUSINESS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL BUSINESS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$64,178.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ACTION TAKEN TO PROMOTE MINORITY PARTICIPATION (WORKFORCE AND SUBCONTRACTING):

Dyer Construction Company, Inc. has in force Affirmative action Plans for hiring minority employees utilizing but not limited to the Sixteen (16) steps as listed in the Specifications. Dyer Construction participates in the "School to Work Program". Dyer Construction Company, Inc is a member of the "Indiana Plan". Dyer also participates in local school job fairs such as Ivy Tech.

I declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 1746, that the foregoing is true and Correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

David J. Neises

May 04, 2000

DATE
### Material, Supplies, & Miscellaneous Purchases Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total of All Purchases</th>
<th>Purchased Within Lake Co., Indiana</th>
<th>Purchased Within Gary, Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Month Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>This Month Total to Date</td>
<td>This Month Total to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month To Date</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,623.98</td>
<td>$189,856.30</td>
<td>$1,810.67</td>
<td>63.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,162.20</td>
<td>33.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$720.51</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,678.79</td>
<td>35.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subcontracts Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awarded Within Lake Co., Indiana</th>
<th>Awarded Within Gary, Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Month Total</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month To Date</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
<td>Amount % of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$114,172.20</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>43.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subcontracts (At Any Tier) Awarded Under This Contract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Large Business</th>
<th>Small Business</th>
<th>Small WBE</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Completed To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOMER TREE SERVICE, INC.</td>
<td>1400 S. ARCHER AVENUE, LOCKPORT, IL 60441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K &amp; S TESTING &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>9715 KENNEDY AVENUE, HIGHLAND, IN 46322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. WICK DRAIN, INC.</td>
<td>8869 KING ROAD, LELAND, N.C. 28451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,678.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Little Calumet River Flood Project - Levee Construction East Reach**
March 2000 Minority Utilization Update

**Contract No.: DACW27-99-C-0040**
Location: Gary, Lake County, Indiana
Contractor: Dyer Construction Company, Inc.
Contract Amount: $1,637,913.00

### 1. Labor Utilization Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Hours All</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Employees By Trade</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>To Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>To Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>To Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>To Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>To Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Engineers</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>2,271.60</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>516.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>646.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>52.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>1,175.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>502.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamsters</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Finishers</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>214.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,794.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>516.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,148.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.69%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40.89%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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